

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations,
and Student Research

Educational Administration, Department of

Spring 4-8-2015

The History of Nebraska Public School Reorganization Over the Past 30 Years and How This History Might be Used to Predict Nebraska School Reorganization in the Future: A Mixed Methods Study

Cory D. Worrell

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, cworrell@esu7.org

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Worrell, Cory D., "The History of Nebraska Public School Reorganization Over the Past 30 Years and How This History Might be Used to Predict Nebraska School Reorganization in the Future: A Mixed Methods Study" (2015). *Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research*. 215.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss/215>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

The History of Nebraska Public School Reorganization Over the Past 30 Years and How
This History Might be Used to Predict Nebraska School Reorganization in the Future:

A Mixed Methods Study

By

Cory Dean Worrell

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Professor Jody Isernhagen

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 2015

The History of Nebraska Public School Reorganization Over the Past 30 Years and How
This History Might be Used to Predict Nebraska School Reorganization in the Future:

A Mixed Methods Study

Cory Worrell, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 2015

Advisor: Jody Isernhagen

The purpose of this study was to examine the history of reorganization in public schools in Nebraska over the past 30 years and how we can use this history to make predictions for the future of reorganization in public schools in Nebraska. The researcher used a mixed method approach. For the quantitative research 199 Nebraska superintendents were surveyed to determine the reasons for their school districts reorganization over the past 30 years. For the qualitative research, eight individuals were interviewed to gauge their perceptions of public school reorganization in Nebraska. These eight individuals were experts in public school education in Nebraska.

The survey results showed that reorganization impacted school enrollment and school finances did not seem to be a major factor as to why districts reorganized. Additionally, results showed the legislature does not really have an impact on reorganization as well.

There was a minimal effect from reorganization upon improving student opportunities, however, it did not take away opportunities from students. Reorganization has a positive effect on staffing as districts usually gain teachers and they do not normally lose their jobs. For the most part, reorganization was positive for the community.

Based on the interview results Nebraska will continue to see a de-population of rural areas, which may negatively impact enrollment in schools. There will continue to be less need for more workers in agriculture, which will impact enrollment in rural areas. Rural communities and school districts prefer local control and that the legislature not be involved in reorganization in the future. However, there may be a need for a reorganization study to be conducted so the legislature better understands the needs of school districts rather than basing decisions on emotion.

Acknowledgements

It is not without the support and help of others this dissertation was completed. I hope everyone I mention realizes the impact they have had on my life and the support they have given me and continue to give me to this day. I am forever grateful to all of you.

I learned from an early age the value of an education. My late mother Janie and father Gary taught my sister Kristi and I how important getting a college degree was. At 8 or 9 years of age, I remember talking in the front yard of our house with two neighbors about how I would go on to college. My parent's encouragement allowed me to persevere through times that were challenging. I only hope that my wife and I can provide the same support to our own children that Kristi and I received.

My wife Amy is the most giving and supportive person I have ever met. Throughout the process of writing this dissertation, Amy has been with me every step of the way. She allowed me time on weekends and evenings to work on this when she needed me to be at home. She also put up with my multiple trips to Lincoln to get help on writing the dissertation. Thank you Amy for your love, support and dedication to myself and our family. I love and respect you dearly.

I also want to thank our children for their patience with me in getting this dissertation completed. Cooper, Brody, Deacon and new baby Archie light up my world and keep me focused on the two most important things in my world: Striving to be a great husband and father. Thank you all for your support and patience.

The NEAR Center crew was able to steer me in the correct direction when writing up both my quantitative and qualitative data. Houston Lester, Grant Orley and

Weldon Smith helped me with the quantitative information and Debbie Miller helped direct me with my qualitative data. Thank you all for your help and dedication to helping me get this completed.

I would also like to thank my friends and co-workers for their support and dedication to encouraging me through this process. I am especially grateful for the help my assistant Gay Sandman has given me through this process. I am lucky for the friends I have and to work with the people I do everyday.

And finally, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Jody Isernhagen for pulling me through this process. Dr. Isernhagen is so good at explaining what needs to be done at that exact moment. She didn't allow me to get overwhelmed with looking at the whole when I needed to focus on the moment and what needed to get done at that time. She is encouraging, supportive and when needed, feisty. When I needed a kick in the rear end, she provided it! I appreciate her honesty and dedication to helping me get this accomplished.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1—Overview	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
The Research Question(s).....	3
Methods.....	4
Definition of Terms.....	5
Assumptions.....	7
Delimitations.....	8
Limitations	8
Significance of the Study	8
Summary	9
Chapter 2—Literature Review	10
Introduction.....	10
Section 1: Definitions, Terms and their Meanings Related to School Reorganization	10
Section II: Key Legislation and Bills Related to School Reorganization (1985-2014).....	11
Key Legislation.....	11
Key Legislation in 1988.....	12
Key Legislation in 1990.....	14
Key Legislation in 1991	17
Key Legislation in 1993	19
Key Legislation in 1994.....	21
Key Legislation in 1995.....	23
Key Legislation in 1996.....	25

Key Legislation in 1997.....	26
Key Legislation in 1998.....	28
Key Legislation in 1999.....	30
Key Legislation in 2001.....	32
Key Legislation in 2002.....	34
Key Legislation in 2003.....	35
Key Legislation in 2004.....	37
Key Legislation in 2005.....	39
Key Legislation in 2006.....	42
Key Legislation in 2007.....	46
Key Legislation in 2008.....	48
Key Legislation in 2010.....	50
Key Legislation in 2011.....	52
Key Legislation in 2014.....	54
Summary.....	55
Chapter 3—Methodology.....	61
Introduction.....	61
Research Questions.....	62
Population and Sample.....	62
Research Design and Collection of Quantitative Data.....	63
Data Analysis for the Survey.....	63
Survey Pilot Testing.....	66
Qualitative Interviews.....	66
Data Analysis for Interviews.....	67
Summary.....	68

Chapter 4—Results	69
Purpose.....	69
Research Questions.....	69
Research Design.....	69
Quantitative Findings.....	70
Population	70
Valid Percent.....	72
Survey Results	72
Question A	72
Question B	74
Question C	74
Question D	76
Question E.....	76
Survey Part 1: Enrollment.....	77
Question #1	77
Enrollment Impacting Reorganization.....	77
Survey Part 2: Finances	78
Question #9.....	78
Finances Impacting Reorganization.....	79
Survey Part 3: Improving Student Opportunities.....	80
The Impact of Improving Student Opportunities upon Reorganization	80
Survey Part 4: Legislative Decisions	82
Legislative Decision Impacting Reorganization.....	82
Survey Part 5: Staffing.....	83

Staffing Impacting Reorganization	83
Survey Part 6: Community.....	84
Community Impacting Reorganization.....	84
Survey Part 7: Open Ended Question	85
Question #30.....	85
Survey Part 7: Open Ended Question Summary.....	89
Survey Results Summary	90
Qualitative Findings.....	93
Interview Participants	93
Interview Question Responses.....	95
Question 1	95
Question 2.....	99
Question 3	102
Question 4	105
Question 5	107
Question 6	110
Summary of Interviews.....	115
Summary of Survey Responses and Interviews.....	116
Chapter 5—Overview	120
Survey Findings	120
Summary of Interpretation of Findings from Surveys.....	124
Summary of Interpretation of Findings from Interviews.....	125
Discussion.....	126
Predictions.....	127
Recommendations.....	129

Future Research	132
Summary	134
References	137
Appendices	142

List of Tables

Table 1	School Districts in Nebraska, 1984-1985	13
Table 2	School Districts in Nebraska, 1987-1988	14
Table 3	School Districts in Nebraska, 1989-1990	17
Table 4	School Districts in Nebraska, 1990-1991	20
Table 5	School Districts in Nebraska, 1992-1993	21
Table 6	School Districts in Nebraska, 1993-1994	23
Table 7	School Districts in Nebraska, 1994-1995	25
Table 8	School Districts in Nebraska, 1995-1996	27
Table 9	School Districts in Nebraska, 1996-1997	28
Table 10	School Districts in Nebraska, 1997-1998	31
Table 11	School Districts in Nebraska, 1998-1999	32
Table 12	School Districts in Nebraska, 2000-2001	33
Table 13	School Districts in Nebraska, 2001-2002	35
Table 14	School Districts in Nebraska, 2002-2003	37
Table 15	School Districts in Nebraska, 2003-2004	38
Table 16	School Districts in Nebraska, 2004-2005	42
Table 17	School Districts in Nebraska, 2005-2006	45
Table 18	School Districts in Nebraska, 2006-2007	47
Table 19	School Districts in Nebraska, 2007-2008	50
Table 20	School Districts in Nebraska, 2009-2010	52
Table 21	School Districts in Nebraska, 2010-2011	54
Table 22	School Districts in Nebraska, 2013-2014	55
Table 23	School District Reorganization Year & Number of Reorganized	73

Table 24	School District Unification Year & Number of Schools Unified	75
Table 25	Current Classification of School District.....	76
Table 26	Enrollment Impacting Reorganization	78
Table 27	Financing Impacting Reorganization	79
Table 28	Impact of Improving Student Opportunities upon Reorganization	81
Table 29	Legislative Decision Impacting Reorganization.....	83
Table 30	Legislative Decision Impacting Reorganization.....	84
Table 31	Community Impacting Reorganization.....	85
Table 32	Interview Participants	94

List of Appendices

Appendix A	District Dissolutions	142
Appendix B	Survey Questions	234
Appendix C	Letter to Survey Participants.....	240
Appendix D	Survey Reminder Letter	242
Appendix E	Interview Letter, IRB Approval and Interview Questions.....	244
Appendix F	Interview Consent Form	247

Chapter 1

Overview

Introduction

School reorganization in Nebraska has taken many different forms in the past 30 years. These reorganizations have included the closing of Class 1 schools (Nebraska Legislative Library, 2005a) and have forced districts to join forces when they haven't necessarily wanted to. This would include the Learning Community approach to reorganization in metro area Omaha and surrounding communities. There have been a number of districts throughout Nebraska that have consolidated/merged with each other over the past 30 years. These consolidations have taken place for a number of reasons including financial pressures that have forced many districts to look for help from other area districts. Some school districts have steadily seen a decline in their enrollments while continuing to stay afloat. These pressures have lead districts to consolidate with each other while many districts also coop sports and other academic areas in order to stay open and remain attractive for potential students. Many of these coop agreements lead to further discussions between districts and eventually they consolidate into one district.

Many of these reorganizations have occurred after much heated discussion and political pressure. These pressures have occurred locally between school districts and the patrons they serve. And these pressures have occurred in the Nebraska State Legislature where state senators debate the merits of reorganization. The purpose of this study is to trace the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and determine how this history might be used to predict what future public school

reorganizations will look like in the next 30 years. The past 30 years includes the time from the 1984-85 school year through the 2013-14 school year.

Statement of the Problem

The State of Nebraska has seen a decrease in the number of public school districts over the past 30 years. In 1987, Nebraska had 898 school districts (NDE, 2011). These 898 school districts included Class I, II, III, IV, V, VI and state operated school districts. At the beginning of 2013, we had 249 school districts from Class I, II, III, IV, VI and state operated schools (NDE, 2013c). In Nebraska, Omaha and Lincoln are our two largest communities. According to statistics obtained from the Nebraska Department of Education, Lincoln and Omaha account for over 50% of our states overall student population. Many people from our rural areas have flocked to Omaha and Lincoln over the past 30 years. Has the declining population base in rural Nebraska given our smaller communities a reason to close their school doors? As your population shrinks, so does your school enrollment. As school districts have lost enrollment, has this factored into their reorganization? What is the cutoff point for districts across Nebraska in terms of their enrollment and the need to make a change for their district?

One might ask, as districts have dealt with reorganization efforts, how has the Nebraska Legislature responded to this? What has been their responsibility with changes in reorganization across Nebraska? When talking with state senators, they are quick to point out that the legislature is currently staying out of the school reorganization discussion. Senator Kate Sullivan from Cedar Rapids has made comments that the legislature would rather let school districts work through this on their own without legislative help. As the past 30 years have gone by, what legislative bills have been

passed that attach themselves to school reorganization? There has been recent legislative efforts to encourage districts to put together some form of reorganization. And in past years, there have been incentives given to school districts to work through the merger process with other districts. This study will share the legislation that has had an impact on school reorganization including the closing of Class I school districts and the Learning Community approach to reorganization. The researcher will examine where the legislature currently stands on school reorganization? This study will provide readers with the chance to hear from current state senators as they share their opinions on future reorganization.

By examining the information we have learned from the past 30 years, what significant predictions can be made about the next 30 years? Considering Nebraska's changing demographics, how might that impact reorganization in the future?

The Research Question(s)

The primary research question for this study is: What is the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and how might this history be used to predict what future public school reorganizations will look like in the next 30 years? There are three sub questions that revolve around the primary research question.

1. What forms of school reorganization have taken place in Nebraska over the past 30 years?
2. What factors led school districts in Nebraska to reorganize when they did?
3. How can we use these factors and our knowledge about the past 30 years of school reorganization in Nebraska to predict the next 30 years?

Methods

A qualitative historical/mixed methods approach will be used for this study. Information will be gathered from the Nebraska Department of Education on the number of school districts that Nebraska has had over the past 30 years and those that have reorganized. Legislative archives of past bills related to reorganization will be examined. Other methods of gathering evidence include similar dissertation studies that have looked at school reorganizations

In gathering historical qualitative data, Busha and Harter (1991) detailed six steps that need to be followed when collecting this evidence. These six steps are:

1. the recognition of a historical problem or the identification of a need for certain historical knowledge;
2. the gathering of as much relevant information about the problem or topic as possible;
3. if appropriate, the forming of hypotheses that tentatively explain relationships between historical factors;
4. the rigorous collection and organization of evidence, and the verification of the authenticity and veracity of information and its sources;
5. the selection, organization, and analysis of the most pertinent collected evidence, and the drawing of conclusions; and
6. the recording of conclusions in a meaningful narrative.

Another means of gathering information will be through a survey. A survey will be conducted that will gather evidence through asking questions related to why school districts reorganized. This survey will be sent to school districts in Nebraska that have had a form of school reorganization in the past 30 years. These questions will attempt to find out the reasons behind their reorganizations. One of the issues that will need to be addressed is the many school districts that reorganized 30 years ago probably have new administrators and board members. Therefore, some district information may be more

informative based on the number of years the survey respondents have served in their school district.

Definitions of Terms

Definitions of technical terminology used in this study include:

School Reorganization—According to Rule 83 from the Nebraska Department of Education, school reorganization “shall mean the formation of new school districts, the alteration of boundaries of established school districts, and the dissolution or disorganization of established school districts” (NDE, 2005, p. 2).

Mergers/Consolidations—according to Rule 83 from the Nebraska Department of Education, consolidations “shall mean the voluntary reduction in the number of school districts providing education to a grade group” (NDE, 2005, p. 1).

Dissolution of Depopulated Districts—

When, for a period of one school term, a school district (1) has less than three legal voters residing in the district or (2)(a) fails to maintain a public elementary school within the district in which are enrolled and in regular attendance for at least one thousand thirty two hours one or more pupils of school age residing in the district, other than option students as defined in Section 79-233 R. R. S., or (b) does not contract for the tuition and transportation of pupils of such district with another district or districts and have pupils attending school regularly for at least one thousand thirty-two hours under such contract or contract, the State Committee shall dissolve such district and attach the territory of such district to one or more neighboring school districts. Before dissolving such district, the State Committee shall fix a time for a hearing and shall notify each legal resident of the district at least fifteen days before such hearing. Notification shall be by mail or by publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the area. (NDE, 2005, p. 12)

Cooperative agreements—The Nebraska State Activities Association has a purpose statement for cooperative agreements that reads as the following,

The philosophy of the Nebraska School Activities Association is to provide an opportunity for high school students to participate in a variety of athletic and non-athletic activities. Through cooperative sponsorship, the opportunity for student

participation will be maintained, or increased, by permitting students who do not have a program available in their school to go to another school for athletic and non-athletic activity participation. The problem of declining enrollment, the inherent financial ramifications of supporting the cost of the program, the lack of facilities and equipment, and the problem of providing quality coaching staff when the number of teaching positions is reduced, make cooperative sponsorship desirable. Schools will not be permitted to use cooperative sponsorship to gain an advantage over other member schools. (NSAA, 2014)

Learning Community—According to the Learning Community webpage (2014) of Douglas and Sarpy counties,

The Learning Community is a Nebraska political subdivision dedicated to supporting and sharing locally proven programs and practices to improve student achievement. Within our community, we have the expertise and talent to collectively change education for young people who face significant obstacles to their education. Our 18-member Coordinating Council of elected and appointed representatives come from public school districts in Douglas and Sarpy counties. You won't find layers of administration in the Learning Community. Our leadership team and support staff consists of only five people. We are accountable to the Nebraska Legislature, the citizens of the Learning Community and more than 110,000 students and their families. There are no quick-fixes to the challenge of improving student achievement, but we have built a strong foundation to share what works. (Learning Community of Douglas and Sarpy Counties, 2014)

Unification—According to Rule 83 from the Nebraska Department of Education, unification “shall mean two or more Class II or III districts participating in an interlocal agreement under the Interlocal Cooperation Act with approval from the State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts (NDE, 2005, p. 3).

Assimilation—According to Rule 83 from the Nebraska Department of Education, assimilation, “shall mean the dissolution and merger of Class 1 and Class VI school districts” (NDE, 2005, p. 1).

District/School District—According to Rule 83 from the Nebraska Department of Education, district/school district “shall mean the territory under the jurisdiction of a single school board” (NDE, 2005, p. 2).

Reorganization of School Districts—According to Rule 83 from the Nebraska Department of Education, “shall mean the formation of new school districts, the alteration of boundaries of established school districts, and the dissolution or disorganization of established school districts (NDE, 2005, p. 2).

Assumptions

When surveying school districts that have gone through reorganization the past 30 years, it is likely that the current leaders were not there when the reorganization took place. Or it is also possible that they weren't at that district even when the reorganization discussions were being held. The information that they use to fill out the survey might be information learned through a second person. The information has potentially moved amongst many different people through the years and might not be as accurate as it could be. Also, the survey information might bring in a variety of responses as to why the district reorganized. The ability to narrow down district's reasons for reorganizing may be vast and inconsistent. This would leave us with a wide range of data and not much specific information.

Also, when interviewing significant people in Nebraska associated with reorganization, the researcher will be relying on assumptions as to what reorganization in Nebraska will look like in the future. These assumptions could be flavored by political influences and not based on knowledge. State senators represent people in the state of Nebraska and at times these people influence them. It may be that their ability to give me information may be influenced by outside forces.

Delimitations

A major delimitating factor in this study is that it is focusing on Nebraska public school districts. The data and results examined in this dissertation will focus only on the effects of reorganization on Nebraska school districts. Therefore, no assumptions will be made about how Nebraska reorganization results compare across the nation. Another possible delimitation is that this author will examine only the past 30 years. Therefore this may limit the overall scope of school reorganization in Nebraska.

Limitations

There are potential limitations created by the methodology used in this study. The rate of return on the surveys might be limited, as school districts may have reorganized many years ago. These districts have probably changed administrators through the years and board members have come and gone. Therefore the ability to complete a survey may be difficult. The information as to why a school district reorganized might have changed over the years.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is it will provide the educational community with a historical perspective for school reorganization in Nebraska. Hopefully, many questions will be answered as to why school districts made the decisions they did and the hope is that this study will unravel the reasons for school reorganization in school districts in Nebraska. Another significance of this research may be that the reasons for reorganization may provide a template for predicting future reorganizations in the state.

The information gained from this study may be helpful in future educational planning for the state of Nebraska. It may allow state legislators, the Nebraska Board of

Education, and public school administrators to better plan for the future education for children across the state.

Summary

Over the past 30 years there has been a loss of 649 school districts due to reorganization. Some Nebraskans still think we have too many school districts. With the population of many of our smaller communities shrinking and the flight of Nebraskans to larger metropolitan areas, many of the remaining 249 school districts may not be viable in the future. The importance of this study is that it will provide more clarity as to why reorganization has taken place in the past and the implications for the future.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

The literature review consists of information from a variety of locations including journals and professional articles; dissertation studies; and Omaha World Herald newspaper articles. These artifacts will assist the researcher in tracing the history of public school reorganization over the past 30 years in Nebraska. All of these references will help to determine how history might be used to predict what future public school reorganization will look like in the next 30 years.

The literature review will contain three sections:

1. Section I will define terms, definitions and what reorganization means for public schools in Nebraska. The rules and processes for reorganization will be included with a discussion of NDE's Rule 83 and how it defines the process. School District classifications will be broken down by class (I, II, III, IV, V and VI) from 1985-2014.
2. Section II will contain key pieces of legislation and the bills with greatest impact on the reorganization of schools will be discussed. This discussion will include the reasons why legislators reduced the number of school districts and the impact on the funding formula for public schools in Nebraska. The state funding formula known as TEEOSA (Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities Support Act) has changed many times over the past 30 years to try to better accommodate public education in Nebraska. Districts have been dissolved and combined with other school districts. It is important to look at how legislative bills have influenced the number of school districts and reorganizations from 1985-2014. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1990b, p. 2)

Section I: Definitions, Terms and their Meanings Related to School Reorganization

It is important for the reader to have an understanding of the Classification of School Districts in Nebraska (NDE, 2002). These classifications will be used throughout the dissertation and will add to the readers understanding of how school districts are classified. Public school districts in Nebraska are classified as follows:

- Class I**—Any school district that maintains only elementary grades under the direction of a single school board.
- Class II**—Any school with territory having a population of one thousand inhabitants or less that maintains both elementary and high school grades under the direction of a single school board.
- Class III**—Any school district with territory having a population of more than one thousand and less than one hundred fifty thousand inhabitants that maintains both elementary and high school grades under the direction of a single school board.
- Class IV**—Any school district with territory having a population of one hundred thousand or more inhabitants with a city of the primary class within the territory of the district that maintains both elementary and high school grades under the direction of a single school board. This class of school system in Nebraska is the Lincoln Public Schools.
- Class V**—Any school district with territory having a population of two hundred thousand or more inhabitants with a city of the metropolitan class within the territory of the district that maintains both elementary and high school grades under the direction of a single school board. This class of school system in Nebraska is the Omaha Public Schools.
- Class VI**—Any school district in this state that maintains only a high school, or only a high school and grades seven and eight or six through eight as provided in section 79-411 under the direction of a single school board. (NDE, 2002)

Section II: Key Legislation and Bills Related to School Reorganization (1985-2014)

The literature review will begin with significant legislative bills and changes to TEEOSA that were brought on by reorganization beginning in 1985. However, some years will not be discussed as those were years where there was little or no legislative action regarding school reorganizations. Information regarding the number of school districts and school enrollment will also be included. This information was taken from the “Statistics and Facts about Nebraska Schools” section of the Nebraska Department of Education webpage (2014).

Key Legislation. LB 662 was approved by the governor on April 24, 1985. LB 662 discussed Class I schools merging with other Class II, III, IV or V districts. Section 1 of LB 662 stated:

On or before September 1, 1989, all Class I districts that are not within a Class VI district on September 1, 1986, or affiliated with another school district prior to March 1, 1989, shall be merged with an existing Class II, III, IV or V school district or become part of an existing Class VI school district. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1985, pp. 1, 2)

In Nebraska in 1984 there were 984 school districts across the state with over 266,116 students. The majority of school districts in Nebraska at the time were Class I districts serving 17,614 students. These districts numbered 666 out of the 984 districts. There were 66 Class II school districts with 8,961 students followed up by 220 Class III districts representing 167,974 students. Class IV Districts were represented by Lincoln Public Schools with 24,859 students and Class V Omaha Public Schools with 41,669 students. Class VI districts numbered 23 with 4,542 students. There were 7 state operated schools in Nebraska at this time with 497 students (see Table 1).

Key Legislation in 1988. LB 940 was approved by the governor on April 8, 1988. LB 940 allowed open Class I districts to stay open and created goals for reorganization. Section 1 of LB 940 states:

The Legislature hereby finds and declares that orderly and appropriate reorganization of school districts may contribute to the objectives of tax equity, educational effectiveness and cost efficiency. The Legislature further finds that there is a need for greater flexibility in school reorganization options and procedures. It is the intent of the Legislature to encourage and orderly and appropriate reorganization of school districts. The Legislature hereby establishes as its goals for the reorganization of school districts that:

1. All real property and all elementary and secondary students should be within school systems which offer education in grades kindergarten through twelve;
2. School districts offering education in kindergarten through grade twelve should be encouraged when possible, to consider cooperative programs in order to enhance educational opportunities to students;
3. County reorganization committees should make a renewed effort to consider and plan for reorganization of schools at the local level; and
4. The State Department of Education in conjunction with the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Studies in the Department of Education

Table 1

School Districts in Nebraska, 1984-1985

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	666	17,614
II	66	8,961
III	220	167,974
IV	1	24,859
V	1	41,669
VI	23	4,542
Total Class I-IV	977	265,619
State Operated Schools	7	497
Total All Public Schools	984	266,116

Administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln should be encouraged to offer greater technical assistance to school districts which are considering reorganization studies. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1988, pp. 1, 2)

There were 590 Class I school districts in 1988 compared with 666 in 1985. In 1988, Class II school districts numbered 54 while in 1985 they numbered 66. There were 222 Class III districts in 1988 compared to 220 in 1985. In Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) there were 25,974 students compared to 24, 859 in 1985. In Class V (Omaha Public Schools) there were 41,416 students in 1988 compared to 41,669 in 1985. There were 23 Class VI districts in 1988, which is the same amount as there was in 1985. In Nebraska in 1988, there were 898 total public school districts in Nebraska with 268,100 students. This was a reduction of 86 total districts from the 984 total districts in 1985. Overall enrollment was up 1,984 students in 1988 compared with 1985 (see Table 2).

Table 2

School Districts in Nebraska, 1987-1988

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	590	15,864
II	54	7,881
III	222	172,024
IV	1	25,974
V	1	41,416
VI	23	4,442
Total Class I-IV	891	267,601
State Operated Schools	7	499
Total All Public Schools	898	268,100

Key Legislation in 1990. In 1990, LB 259 was approved by the governor on April 4, 1990. LB 259 said that all Class I districts would either merge, become part of a Class VI district, or affiliate with one or more Class II, III, IV, V or VI districts. LB 259 in Section 1 states:

By July 1, 1992, all real property and all elementary and high school students shall be in school systems which offer education in grades kindergarten through twelve. For purposes of meeting such requirement, a Class I district which is part of a Class VI district and Class I districts affiliated with one or more Class II, III, IV, V or VI districts shall be considered as including all real property and all elementary and high school students within a school district which offers education in grades kindergarten through twelve, (Nebraska Legislature Library, LB 259, p. 1 and 2, 1990). LB 259 goes on to further state, "Effective July 1, 1994, with the full implementation of sections 23 and 24 of this act, the Legislature will have attained its school reorganization goals for Class I districts as described in section 79-426.27. Section 2 states "For purposes of the statutes governing schools:

1. Affiliated school system shall mean all the high school districts and all Class I districts which have become affiliated; and

2. Affiliation or affiliation of school districts shall mean an ongoing association of a Class I district not a part of a Class VI district with one or more existing Class II, III, IV, V or VI districts for the purpose of (a) providing a high school program serving the Class I district students and (b) maintaining tax support to finance such program. The services provided may include student transportation. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1990a, p. 2)

Section 7 of LB 259, goes on to further state:

When the legal voters of a Class I or II school district in which no city or village is located petition to merge in whole or in part with a Class I or Class II district, such merger may be accepted by petition of the board of education of the accepting district. When the legal voters of a Class I district petition to affiliate in whole or in part with one or more Class II, III, IV, VI or VI districts, such affiliation may be accepted or rejected by petition of the board of education of any such district, but in either case such petition to affiliate shall be accepted or rejected within sixty days of the date of receipt of the petition by the board of education of such district. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1990a, pp. 4, 5)

In 1990, we also saw the formation of TEEOSA (Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities and Support Act). The TEEOSA funding formula for schools is still in effect today. As the years have passed since 1990, TEEOSA has seen many changes. At the time it was signed in 1990, there were several key pieces to the formula. LB 1059 was passed over the governor's veto on April 9 1990. At the time of its passage, concerns over the funding formula in place were:

1. Nebraska currently finances over 70% of the costs of operating its public school system from the property tax and other local sources while nationally only 43% of the costs are supported by property taxes and other local sources;
2. The cost of operating the public school system is near the national average in per pupil cost as well as per capita spending.
3. The overreliance on the property tax for the support of the public school system has created great disparities in local property tax rates. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1990b, p. 2)

The intent of the new TEEOSA formula in 1990 was to create a system that:

1. Provide state support from all sources of state funding for forty-five percent of the aggregate general fund operating expenditures of school districts;
2. Reduce the reliance on the property tax for the support of the public school system;

3. Broaden financial support for the public school system by dedicating a portion of the revenue received from the state income tax for support of the system. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1990b, p. 2)

A few key pieces to how the actual formula will work were:

1. Beginning in fiscal year 1990-91, twenty percent of the projected state income tax receipts shall be dedicated to the use and support of the public school system to provide support for the distribution of aid to districts;
2. For each Class I district which is not part of a Class VI district, 61.3793 percent of the certified income tax liability shall be allocated to the nonresident high school tuition fund to which the Class I district belongs. When the Class I district is a joint district, such remainder shall be allocated to the nonresident high school tuition fund of each county in which the Class I district has property based on each county's pro rata share of the Class I district's total adjusted valuation;
3. For each Class I district which is part of a Class VI district which offers instruction in grades seven through twelve, 44.8276% of the certified income tax liability shall be allocated to such Class I district, and the remainder shall be allocated to the Class VI district. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1990b, p. 6)

In 1990, we saw another significant drop in the number of Class I school districts across Nebraska. In 1990, we had 538 Class I school districts compared with 562 in 1989. We had 53 Class II districts in both 1990 and 1989. We also had the same amount of Class III districts in 1990 and 1989 with 223. In Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) we saw their enrollment in 1990 at 27,356 compared with 26,567 in 1989. For Class V (Omaha Public Schools) in 1990, we saw they had 41,669 students enrolled compared to 41,243 in 1989. And we also had the same amount of Class VI districts in 1990 and 1989 with 22. Overall, the number of total districts in Nebraska in 1990 was 845 compared with 869 total in 1989. This is a decrease of 24 districts. The overall total public school enrollment across Nebraska was 270,389 in 1990 compared with 269,382 in 1989. This is an increase of 1007 students (see Table 3).

Table 3

School Districts in Nebraska, 1989-1990

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	538	14,366
II	53	7,736
III	223	175,047
IV	1	27,356
V	1	41,251
VI	22	4,105
Total Class I-IV	838	269,861
State Operated Schools	7	528
Total All Public Schools	845	270,389

Key Legislation in 1991. LB 511 was approved by the governor on June 10, 1991. LB 511 changed the date to complete the affiliation process set out in LB 259 in 1990. LB 511 states in section 13 that:

When the legal voters of a Class I or II school district in which no city or village is located petition to merge in whole or in part with a Class I or Class II district, such merger may be accepted by petition of the board of education of the accepting district. When the legal voters of a Class I district petition to affiliate in whole or in part with one or more Class II, III, IV or V districts, such affiliation may be accepted or rejected by petition of the board of education of any such district, but in either case such petition to affiliate shall be accepted or rejected within sixty days of the date of receipt of the petition by the board of education of such district. Section 14 further states:

Any Class I district or portion thereof which is not part of a Class VI district on July 10, 1990, may, prior to February 1, 1993, file a petition for affiliation pursuant to section 79-402, 79-402.03, or 79-402-04 or a plan for affiliation pursuant to section 79-426.08 with the county superintendents to affiliate with one or more Class II, III, IV or V districts or to affiliate in part with one or more Class II, III, IV or V districts and in part to become part of one or more Class VI districts. Affiliation shall be accomplished pursuant to any of the procedures

provided in sections 79-402, to 79-402.08 and the Reorganization of School Districts Act. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1991a, p. 11)

Section 22 of LB 511 goes on to further state:

Reorganization of school districts may be had and accomplished through or by means of any one or more of the following methods: (1) The creation of new districts; (2) the uniting of one or more established districts; (3) the subdivision of one or more established districts; (4) the transfer and attachment to any established district of a part of the territory of one or more districts; (5) the affiliation of a Class I district or portion thereof with one or more Class II, III, IV or V districts; (6) the changing of boundaries of a Class VI district; and (7) the dissolution or disorganization of any established district for any of the reasons specified by law. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1991a, p. 15)

Section 26 of LB 511 describes a change to the TEEOSA formula. Section 26 states:

The county superintendent and county treasurer in each county maintaining a nonresident high school tuition fund created pursuant to section 79-437, which is repealed effective July 1, 1993, shall maintain an account to receive delinquent tax collections for the nonresident high school tuition levy, proceeds from the TEEOSA and the Special Education Act, and any other funds legally due the nonresident high school tuition fund and to distribute the balance in such account periodically to school districts in the following order of priority;

1. Class II, III, IV, V and VI districts which have not received full payment of nonresident high school tuition charges certified pursuant to sections 79-4,102 to 79-4.104 until each has received full payment; and
2. Class I districts which affiliate pursuant to section 79-402.13 or become part of a Class VI district and any Class II, III, IV or V district with which a Class I district merges or forms a new Class II, III, IV or VI district. The distribution shall be made to such districts in payments as nearly as practicable in the proportion that the actual valuation of taxable property of Class I district bears to the total valuation of all Class I districts comprising the nonresident high school tuition fund. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1991a, p. 18)

In 1991, LB 829 was signed into effect by the governor on June 10, 1991. LB 829 had a modification to the TEEOSA formula. Under Section 1 of LB 829, states:

On or before August 20th of each year, the county assessor shall certify to each governing body or board empowered to levy or certify a tax levy the current valuation of all property subject to the applicable levy. Current valuation shall mean that valuation established by the county assessor and equalized by the county board of equalization and the State Board of Equalization and Assessment

and for tax year 1991 shall include the value of personal property which was immediately prior to the operative date of this section subject to tax for tax year 1991 but which is exempt from tax solely because of the changes made to section 77-202 by this legislative bill. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1991b, p. 2)

In 1991, Class I district's continued to close their doors. In 1991, there were 513 Class I districts in Nebraska compared to 538 in 1990. There were 51 Class II districts in 1991 compared to 53 in 1990. In 1991, we saw an increase in Class II districts going from 225 compared to 223 in 1990. In Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) there were 27,986 students in 1991 compared with 27,356 in 1990. In Class V (Omaha Public Schools) there were 41,699 students in 1991 compared with 41,251 in 1990. There was one less Class VI district in 1991 with 21 of those districts compared to 22 in 1990. Overall, in 1991, there were 819 public school districts compared with 845 in 1990. There were 273,530 students enrolled in public schools in 1991 compared with 270,389 in 1990. This is an increase of 3,141 students (see Table 4).

Key Legislation in 1993. LB 348 was signed by the governor on June 10, 1993.

A modification to TEEOSA was made Under Section 70 of LB 348 and is stated that:

For the calculation of state aid to be paid in school year 1993-94 and each school year thereafter in Class I districts which have more than one general fund levy in the current year, the department shall base the calculation on a derived general fund levy for the district computed by adding the general fund property tax yield for all portions of the district and dividing the result by the total assessed valuation of the district in hundreds. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1993a, p. 39)

LB 839 was signed by the governor on June 10, 1993. LB 839 was another modification to the TEEOSA formula. Under Section 2 of LB 839 it states:

Commencing with the 1995-96 school year, the general fund property tax requirement of the Class VI school district and each Class I school district or portion thereof in a Class VI school system tax levy. The proceeds of such levy, upon collection by the county, shall be distributed to the districts in the Class VI school system in amounts which are in proportion to the amounts of the general

Table 4

School Districts in Nebraska, 1990-1991

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	513	13,836
II	51	7,307
III	225	178,163
IV	1	27,986
V	1	41,699
VI	21	3,991
Total Class I-IV	812	272,982
State Operated Schools	7	548
Total All Public Schools	819	273,530

fund property tax requirement of the Class IV school system shall be divided by the assessed valuation, in hundreds, of the system. If only a portion of a Class I district is part of the Class VI district, such Class I district's general fund property tax requirement shall be apportioned to respective portions of such Class I district for purposes of this computation based on each portion's assessed taxable valuation in relation to the total assessed valuation of the entire Class I district. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1993b, p. 3)

In 1993, there were now 433 Class I school districts compared with 513 in 1991. This was a decrease of 80 Class I districts, which was significant. In 1993, there were 48 Class II districts compared with 51 in 1991. In 1993 there were 224 Class III school districts compared with 225 in 1991. We saw Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) with 29,738 in 1993 compared with 27,986 students in 1991. Students with the Class V (Omaha Public Schools) had 43,158 students in 1993 while there were 41,699 students in OPS in 1991. In 1993 we saw there were still 22 Class VI school districts compared with 21 in 1991, an increase of one. Overall, in 1993 there were 736 public school districts in

Nebraska compared with 819 in 1991. This is 83 less districts in 1993 than in 1991. This mainly resulted from a decrease of 80 Class 1 districts in the span of that time. Overall, there were 281,879 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 1993 as compared with 273,530 in 1991. This was an increase of 8,349 students (see Table 5).

Table 5

School Districts in Nebraska, 1992-1993

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	433	12,770
II	48	7,081
III	224	184,217
IV	1	29,738
V	1	43,158
VI	22	4,403
Total Class I-IV	729	281,367
State Operated Schools	7	512
Total All Public Schools	736	281,879

Key legislation in 1994. LB 1290 was approved by the governor on April 7, 1994. This was a modification to the TEEOSA formula. Under Section 9 of LB 1290 it states:

Except as otherwise provided in the Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities Support Act, state aid payable pursuant to the act for each school year shall be based upon data found in applicable reports for the most recently available complete data year. The annual financial reports of all school districts shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Education pursuant to the date prescribed in subdivision (3) of section 79-451. If a school district fails to timely submit its report, the commissioner, after notice to the district and an opportunity to be

heard, shall direct that any state aid granted pursuant to the act be withheld until such time as the report is received by the department. In addition, the commissioner shall notify the county superintendent to direct the county treasurer to withhold all school money belonging to the school district until such time as the commissioner notifies the county superintendent of receipt of such report. The county treasurer shall withhold such money. Section 9 goes on to read:

A district which receives federal funds in excess of twenty-five percent of its general fund budget of expenditures may apply for early payment of state aid paid pursuant to the act when such federal funds are not received in a timely manner. Such application may be made at any time by a district suffering such financial hardships and maybe for any amount up to fifty percent of the remaining amount to which the district is entitled during the current fiscal year. The state board may grant the entire amount applied for or any portion of such amount if the state board finds that a financial hardship exists in the district. The state board shall notify the Director of Administrative Services of the amount of funds to be paid in lump sum and the reduced amount of the monthly payments. The Director of Administrative Services shall, at the time of the next state aid payment made pursuant to section 79-3813, draw a warrant for the lump-sum amount from appropriated funds and forward such warrant to the district. For purposes of this subsection, financial hardship shall mean a situation in which income to a district is exceeded by liabilities to such a degree that if early payment is not received it will be necessary for the district to discontinue vital services or functions. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1994, p. 6)

In 1994, the number of Class I districts was reduced to 399 compared to 433 in 1993. Class II districts stayed the same at 48 in 1994 and 1993. Class III districts in 1994 numbered 221 compared to 224 in 1993. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) enrollment number was 30,017 in 1994 compared with 29,738 in 1993. Class V (Omaha Public Schools) had an enrollment of 43,609 in 1994 compared with 43,158 in 1993. There were 22 Class VI districts in 1994 and 1993. Overall, there were 699 overall districts in 1994 compared with 736 in 1993. The total enrollment for students in public schools in Nebraska was 284,459 in 1994 compared with 281,879 in 1993. This was an increase of 2,580 students (see Table 6).

Table 6

School Districts in Nebraska, 1993-1994

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	399	12,240
II	48	7,118
III	221	186,375
IV	1	30,017
V	1	43,609
VI	22	4,576
Total Class I-IV	692	283,935
State Operated Schools	7	524
Total All Public Schools	699	284,459

Key Legislation in 1995. In 1995, the governor signed LB 840 into effect on June 13, 1995. LB 840 was both another modification to TEEOSA and incentives were given to school districts to reorganize. A few key points on the changes to TEEOSA included:

1. Reorganized districts which become reorganized districts on or before June 30, 2005 shall not receive state aid for each of the school years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 which is less than one hundred percent of the amount of aid received pursuant to the School Foundation and Equalization Act for school year 1989-90.
2. No district shall receive equalization aid in an amount such that total state aid received would result in such district having a general fund tax levy of less than sixty percent of the local effort rate as computed pursuant to section 79-3808. The calculation shall be based on valuation, state aid and levy data from the current school year and for the calculation of state aid in school year 1992-93 and each school year thereafter, shall also take into consideration the amounts of nonresident high school tuition certified by the department pursuant to section 79-4,102 for the current school year and for the school year in which such state aid is to be paid. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1995, p. 4)

Under LB 840 there were also incentives given to school districts to reorganize.

Under Section 7 of LB 840, it states:

When two or more districts consolidate into one or more reorganized districts:

1. In the base fiscal year, the reorganized district shall receive as state aid one hundred percent of the state aid or portion thereof calculated for the individual districts involved in the reorganization in the fiscal year prior to the base fiscal year, or the total amount the reorganized district would receive under section 79-3806, whichever is greater;
2. In the first fiscal year after the base fiscal year, the reorganized district shall receive as state aid sixty-six percent of the state aid or portion thereof calculated for the individual districts in the fiscal year prior to the base fiscal year, or the total amount the reorganized district would receive under section 79-3806, whichever is greater.
3. In the second fiscal year after the base fiscal year, the reorganized district shall receive as state aid thirty-three percent of the state aid or portion thereof calculated for the individual districts in the fiscal year prior to the base fiscal year, or the total amount the reorganized district would receive under section 79-3806, which is greater; and
4. In the third fiscal year after the base fiscal year and in each fiscal year thereafter, the reorganized district shall receive the amount of state aid to which it is entitled under section 79-3806. If the total amount of payments under this section to school districts for a school year exceeds the total amount appropriated under subsection (2) of section 79-3806 for fiscal year 1994-95, the incentive payment shall be reduced proportionately so that the total amount of aid under this section does not exceed the amount appropriated under subsection (2) of section 79-3806 for fiscal year 1994-95. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1995, p. 4)

In 1995, there were 389 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 399 in 1994. There were 46 Class II school districts in 1995 compared with 48 in 1994. There were 221 Class III districts in both 1995 and 1994. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) there were 30,352 students enrolled in 1995 compared with 30,017 in 1994. Class V (Omaha Public Schools) there were 43,577 students enrolled in 1995 compared with 43,609 in 1994. There were 22 Class VI school districts in both 1995 and 1994. Overall, there were 687 school districts in 1995 as compared with 699 in 1994. In 1995, there

were 286,453 students enrolled in public schools across Nebraska compared with 284,459 in 1994. This was an increase of 1994 (see Table 7).

Table 7

School Districts in Nebraska, 1994-1995

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	389	12,065
II	46	6,995
III	221	188,085
IV	1	30,352
V	1	43,577
VI	22	4,768
Total Class I-IV	680	285,842
State Operated Schools	7	591
Total All Public Schools	687	286,453

Key Legislation in 1996. In LB 1050, reorganization incentives were again attached to this bill. On April 1, 1996 the governor approved the bill. A couple of key pieces to Section 19 of LB 1050 stated:

1. To encourage consolidation of school districts, incentives shall be paid to reorganized districts in certain size ranges for a three-year period to reward the reorganized districts for their efforts to increase efficiency in the delivery of educational services. This section shall only apply to consolidations when the order to change boundaries issued pursuant to subsection (1) of section 228, Legislative Bill 900, Ninety fourth Legislature, Second Session, 1996, takes effect after May 31, 1996 and before August 2, 2001.
2. To qualify for incentive payments under this section, the consolidation must be approved for incentive payments by the State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts. When reviewing a petition for the boundary change pursuant to section 79-402, the state committee shall issue a

preliminary approval or disapproval for incentive payments along with a notice specifying application procedures. Affected school districts shall file and application for incentive payments with the state committee within thirty days following the issuance of the boundary change order pursuant to subsection (1) of section 228. If there are no material changes in the reorganization plan between a preliminary approval and application for incentive payments following the boundary change order, the state committee shall approve the incentive payments. If a preliminary disapproval was issued or if there was a material change in the reorganization plan prior to the issuance of the boundary change order, the state committee shall reconsider the approval or disapproval of incentive payments. The state committee shall make the determination regarding whether or not any changes in a reorganization plan are material for the purpose of approving or disapproving incentive payments. (Nebraska Legislative Library, 1996, p. 18)

In 1996, there were 378 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 389 in 1995. There were 45 Class II districts in 1996 compared with 46 in 1995. There were still the same number of Class III districts, 221, in 1996 and 1995. Class IV districts (Lincoln Public Schools) there were 30,693 students enrolled in 1996 compared with 30,352 in 1995. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) had 44,247 students in 1996 compared with 43,577 in 1995. There were 22 Class VI districts in both 1996 and 1995. There were a total of 674 school districts across Nebraska in 1996 compared with 687 in 1995. Total enrollment in public schools in Nebraska in 1996 was 289,189 compared with 286,453 in 1995. This was an increase of 2,736 students (see Table 8).

Key Legislation in 1997. In 1997, we again see modification to TEEOSA in both LB 806 and LB 710. LB 806 was signed by the governor on June 3, 1997. LB 806 states:

Incentive payments shall be paid directly to the consolidated district from the Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities Fund. The payments shall be subtracted from the appropriation prior to any calculations affecting the distribution of equalization aid pursuant to TEEOSA. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1997a, p. 29)

Table 8

School Districts in Nebraska, 1995-1996

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	378	11,800
II	45	7,037
III	221	190,088
IV	1	30,693
V	1	44,247
VI	22	4,836
Total Class I-IV	668	288,701
State Operated Schools	6	488
Total All Public Schools	674	289,189

In 1997, LB 710 was signed by the governor on June 16th. LB 710 again was a modification to TEEOSA. It defined what base fiscal year meant to a school reorganization that occurred prior to 1995-96. LB 710, Section 5 subsection 6 states:

Base fiscal year means (a) for school district reorganizations which occurred prior to the 1995-96 school fiscal year, the first fiscal year in which all data sources reflect the reorganized district as a single district for the calculation of state aid and (b) for school district reorganizations which occur during or after the 1995-96 school fiscal year, the second fiscal year following the year in which the reorganization occurred. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1997b, p. 6)

There were 44 Class II districts in 1997 compared with 45 in 1996. There were 221 Class III districts in both 1997 and 1996. In Class IV districts (Lincoln Public Schools) there were 30,691 students in 1997 compared with 30,693 in 1996. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) there were 44,761 students in 1997 compared with 44,247 in 1996. There were 22 Class VI districts in both 1997 and 1996. Overall, there

were a total of 662 school districts in Nebraska in 1997 compared with 674 in 1996.

Total enrollment in public schools in Nebraska was 291,417 in 1997 compared with 289,189 in 1996. This was an increase of 282 students (see Table 9).

Table 9

School Districts in Nebraska, 1996-1997

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	367	11,769
II	44	7,043
III	221	191,761
IV	1	30,691
V	1	44,761
VI	22	4,865
Total Class I-IV	656	290,890
State Operated Schools	6	527
Total All Public Schools	662	291,417

Key Legislation in 1998. LB 1134 was approved by the governor on April 8,

1998. LB 1134 was another change to the TEEOSA formula. LB 1134 states:

Base fiscal year means (a) for school district reorganizations which occurred prior to the 1995-96 school fiscal year, the first fiscal year in which all data sources reflect the reorganized district as a single district for the calculation of state aid, for school district reorganizations which occur during the 1995-96 school fiscal year of the 1996-97 school fiscal year, the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the reorganization occurred, and (c) for school district reorganizations which occur during or after the 1997-98 school fiscal year, the first school fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the reorganization occurred. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1998a, p. 1)

LB 1134, under Section 3, describes the creation of the Reorganized School

Assistance Fund. Section 3 states:

The Reorganized School Assistance Fund is created. This fund shall receive a transfer of two million dollars from the Cash Reserve Fund on or before September 1, 1998, pursuant to section 84-612. Any money in the Reorganized School Assistance Fund available for investment shall be invested by the state investment officer pursuant to the Nebraska Capital Expansion Act and the Nebraska State Funds Investment Act. The fund shall be used to make base fiscal year incentive payments pursuant to subsection (6) of section 79-1010 and to make transfers to the Case Reserve Fund. Section 4 of LB 1134 goes on to further state:

1. To encourage consolidation of school districts, incentives shall be paid to reorganized districts in certain size ranges for a three-year period to reward the reorganized districts for their efforts to increase efficiency in the delivery of educational services. This section shall only apply to consolidations when the order to change boundaries issued pursuant to subsection (1) of section 79-479 takes effect after May 31, 1996, and before August 2, 2001. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1998a, p. 4)

LB 1219 also saw changes to TEEOSA and defines unified school systems and incentive payments for reorganization. Under Section 17 of LB 12 19, it states:

To qualify for incentive payments under this section, the consolidation or unification must be approved for incentive payments by the State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts. For consolidations, when reviewing a petition for the boundary change pursuant to section 79-413, the state committee shall issue a preliminary approval or disapproval for incentive payments along with a notice specifying application procedures. For consolidations, affected school districts shall file an application for incentive payments with the state committee within thirty days following the issuance of the boundary change order pursuant to subsection (1) of section 79-479. For unifications, the unified system or participating districts shall file an application for incentive payments with the state committee either following approval of the application for unification or in conjunction with the application for unification. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1998b, p. 9)

LB 1219 also had more changes to TEEOSA. Some of these key areas to the changes to TEEOSA, under Section 15 and how it effected reorganizations were:

1. Base fiscal year means (a) for school district reorganizations which occurred during the 1995-96 school fiscal year or the 1996-97 school fiscal year, the second school fiscal year following the school fiscal year in which the

reorganization occurred or (b) for school district reorganizations or unifications which occur during or after the 1997-98 school fiscal year, the first school fiscal year following the school fiscal year in which the reorganization or unification occurred. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1998b, p. 6)

In 1998, there were 354 Class I districts in the state of Nebraska compared with 367 in 1997. There were 41 Class II districts in 1998 compared with 44 in 1997. There were 223 Class III districts in 1998 compared with 221 in 1997. Class IV districts (Lincoln Public Schools) had 30,853 students in 1998 compared with 30,691 in 1997. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) had 45,046 students in 1998 compared with 44,761 in 1997. There were 20 Class VI schools in 1998 compared with 22 in 1997. There were a total of 646 school districts in 1998 compared with 662 in 1997. Overall there were 292,119 students enrolled in public Schools in Nebraska in 1998 compared with 291,417 in 1997. This was an increase of 702 students (see Table 10).

Key Legislation in 1999. In 1999, LB 272 was approved by the governor on May 25, 1999. Under Section 30 of LB 272 it states:

The State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts created under section 79-435 may create a new school district from other districts, change the boundaries of any district, or affiliate a Class I district or portion thereof with one or more existing Class II, III, IV or V districts upon receipt of petitions signed by sixty percent of the legal voters of each district affected. If the petitions contain signatures of at least sixty-five percent of the legal voters of each district affected, the state committee shall approve the petitions. When area is added to a Class VI district or when a Class I district which is entirely or partially within a Class VI district is taken from the Class VI district, the Class VI district shall be deemed to be an affected district. Any petition of the legal voters of a Class I district in which no city or village is situated which is commenced after January 1, 1996, and proposes the dissolution of the Class I district and the attachment of a portion of it to two or more districts shall require signatures of more than fifty percent of the legal voters of such Class I district. If the state committee determines that such petition contains valid signatures of more than fifty percent of the legal voters of such Class I district, the state committee shall grant the petitions. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 1999, p. 11)

Table 10

School Districts in Nebraska, 1997-1998

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	354	10,724
II	41	6,800
III	223	193,713
IV	1	30,853
V	1	45,046
VI	20	4,449
Total Class I-IV	640	291,585
State Operated Schools	6	534
Total All Public Schools	646	292,119

In 1999, there were 320 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 354 in 1998. There were 39 Class II districts in 1999 compared with 41 in 1998. There were 225 Class III school districts in 1999 compared with 223 in 1998. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 31,013 students enrolled in 1999 compared with 30,853 in 1998. Class V district (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 1999 was 45,118 compared to 45,046 in 1998. There were 18 Class VI districts in 1999 compared to 20 in 1998. There were a total of 609 public school districts in 1999 in Nebraska compared to 646 in 1998. Overall there were 290,445 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 1999 compared with 292,119 enrolled in 1998. This was a decrease of 1,674 students (see Table 11).

Table 11

School Districts in Nebraska, 1998-1999

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	320	9,826
II	39	6,206
III	225	194,069
IV	1	31,013
V	1	45,118
VI	18	3,752
Total Class I-IV	604	289,984
State Operated Schools	5	461
Total All Public Schools	609	290,445

Key Legislation in 2001. In 2001, LB 313 was approved by the governor on

May 25, 2001. A few key pieces to LB 313 were:

Under Section 2 of LB 313 it states:

1. To encourage consolidation and unification of school districts, incentives shall be paid to reorganized districts and unified systems in certain size ranges for a three-year period to reward the reorganized districts or unified systems for their efforts to increase efficiency in the delivery of educational services. This section shall only apply to consolidations and unifications with an effective date after May 31, 1996, and before August 2, 2002. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2001, p. 3)
2. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (6) of this sections, two million dollars shall be set aside for school fiscal years 1999-00 and 2000-01 and five million dollars shall be set aside for school fiscal year 2001-02 for base fiscal year incentive payments pursuant to subsection (6) of this section. For school fiscal year 2002-03, two million dollars plus any unused funds that were made available for base fiscal year incentive payments in school fiscal year 2001-02 shall be set aside for base fiscal year incentive payments pursuant to such subsection. All other payments pursuant to this section shall be paid directly to the consolidated district or unified system from the Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities Fund. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2001, p. 5)

In 2001 there were only 293 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 320 in 1999. There were 35 Class II districts compared with 39 in 1999. There were 228 Class III school districts in 2001 compared with 225 in 1999. Class VI (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 31,354 students enrolled in 2001 compared with 31,013 in 1999. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2001 was 45,197 compared with 45,118 in 1999. There were 18 Class VI districts in 2001 compared to 18 in 1999. There were a total of 580 public school districts in 2001 in Nebraska compared to 609 in 1999. Overall there were 285,448 students enrolled in 2001 compared to 290,445 in 1999. This was a decrease of 4,997 students (see Table 12).

Table 12

School Districts in Nebraska, 2000-2001

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	293	9,149
II	35	4,777
III	228	190,817
IV	1	31,354
V	1	45,197
VI	18	3,630
Total Class I-IV	576	284,924
State Operated Schools	4	524
Total All Public Schools	580	285,448

Key Legislation in 2002. In 2002, the governor approved LB 460 on April 17, 2002. LB 460 was an amendment related to Class I school districts. Section 1 of LB 460 states:

A Class I district of which eight percent or more of the district's valuation is affiliated with a single Class II or III district shall not merge, dissolve, or reorganize unless:

1. All Class II or III districts with which eight percent or more of the Class I district's valuation is affiliated are also reorganizing in the same reorganization plan, petition or election and that plan, petition, or election requires approval by either the school boards or legal voters of such Class II or III districts;
2. The Class I district's valuation is being merged with the Class II or III districts with which the property is affiliated;
3. The Class I district has been participating in a unified system for a minimum of seven school fiscal years and the unified system includes at least one Class II or III district reorganizing in the same reorganization plan or petition; or
4. The school boards of all Class II or III districts with which eight percent or more of the Class I district's valuation is affiliated vote to approve the plan or petition. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2002, p. 5)

In 2002 there were only 271 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 293 in 2001. There were 25 Class II districts compared with 35 in 2001. There were 218 Class III school districts in 2002 compared with 228 in 2001. Class VI (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 31,581 students enrolled in 2002 compared with 31,354 in 2001. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2002 was 45,782 compared with 45,197 in 2001. There were 18 Class VI districts in 2002 compared to 18 in 2001. There were a total of 538 public school districts in 2002 in Nebraska compared to 580 in 2001. Overall there were 284,311 students enrolled in 2002 compared to 285,448 in 2001. This was a decrease of 1,137 students (see Table 13).

Table 13

School Districts in Nebraska, 2001-2002

Class	# of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	271	8,880
II	25	4,063
III	218	189,920
IV	1	31,581
V	1	45,782
VI	18	3,565
Total Class I-IV	534	283,791
State Operated Schools	4	520
Total All Public Schools	538	284,311

Key Legislation in 2003. On May 27, 2003 LB 540 was passed over a veto by the governor. LB 540 was amended by declaring 2003-04 certifications of state aid, applicable allowable growth rates and Class I budget authority to be null and void. Under Section 6 of LB 540, it states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the certification of state aid pursuant to section 79-1022 to be paid to school districts during school year 2003-04, the certification of applicable allowable growth rates pursuant to section 79-1026 for school fiscal year 2003-04, and the certifications of Class I school district allowable general fund budgets of expenditures pursuant to section 79-1083.03 for school fiscal year and the certifications pursuant to section 79-1022 shall be recertified on or before June 15, 2003, using data sources as they existed on February 1, 2003. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2003a, p. 6)

On January 30, 2003, the governor signed in LB 67. LB 67 added language to clarify that a Class VI high school may require a Class I school within its system to

reduce their tax request (Class I) if the system tax request exceeds the statutory maximum levy plus exclusions. Section 17 on LB 67 states:

If the total levy required for property tax requests for all general fund budgets in a local system exceeds the amount that can be generated by the maximum levy pursuant to subdivision (2) (a) of section 77-3442, the high school district shall be entitled to take the necessary steps to comply with such maximum levy by:

1. Reducing the property tax request for each district up to the amount by which the district's budgeted general fund cash reserve exceeds fifteen percent of the district's general fund budget of expenditures for the preceding school fiscal year, and for Class I districts, this difference multiplied by the percentage of the Class I district's valuation which is affiliated with or part of the high school district;
2. If the reductions under subdivision (1) of this section do not reduce the required levy to the maximum levy permitted under subdivision (2) (a) of section 77-3442, reducing the property tax request for each district proportionately based on the amount of the difference between the district's general fund budget of expenditures minus the special education budget of expenditures for the current budget year and a two-year average for the two preceding school fiscal years of the general fund budget of expenditures minus the special education budget of expenditures up to such difference, and for Class I district, this difference multiplied by the percentage of the Class I district's valuation which is affiliated with or part of the high school district; and
3. If the reductions under subdivisions (1) and (2) of this section do not reduce the required levy to the maximum levy permitted under subdivision (2) (a) of section 77-3442, reducing the property tax request for each district by an amount proportional to the district's share of the total property tax request for the preceding school fiscal year such that the required local system levy shall be the maximum levy allowed under subdivision (2) (a) of sections 77-3442. Class I districts with multiple high school districts which are required to reduce their general fund property tax request pursuant to this section shall make such reduction as necessary to effect the total required from this calculation within each local system requiring the reduction. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2003b, p. 9)

In 2003, there were 256 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 293 in 2001. There were 23 Class II districts in 2003 compared with 35 in 2001. There were 218 Class III districts in 2003 compared with 228 in 2001. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 31,867 students in 2003 compared with 31,354 in 2001. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2003 was 45,986 compared to 45,197 in

2001. There were 18 Class VI districts in 2003 compared to 18 in 2001. There were a total of 521 public school districts in 2003 compared with 580 in 2001. Overall there were 284,438 students enrolled in public school in Nebraska in 2003 compared with 285,448 in 2001. This was a decrease of 1,010 students (see Table 14).

Table 14

School Districts in Nebraska, 2002-2003

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	256	8,595
II	23	3,773
III	218	190,220
IV	1	31,867
V	1	45,986
VI	18	3,489
Total Class I-IV	517	283,930
State Operated Schools	4	508
Total All Public Schools	521	284,438

Key Legislation in 2004. On April 13, 2004, the governor approved LB 1091.

LB 1091 had reorganizational incentives in the bill and it provided the School District Reorganization Fund. Under Section 10 of LB 1091, it states:

The School District Reorganization Fund is created. The fund shall be administered by the department. The fund shall consist of money transferred from the Education Innovation Fund and shall be used to provide payments to reorganized school districts pursuant to section 9 of this act. Any money remaining in the fund on July 1, 2008, shall be transferred to the General Fund on such date. Any money in the School District Reorganization Fund available for investment shall be invested by the state investment officer pursuant to the

Nebraska Capital Expansion Act and the Nebraska State Funds Investment Act.
(Nebraska Legislature Library, 2004, p. 9)

In 2004, there were 241 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 256 in 2003. There were 22 Class II districts in 2004 compared with 23 in 2003. There were 218 Class III school districts in 2004 compared with 218 in 2003. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 32,120 students enrolled in 2004 compared with 31,867 in 2003. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2004 was 46,035 compared to 45,986 in 2003. There were 18 Class VI districts in 2004 compared with 18 in 2003. There were a total of 505 public school districts in 2004 compared with 521 in 2003. Overall there were 284,641 students enrolled in public school in Nebraska in 2004 compared with 284,438 in 2003. This was an increase of 203 students (see Table 15).

Table 15

School Districts in Nebraska, 2003-2004

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	241	8,317
II	22	3,550
III	218	190,649
IV	1	32,120
V	1	46,035
VI	18	3,499
Total Class I-IV	501	284,170
State Operated Schools	4	471
Total All Public Schools	505	284,641

Key Legislation in 2005. On June 3, 2005, LB 126 was passed over the Governor's veto. LB 126 marked the beginning of the end of Class I school districts. As Section 1 of LB 126 states:

On or before September 10, 2005, the secretary of the school board of each Class I school district shall certify to each Class II, III, IV and VI school district with each territory within the boundaries of the Class I school district is affiliated or of which territory within such boundaries is a part. Further in Section 1 it states:

On or before November 1, 2005, the secretary of the school board of each Class I district shall certify to the State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts and to each Class II, III, IV or VI school district with which territory within the boundaries of the Class I school district is affiliated or of which territory within such boundaries is a part of a list of all membership percentages calculated by the Class I school district pursuant to subsection (3) of this section. In Section 3 of the bill it states: Notwithstanding the provisions of any affiliation petition or plan entered into by Class I school districts prior to the operative date of this section, the State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts shall issue orders, on or before December 1, 2005, which dissolve and attach the territory of each Class I school district, except as provided in section 2 of this act, to one or more Class II, III, IV or VI school districts pursuant to one of the methods contained in subsection (3) of this section. To attach territory of a Class I district dissolved pursuant to this section to a Class VI district of which the territory is a part means to include the territory in the Class II or Class III school district formed from the Class VI school district pursuant to subsection (5) of this section. Further in Section 3, it states: Specify the Class II, III, IV and VI school districts to which the territory of the Class I school district will be attached and the territory to be attached to each specified school district. It goes on to further state: Be approved by a majority of the members of the school boards of: (i) the Class I school district; (ii) all Class II, III, or IV school districts with which territory of the Class I school district is affiliated; (iii) all Class VI school districts of which territory of the Class I school district is a part; and (iv) all Class II, III, IV or VI school districts which will receive territory from the Class I school districts. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2005a, p. 2)

LB 126 has further language describing what happens to Class I school districts.

As Section 3 goes on, it states:

On or before December 1, 2005, the State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts shall issue orders classifying each Class VI school district into a new Class II or Class III school district as defined in section 79-1102. The territory of Class I school districts ordered to be attached to a new Class VI school district pursuant to this section shall be attached to the new Class II or III school district created from such Class VI school district pursuant to this subsection. The

existing school board members of each Class VI school district as of June 15, 2006, shall continue as the school board members for the new Class II or Class III school district created from such Class VI school district until their terms expire and their successors are elected and qualified. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2005a, p. 3)

Section 4 of LB 126 goes on to further state:

Any elementary attendance center may be designated as a community school through the formation of an operating council. On or before June 14, 2006, the school board of each Class I school may form an operating council for the district's elementary attendance center. If the school board of a Class II, III, IV or V school district receives a request for an elementary attendance center to be designated as a community school, the school board shall hold an operating council organizational meeting at such elementary attendance center within sixty days after receiving the request, except that the school board shall not be required to hold organizational meetings at any one elementary attendance center more than once during a calendar year. School board of Class II, III, IV and V school districts shall establish procedures for the formation of operating councils. Once formed, operating councils shall determine the timing and procedures for selecting successor members. Each operating council shall be composed of not less than three and not more than six members. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2005a, p. 3)

For purposes of TEEOSA, we saw some areas that were changed within that

formula. Some of the key pieces in Section 45 of LB 126 included:

1. Adjusted general fund operating expenditures means general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (23) of this section minus the transportation allowance and minus the special receipts allowance;
2. Adjusted valuation means the assessed valuation of taxable property of each local system in the state, adjusted pursuant to the adjustment factors described in section 79-1026. Adjusted valuation means the adjusted valuation for the property tax year ending during the school fiscal year immediately preceding the school fiscal year in which the aid based upon that value is to be paid. For purposes of determining the local effort rate that value is to be paid. For purposes of determining the local effort rate yield pursuant to section 79-1015.01, adjusted valuation does not include the value of any property which a court, by a final judgment from which no appeal is taken, has declared to be nontaxable or exempt from taxation. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2005a, p. 20)

On April 27, 2005, LB 503 was approved by the governor. Under Section 11 on

LB 503 it states:

For School fiscal year 2005-06, a Class II, III, IV, V or VI district may exceed its applicable allowable growth rate by a specific dollar amount not to exceed seventy-four hundredths percent of the amount budgeted for employee salaries for such school fiscal year. For school fiscal year 2006-07, a Class II, III, IV, V or VI district may exceed its applicable allowable growth rate by a specific dollar amount not to exceed fifty-nine hundredths percent of the amount budgeted for employee salaries for such school fiscal year. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2005b, p. 10)

On March 22, 2005 the governor approved LB 198. LB 198 cleared up the issues of transfers of property due to annexation and dissolutions or reorganizations involving Class 1 school districts into the payment of state aid. As Section 1 of LB 198 states:

1. State aid payments shall be adjusted to reflect transfers of property due to annexation, to any dissolution of a Class I school district, and to any reorganization involving one or more Class I school districts;
2. (a) A Class I school district dissolves or reorganizes in such a manner that the parcels of property making up the Class I district prior to the dissolution or reorganization which were affiliated with a Class II, III, IV or V school district do not become part of the Class II, III, IV or V school district with which such parcels of property were affiliated;
 (b) Property within the boundaries of a Class II, III, IV, V or VI school district is transferred to another school district due to a change in the school district boundaries in response to annexations of the transferred property by a city or village.
3. To qualify for additional state aid pursuant to this section, the school district from which property is being transferred shall apply on a form prescribed by the State Department of Education on or before August 20 preceding the first school fiscal year for which the property will not be available for taxation for the school district's general fund levy.
4. Upon receipt of the application, the department, with the assistance of the Property Tax Administrator, shall calculate the amount of additional state aid, if any, that the local system, as defined in section 79-1003, for the applicant school district would have received for such school fiscal year if the adjusted valuation for the transferred property had not been included in the adjusted valuation of such local system for the calculation of state aid for such school fiscal year.
5. The state aid payments shall be reduced for the high school district of each receiving local system. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2005c, p. 1)

In 2005, there were 231 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 241 in 2004. There were 18 Class II districts in 2005 compared to 22 in 2004. There were 219

Class III school districts in 2005 compared to 218 in 2004. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 32,270 students enrolled in 2005 compared to 32,120 in 2004. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2005 was 46,549 in 2005 compared to 46,035 in 2004. There were 18 Class VI districts in 2005 compared to 18 in 2004. There were a total of 492 public school districts in 2005 compared to 505 in 2004. Overall there were 285,015 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 2005 compared with 284,641 in 2004. This was an increase of 374 students (see Table 16).

Table 16

School Districts in Nebraska, 2004-2005

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	231	7,967
II	18	3,024
III	219	191,270
IV	1	32,270
V	1	46,549
VI	18	3,479
Total Class I-IV	488	284,559
State Operated Schools	4	456
Total All Public Schools	492	285,015

Key Legislation in 2006. In 2006, LB 1024 established Learning Communities in the Omaha and surrounding area. This was a new form of school reorganization that had not been established before. LB 1024 was signed by the governor on April 13, 2006. Section 13 of LB 1024 states:

Learning Community means a political subdivision which shares the territory or member school districts and is governed by a learning community coordinating council. The fiscal year for a learning community shall be the same as for member school districts. A learning community shall not have the authority to levy property taxes for the first fiscal year of its existence and shall not have the authority to levy property taxes prior to school fiscal year 2008-09. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2006, p. 49)

Section 104 of LB 1024 goes on to further state:

1. On or before August 1, 2006, and on or before August 1 following the official designation of any new city of the metropolitan class or any valid request to form a new learning community, the Secretary of State shall certify the establishment of a new learning community with an effective date of September 1 of the year of such certification to the county clerks and county assessors of the counties with territory in the new learning community, to the Property Tax Administrator, to the State Department of Education, and to the school boards of the member school districts of the new learning community. A learning community shall be established for each city of the metropolitan class and shall include all school districts for which the principal office of the school district is located in a county that has a contiguous border of at least five miles in the aggregate with such city of the metropolitan class. A learning community may also be established for one or more counties at the request of the school boards of all school districts for which the principal office of the school district is located in the specified county or counties if such school districts have a minimum combined total of at least two thousand students, except that districts in local systems that are in the sparse cost grouping or the very sparse cost grouping as described in section 79-1007.02 need not have a minimum combined total of at least two thousand students but a learning community with fewer than two thousand students shall include at least two school districts. Such requests shall be received by the Secretary of State on or before March 1 to be effective the following September 1.
2. On or before September 1 following the certification of the establishment of a new learning community, the school board of each member school district shall appoint a member of such school board to serve on the learning community coordinating council and shall notify the Secretary of State of the appointment. The Secretary of State or his or her designee shall convene a meetings of the new council during the month of September and each month thereafter through the following June. At the September meeting, the council shall elect officers and shall begin taking the necessary steps to being operating as a learning community. The Secretary of State or his or her designee shall schedule and host each meeting and shall serve as a facilitator at each meeting. The Secretary of State may contract for facilitation services. In any fiscal year that one or more new learning communities are established, the Secretary of State shall report to the Education Committee of the Legislature on or before December 31 and on or before June 30, regarding the

progress of any new learning community councils. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2006, p. 50)

Section 105 of LB 1024 goes on further to state:

The State Department of Education shall provide transition aid to learning communities pursuant to this section. A learning community shall receive transition aid for the second school fiscal year of the learning community's existence for funding the general fund budget of the learning community during the transition to property tax funding. Each learning community established on September 1, 2006, shall also receive transition aid for the third school fiscal year of the learning community's existence. Transition aid shall be distributed to each qualified learning community on or before July 5 of each school fiscal year in an amount equal to the amount appropriated for transition aid divided by the number of qualified learning communities. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2006, p. 50)

LB 1024 also had an impact on the TEEOSA funding formula. A couple of key areas Under Section 73 of LB 104 state:

1. Adjusted general fund operating expenditures means (a) for school fiscal years before school fiscal year 2007-08, general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (24) of this section minus the transportation allowance and minus the special receipts allowance (b) for school fiscal year 2007-08, general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (24) for this section minus the sum of the transportation, special receipts, and distance education and telecommunication allowances, and (c) for school fiscal year product of the general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (24) of this section multiplied by the cost growth factor for the school district's cost grouping calculated pursuant to section 83 of this act minus the transportation allowance, special receipts allowance, poverty allowance, limited English proficiency allowance, elementary class size allowance, and focus school and program allowance;
2. Adjusted valuation means the assessed valuation of taxable property of each local system in the state, adjusted pursuant to the adjustment factors described in section 79-1016. Adjusted valuation means that adjusted valuation for the property tax year ending during the school fiscal year immediately preceding the school fiscal year in which the aid based upon that value is to be paid. For purposes of determining the local effort rate yield pursuant to section 79-1015.01, adjusted valuation does not include the value of any property which a court, by a final judgment from which no appeal is taken, has declared to be nontaxable or exempt from taxation. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2006, p. 30)

In 2006, there were 206 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to 231 in 2005. There were 17 Class II districts in 2006 compared to 18 in 2005. There were 219 Class III districts in 2006 compared to 219 in 2005. The Class VI (Lincoln Public Schools) district had 32,505 students enrolled in 2006 compared with 32,270 in 2005. The Class V district (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2006 was 46,686 compared to 46,549 in 2005. There were 16 Class VI districts in 2006 compared to 18 in 2005. There were a total of 465 school districts in 2006 compared with 492 in 2005. Overall there were 286,038 students enrolled in 2006 compared with 285,015 in 2005. This was an increase of 1,023 students (see Table 17).

Table 17

School Districts in Nebraska, 2005-2006

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	206	7,250
II	17	2,956
III	219	192,872
IV	1	32,505
V	1	46,686
VI	16	3,277
Total Class I-IV	460	285,546
State Operated Schools	4	492
Total All Public Schools	464	286,038

Key Legislation in 2007. On May 24, 2007, the governor approved LB 641. LB 641 cleaned up parts of LB 1024 and provided for a common levy for districts within a learning community. Again, we saw changes made to the TEEOSA formula as well. As stated in Section 40 of LB 641:

A learning community coordinating council shall have the authority to:

1. Levy and distribute a common levy for the general funds of member school districts pursuant to sections 77-3442 and 79-1073;
2. Levy and distribute a common levy for the special building funds of member school districts pursuant to sections 77-3442 and 79-1073.01;
3. Levy for capital projects approved by the learning community council pursuant to section 77-3442 and section 43 of this act. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2007, p. 26)

Again, we see changes to the TEEOSA formula. Within LB 641, we saw Section 13 changed again. A few key areas of change in Section 13 state:

1. Adjusted general fund operating expenditures means (a) for school fiscal years before school fiscal year 2007-08, general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (24) of this section minus the transportation allowance and minus the special receipts allowance, (b) for school fiscal year 2007-08, general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (24) of this section minus the sum of the transportation, special receipts, and distance education and telecommunications allowances, and (c) for school fiscal year 2008-09 and each school fiscal year thereafter, the difference of the product of the general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (24) of this grouping calculated pursuant to section 79-1007.10 minus the transportation allowance, special receipts allowance, poverty allowance, limited English proficiency allowance, distance education and telecommunications allowance, elementary class size allowance, and focus school and program allowance,
2. Adjusted valuation means the assessed valuation of taxable property of each local system in the state, adjusted pursuant to the adjustment factors described in section 79-1016. Adjusted valuation means the adjusted valuation for the property tax year ending during the school fiscal year immediately preceding the school fiscal year in which the aid based upon that value is to be paid. For purposes of determining the local effort rate yield pursuant to section 79-1015.01, adjusted valuation does not include the value of any property which a court, by a final judgment from which no appeal is taken, has declared to be nontaxable or exempt from taxation. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2007, p. 9)

In 2007, there were 0 Class I districts in Nebraska compared to 206 in 2006. There were 25 Class II districts in 2007 compared with 17 in 2006. There were 240 Class III districts in 2007 compared with 219 in 2006. The Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) district had 32,934 students enrolled in 2007 compared with 32,505 in 2006. The Class VI districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2007 was 47,044 compared to 46,686 in 2006. There were 0 Class VI districts in 2007 compared with 16 in 2006. There were a total of 271 school districts in 2007 compared with 464 in 2006. Overall there were 287,580 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 2007 compared with 286,038 in 2006. This was an increase of 1,542 students (see Table 18).

Table 18

School Districts in Nebraska, 2006-2007

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	0	0
II	25	3,192
III	240	203,965
IV	1	32,934
V	1	47,044
VI	0	0
Total Class I-IV	267	287,135
State Operated Schools	4	445
Total All Public Schools	271	287,580

Key Legislation in 2008. On April 2, 2008, the governor approved LB 988.

LB 988 made another change to TEEOSA that effected the learning community and unified school systems.

Under Section 9 of LB 988, a few key changes to the TEEOSA system included:

1. Adjusted general fund operating expenditures means (a) for school fiscal year before school fiscal year 2007-08, general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (21) of this section minus the transportation allowance and minus the special receipts allowance, (b) for school fiscal year 2007-08, general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (21) of this section minus the sum of the transportation, special receipts and distance education and telecommunications allowances, (c) for school fiscal year 2008-09, the difference of the product of the general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (21) of this section multiplied by the cost growth factor calculated pursuant to section 79-1007.10 minus the transportation allowance, special receipts allowance, poverty allowance, limited English proficiency allowance, distance education and telecommunications allowance, elementary site allowance, elementary class size allowance, summer school allowance, and focus school and program allowance, (d) for school fiscal years 2009-10 through 2012-13, the difference of the product of the general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (21) of this section multiplied by the cost growth factor calculated pursuant to section 79-1007.10 minus the transportation allowance, special receipts allowance, poverty allowance, limited English proficiency allowance, distance education and telecommunications allowance, elementary instructional time allowance, and focus school and program allowance, and (e) for school fiscal year 2013-14 and each school fiscal year thereafter, the difference of the product of the general fund operating expenditures as calculated pursuant to subdivision (21) of this section multiplied by the cost growth factor calculated pursuant to section 79-1007.10 minus the transportation allowance, special receipts allowance, poverty allowance, limited English proficiency allowance, distance education and telecommunications allowance, elementary site allowance, summer school allowance, instructional time allowance and focus school and program allowance,
2. Adjusted valuation means the assessed valuation of taxable property of each local system in the state, adjusted pursuant to the adjustment factors described in section 79-1016. Adjusted valuation means the adjusted valuation for the property tax year ending during the school fiscal year immediately preceding the school fiscal year in which the aid based upon that value is to be paid. For purposes of determining the local effort rate yield pursuant to section 79-1015.01, adjusted valuation does not include the value of any property which a court, by a final judgment from which no appeal is taken,

has declared to be non taxable or exempt from taxation. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2008a, p. 9)

LB 1154 was approved by the governor on April 14, 2008. LB 1154 cleaned up the original LB 1024 for which Learning Communities were born. Under Section 3 of LB 1154 it reads:

Each learning community shall be governed by a learning community coordinating council consisting of eighteen voting members, with twelve members elected on a nonpartisan ballot from six numbered election districts and with six members appointed from such election districts pursuant to this section. Each voter shall be allowed to cast votes for one candidate to represent the election district in which the voter resides. The two candidates receiving the most votes shall be elected. A candidate shall reside in the election district for which he or she is a candidate. No primary election for the office of learning community coordinating council shall be held. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2008b, p. 2)

Another key piece to LB 1154 under Section 3 states:

Each learning community coordinating council shall also have a nonvoting member from each member school district which does not have either an elected or an appointed member who resides in the school district on the council. Such nonvoting members shall be appointed by the school board of the school district to be represented to serve for two-year terms, and notice of the nonvoting member selected shall be submitted to the Secretary of State by such board prior to December 31 of each even-numbered year. Each such nonvoting member shall be a resident of the appointing school district and shall not be a school administrator employed by such school district. Whenever a vacancy occurs, the school board of such school district shall appoint a new nonvoting member and submit notice to the Secretary of State and to the learning community coordinating council. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2008b, p. 3)

In 2008, there were no (0) Class I districts in Nebraska compared with none (0) in 2007. There were 23 Class II districts in 2008 compared with 25 in 2007. There were 238 Class III districts in 2008 compared with 240 in 2007. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 33,464 students enrolled in 2008 compared with 32,934 in 2007. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2008 was 47,652 in 2008 compared to 47,044 in 2007. There were no (0) Class VI districts in 2008 compared to

none (0) in 2007. There were a total of 268 school districts in 2008 compared to 271 in 2007. Overall there were 291,111 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 2008 compared to 287,580 in 2007. This was an increase of 3,531 students (see Table 19).

Table 19

School Districts in Nebraska, 2007-2008

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	0	0
II	23	3,287
III	238	206,376
IV	1	33,464
V	1	47,652
VI	0	0
Total Class I-IV	263	290,779
State Operated Schools	5	332
Total All Public Schools	268	291,111

Key Legislation in 2010. On February 25, 2010, the governor approved LB 711. LB 711 changed provisions for the withdrawal of districts from a unified school system or the dissolution of a unified school system. Under Section 1 of LB 711, it reads:

Unified system means two or more Class II or III school districts participating in an interlocal agreement under the Interlocal Cooperation Act with approval from the State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts. The interlocal agreement may include Class I districts if the entire valuation is included in the unified system. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2010, p. 91)

LB 711 goes on to further state in Section 1 that:

Upon granting the application for unification, the State Department of Education shall recognize the unified system as a single Class II or III district for state aid, budgeting, accreditation, enrollment of students, state programs, and reporting, except that the department shall require such reporting on an individual district basis that the department shall require such reporting on an individual district basis as necessary to calculate formula need pursuant to the Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities Support Act separately for each participating district beginning with the calculation of state aid for fiscal year 2009-10. Except as with the calculation of state aid for school fiscal year 2009-10. Except as otherwise required by the department, the unified system shall submit a single report document for each of the reports required of school district pursuant to Chapter 79 and shall submit a single budget document pursuant to the Nebraska Budget Act and sections 13-518 to 13-522. The class of district shall be the same as the majority of participating districts, excluding Class I districts. If there are an equal number of Class II and Class III districts in the unified system, the unified system shall be recognized by the department as a Class III district. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2010, p. 2)

In 2010 we also saw LB 1070 and LB 1071 further clean up the original bills that were written on the Learning Community approach to reorganization.

In 2010, there were 0 Class I school districts in Nebraska compared with 0 in 2008. There were 23 Class II districts in 2010 compared with 23 in 2008. There were 235 Class III districts in 2010 compared with 238 in 2008. Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) districts had 34,927 students enrolled in 2010 compared with 33,464 in 2008. Class V districts (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2010 was 48,796 students compared to 47,652 in 2008. There were no (0) Class VI districts in 2010 compared with none (0) in 2008. There were a total of 265 public school districts in 2010 compared with 268 in 2008. Overall there were 295,654 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 2010 compared with 291,111 in 2008. This was an increase of 4,543 students (see Table 20).

Table 20

School Districts in Nebraska, 2009-2010

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	0	0
II	23	3,092
III	235	208,367
IV	1	34,927
V	1	48,796
VI	0	0
Total Class I-IV	260	295,182
State Operated Schools	5	472
Total All Public Schools	265	295,654

Key Legislation in 2011. LB 558 was approved by the governor on April 26, 2011. This bill amended current law relating to focus schools, focus programs and magnet schools established by school districts in a learning community. As stated in Section 1 of LB 558:

1. Any one or more member school districts of a learning community may establish one or more focus programs, focus schools, or magnet schools. If included as part of the diversity plan of a learning community, the focus school or focus program shall be eligible for a focus school and program allowance pursuant to section 79-1007.05.
2. Focus schools, focus program, and magnet schools may be included in pathways across member school districts pursuant to the diversity plan developed by the learning community coordinating council pursuant to section 79-2104.
3. If multiple member school districts collaborate on a focus program, focus school or magnet school, the school districts shall form a joint entity pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act for the purpose of creating, implementing and operating such focus program, focus school, or magnet school. The agreement creating such joint entity shall address legal, financial, and academic responsibilities and the assignment to participating school districts

of students enrolled in such focus programs, focus school, or magnet school who reside in nonparticipating districts.

4. For purposes of this section;
 - (a) Focus program means a program that does not have an attendance area, whose enrollment is designed so that the socioeconomic diversity of the students attending the focus program reflects as nearly as possible the socioeconomic diversity of the student body of the learning community, which has a unique curriculum with specific learning goals or teaching techniques different from the standard curriculum with specific learning goals or teaching techniques different from the standard curriculum which may be housed in a building with other public school programs, and which may consist of either the complete education program for participating students or part of the education program for participating students;
 - (b) Focus school means a school that does not have an attendance area, whose enrollment is designed so that the socioeconomic diversity of the students attending the focus school reflects as nearly as possible the socioeconomic diversity of the student body of the learning community, which has a unique curriculum with specific learning goals or teaching techniques different from the standard curriculum, which may be housed in a building with other public school programs, and which may consist of either the complete education program for participating students or part of the education program for participating students;
 - (c) Magnet school means a school having a home attendance area but which reserves a portion of its capacity specifically for students from outside the attendance area who will contribute to the socioeconomic diversity of the student body of such school and which has a unique curriculum with specific learning goals or teacher techniques different from the standard curriculum; and
 - (d) Pathway means elementary, middle and high school focus program, focus schools, and magnet school with coordinated curricula based on specific learning goals or teaching techniques. (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2011, p. 1)

In 2011, there were no (0) Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to none (0) in 2010. There were 22 Class II districts in 2011 compared with 23 in 2010. There were 235 Class III districts in 2011 compared with 235 in 2010. The Class VI, (Lincoln Public Schools) district had 35,896 students enrolled in 2011 compared with 34,927 in 2010. The Class V districts, (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2010 was 49,333 compared with 48,796 in 2010. There were no (0) Class VI districts in 2011 compared with none (0) in 2010. There were a total of 264 public school districts in Nebraska in

2011 compared with 265 in 2010. Overall there were 298,447 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 2011 compared with 295,654 in 2010. This was an increase of 2,793 students (see Table 21).

Table 21

School Districts in Nebraska, 2010-2011

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	0	0
II	22	2,905
III	235	209,949
IV	1	35,896
V	1	49,333
VI	0	0
Total Class I-IV	259	298,083
State Operated Schools	5	364
Total All Public Schools	264	298,447

Key Legislation in 2014. LB 967 was approved by the governor on April 2, 2014. Under Section 2, subsection 4 (c) of LB 967 it states: “The next one million dollars shall be transferred to the School District Reorganization Fund” (Nebraska Legislature Library, 2014, p. 3).

In 2014, there were no (0) Class I school districts in Nebraska compared to none (0) in 2013. There were 18 Class II districts in 2014 compared with 18 in 2013. There were 229 Class III districts in 2014 compared with 229 in 2013. The Class VI, (Lincoln Public Schools) district had 37,979 students enrolled in 2014 compared with 36,943 in

2013. The Class V districts, (Omaha Public Schools) enrollment in 2014 was 51,069 compared with 50,559 in 2013. There were no (0) Class VI districts in 2014 compared with none (0) in 2013. There were a total of 254 public school districts in Nebraska in 2014 compared with 254 in 2013. Overall there were 307,677 students enrolled in public schools in Nebraska in 2014 compared with 303,505 in 2013. This was an increase of 4,172 students (see Table 22).

Table 22

School Districts in Nebraska, 2013-2014

Class	# Of Districts	Total Enrollment
I	0	0
II	18	2,792
III	229	215,658
IV	1	37,879
V	1	51,069
VI	0	0
Total Class I-IV	249	307,398
State Operated Schools	5	279
Total All Public Schools	254	307,677

Summary

In comparing where we began in 1985 to this past year, 2014, there are significant changes in the number of school districts in Nebraska as well as the number of students enrolled in those districts. This includes state operated schools as well. In 1985, we started with 666 Class I school districts in Nebraska that enrolled 17,614 students. In

2014, there are (0) Class I school districts in Nebraska with no student enrolled. This was a decrease of 666 school districts and 17,614 students.

In 1985, there were 66 Class II school districts in Nebraska that enrolled 8,961 students. In 2014, there were 18 Class II school districts with 2,792 students enrolled. This was a decrease of 48 school districts and 6,169 students.

In 1985, we had 220 Class III districts in the state of Nebraska that had 167,974 students enrolled. In 2014, there were 229 Class III school districts with 215,658 students enrolled. This was an increase of 9 school districts that are housing an increase of 47,684 students.

In 1985, Class IV (Lincoln Public Schools) district was counted as one district and it is counted as one district in 2014. In 1985, Lincoln Public Schools had 24,859 students enrolled. In 2014, their enrollment was 37,879. This is an increase of 13,020 students.

In 1985, Class VI (Omaha Public Schools) district was counted as 1 district and it is still counted as 1 district in 2014. In 1985, Omaha Public Schools had an enrollment of 41,669 students. In 2014, they have an enrollment of 51,069. This is an increase of 9,400 students.

In 1985, there were a total of 23 Class VI school districts in Nebraska with an enrollment of 4,542 students. In 2014, there were (0) Class VI districts in Nebraska. This was a decrease of 23 Class VI school districts and a decrease of 4,542 students.

In 1985, there were 7 state operated schools in Nebraska with a total enrollment of 497 students. In 2014, there are 5 state operated schools with 279 students. This is a decrease of 2 school districts and a decrease of 218 students.

What this data shows us is that over the course of the past 30 years, the Lincoln and Omaha Public Schools have seen a gain of 22,420 students. That is a gain of almost 750 new students a year! Also to note, our Class III school districts have seen a gain of 9 new school districts in the past 30 years with an increase of 47,684 students. Our Class I districts have been closed as have our Class VI districts. Our Class II districts have seen 48 districts close and lost 6,169 students.

It is clear that the legislation has changed the number of school districts in the past 30 years. When looking at the legislation that has impacted school reorganization in the past 30 years, there are a few observations worth making. The State of Nebraska has tried over the past 30 years to make public education more efficient in Nebraska. There have been numerous incentives given to districts to consolidate and merge with each other. These incentives have occurred frequently through the past 30 years. As legislation has occurred that impacts reorganization, the funding formula for public education has changed frequently as well. The TEEOSA (Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities Support Act) seems to change every year since it has been introduced in 1990. These changes were a reflection as to what was happening in education and the financial needs of education in Nebraska through the years. These changes were also made because of reorganization in Nebraska schools. Also, some of the legislation from the past 30 years dealt directly with reorganization. As is evident with the Learning Community approach to reorganization, legislation dealt directly with the issue of reorganization. These three areas: incentives, changes to the state aid model of financing public education in Nebraska, and direct reorganization legislation have made large impacts on Nebraska public education.

The legislature has tried to give school districts numerous opportunities to reorganize through financial incentives and providing legislation in 1995 with LB 840, 1996 with LB 1050, 1997 with LB 806 , LB 1219 in 1998, 2001 with LB 313, 2004 with LB 1091 and LB 967 in 2014. All of these bills called for incentives for districts to reorganize. Again in 1998, with LB 1134 legislation created the Reorganized School Assistance Fund. This fund was designed to generate money for districts to reorganize. It also gave reorganization a place where laws and rules were established for reorganization. In 1999 under LB 272, the State Committee for Reorganization of School Districts defined that new districts may be created from other districts with some parameters.

The state aid funding formula has changed many different times throughout the past 30 years. The modern system known as TEEOSA was established in 1990 with the passage of LB 1059. LB 1059 set the tone for Nebraska's modern state aid funding formula. As we have seen since that time, TEEOSA has changed many times. These changes occurred because of the economy of Nebraska and the state's ability to raise money for public education. As the years have passed, these changes don't seem to be significant within themselves. However, added up over the years, these changes have had a great impact on TEEOSA. These changes to TEEOSA began with LB 511 in 1991 when districts were required to receive tuition payments from non-resident high schools. In 1993, with LB 829, state aid was paid to Class I districts which had more than one general fund levy in the current year. LB 829 stated that NDE would base their calculation on a derived general fund. In 1994, LB 1290 stated that state aid would be withheld from schools if their data reports were late to the Commissioner of Education in Nebraska. In 1997 under LB 710, the base fiscal year was defined as what it means to a

school reorganization prior to 1995-96. In 1998, under LB 1134, base fiscal year was defined for the TEEOSA formula. LB 1219 also defined what base fiscal year means to reorganized districts in 1998. LB 126 in 2005 defined what adjusted valuation meant to reorganized school districts. Also in 2005, LB 198 described how state aid payments to school districts would be adjusted to reflect transfers of property because of a reorganization. In 2006 with LB 1024 and 2007 with LB 641, a definition was given to the TEEOSA formula as to what adjusted general fund expenditures and adjusted valuation meant to the funding formula. The TEEOSA formula was also adjusted again for reorganization as the Learning Community was established in 2006. In 2007, LB 641 provided for a common levy for districts in the Learning Community. In 2008, LB 988 changed TEEOSA in that it defined adjusted general fund operating expenditures and adjusted valuation for schools in the Learning Community.

There have been incentives given to districts to reorganize in Nebraska. Legislation regarding changes to the TEEOSA funding formula have occurred because of reorganization. There are also a number of bills that were created to establish reorganization in Nebraska. These bills were successful in changing reorganization in some ways but not successful in other ways. In 1985, LB 662 was established to have Class I districts to merge with other Class II, III, IV or V districts. In 1988, LB 940 looked to keep open Class I districts. Goals were also established through this bill for reorganization in Nebraska. In 1990, LB 259 again specified that Class I districts must merge with Class VI districts or affiliate with Class II, III, IV, V or VI districts by July 1, 1992. LB 511 said that any Class I district that is not part of a Class VI district on or before July 10, 1992 can file a petition to affiliate with one or more Class II, III, IV or VI

Districts. In 2002, LB 460 established reorganization rules that districts must follow when trying to reorganize. In 2005, Class I districts were required to have its territory attached to a Class II, III, or VI District with LB 126. In 2006, the Legislature created the Learning Community approach to reorganization with the passage of LB 1024. As part of the Learning Community, a coordinating council with one board member from each district in the Learning Community was established. In 2008, LB 1154 helped to clean up part of the original bill that established Learning Communities, LB 1024. LB 1154 described the role and responsibilities of the Coordinating Council.

With the passage of LB 711 in 2010 provisions for schools to withdrawal from a unified school system were provided. It recognized a unified district as a single Class II, III district for state aid, budgeting, accreditation and enrollment to name a few. In 2011, LB 558 continued to define more of the Learning Community's responsibility.

School reorganization has been influenced by changes to the state aid formula, incentives for district reorganization and the legislature's efforts to be more efficient as a state with public education. However, with the passage of LB 967 in 2014, once again money was placed in the School District Reorganization Fund to entice districts to reorganize.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed method study is to trace the past 30 years of reorganization in public schools within Nebraska. These reorganizations have taken many forms from the closing of Class I school districts to mergers and consolidations amongst public schools and the addition of the Learning Community approach in the metro Omaha area. The reorganizations have occurred for a number of different reasons including declining enrollments and financial pressures within school districts across Nebraska. The Nebraska State Legislature has also played a significant role in shaping the reorganization of school districts in Nebraska over the past 30 years.

This mixed method study will include the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. John Creswell (2003), explains in, *Research Design Qualitative,*

Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches:

One in which the investigator primarily uses post positivist claims for developing knowledge (i.e., cause and effect thinking, reduction to specific variables and hypotheses and questions, use of measurement and observation, and the test of theories), employs strategies or inquiry such as experiments and surveys, and collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data. (p. 18)

Mixed methods also uses a qualitative approach to research in that it is

one in which the inquirer often makes knowledge claims based primarily on constructivist perspectives (i.e., the multiple meanings of individual experiences, meaning socially and historically constructed, with an intent of developing a theory or pattern) or advocacy/participatory perspective (i.e., political, issue-oriented, collaborative, or change oriented) or both. It also uses strategies of inquiry such as narratives, phenomenologist, ethnographic, grounded theory studies, or case studies. The researcher collects open-ended, emerging data with the primary intent of developing themes from the data. (Creswell, 2003, p. 18)

As Creswell (2003) also explains the Mixed-Method approach to research

is one in which the researcher tends to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds (e.g., consequence-oriented, problem-centered, and pluralistic). It employs strategies of inquiry that involved collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems. The data collection also involves gathering both numeric information (e.g. instruments) as well as text information (e.g., on interviews) so that the final database represents both quantitative and qualitative information. (p. 18)

Research Questions

The primary research question is: What is the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and how might this history be used to predict what future public school reorganizations will look like in the next 30 years?

There are three sub questions that contribute to the primary research question. These three sub questions are:

1. What forms of school reorganization have taken place in Nebraska during the past 30 years?
2. What factors in the last 30 years led school districts in Nebraska to reorganize when they did?

The qualitative question in this research is:

3. Can we use these factors and our knowledge about the past 30 years of school reorganization in Nebraska to predict the next 30 years?

Population and Sample

The population of this survey was identified by determining Nebraska school districts that went through reorganization over the past 30 years. This information was obtained from the Nebraska Department of Education and is attached as Appendix A.

The survey was sent to 199 school district's superintendents. These districts have gone

through some form of reorganization in the past 30 years. The years that the past 30 years include are from the 1984-85 school year until 2013-14.

Research Design and Collection of Quantitative Data

A survey was sent to Nebraska superintendents of school districts that have gone through reorganization in the past 30 years. These superintendents were sent a letter to explain how they were selected for participation in the study (see Appendix C). This letter also explained why this topic was selected, how their confidentiality will be ensured and a copy of the survey. The letter and survey (Appendix D) was distributed to superintendents in January 2015 after the study had been approved by the Institutional Review Board. Survey participants were given three weeks to complete the survey online. Telephone contacts will be made with superintendents who have not responded to the survey to ensure that as many surveys as possible can be returned. The researcher realizes that the current superintendent of the district the survey went to might not have been in this district when the reorganization took place. However, they were able to answer the questions within the survey. Also, there would be enough history within the school district for the response to the survey questions. The addresses for these superintendents were supplied by the Nebraska Department of Education.

Data Analysis for the Survey

The survey was a self-administered survey. The survey was web based and an Internet link will was provided to each participant for the survey.

The survey instrument was specifically designed for this research. The researcher used the Qualtrics program that is offered from UNL to create the survey. The survey results were calculated using the Qualtrics program. The survey contained 33 questions.

Before the respondents answered the questions on the survey, they were asked to give a date to when their reorganization took place. This date gave us the opportunity to know when the reorganization occurred and how that date might align with legislative bills that changed reorganization in public schools in Nebraska.

The survey contains seven sections as noted below.

1. Enrollment
2. Finances
3. Improving Student Opportunities
4. Legislative Decisions
5. Staffing
6. Community
7. Open Ended Questions

The rest of the survey will include 16 questions that will require a “Yes-No-Don’t Know” response. The researcher calculated the respondent responses using a percentage. How many responded “Yes-No-Don’t Know?” This “Yes-No” approach is considered a dichotomous variable. A dichotomous variable is:

One that takes on one of only two possible values when observed or measured. The value is most often a representation for a measured variable (e.g., age: under 65/65 and over) or an attribute (e.g., gender: male/female). If the dichotomous variable represents another variable, that underlying variable may be either observed or unobserved. For example, a dichotomous variable may be used to indicate whether a piece of legislation passed. The dichotomous variable (pass/fail) is a representation of the actual, and observable, vote on the legislation. In contrast, each legislator's vote is the result of an individual, and unobserved, probability distribution between voting either. The researcher will calculate the results using a percentage of how each question was answered. (Hagle, 2004, p. 1)

The “yes-no” questions and responses were used to break down into percentages. The researcher wanted to see how each question was responded to by a percentage as to the impact it had on a school’s decision to reorganize.

Two additional questions required a “Very important-Important-Somewhat important-Not important-Don’t Know response.” The remainder of the survey questions required a “To a Great Degree-To a Moderate Degree-To Some Degree-Not at All” responses. For these questions a 4 point Lickert Scale and a 5 point Lickert Scale were made. A summative rating or Lickert Scale determines the perceptions of survey respondents about certain qualities regarding reorganization in their school district. Both the average score and standard deviation were calculated for the survey. As Thorndike and Thorndike described in their book titled *Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education* (2010, p. 363):

The most frequently used technique for obtaining such a numerical indication is to have respondents indicate their level of feeling toward a number of statements, often in terms of the degree to which they agree or disagree with the statements. This technique is called a summative rating, because the person’s attitude is then reflected by the sum of the responses to the individual statements. It is also called a Lickert Scale.

The Lickert Scale gave us a standard score for each question and we were able to calculate the standard deviation on six sections of the questions.

Finally the survey ended with one open ended qualitative question. This question was: “Is there anything this survey didn’t ask that we need to know about your reorganization?” This question will be transcribed and coded.

The survey, Appendix D, was e-mailed to participants, to be completed online. This information will appear in the letter that will be sent to participants.

Survey Pilot Testing

Prior to sending out the survey instrument to the large group that will receive it, the researcher sent the survey to three individuals. These individuals received the survey and letter explaining the process of data collection the research is trying to accomplish. These individuals were asked to complete the online survey and to also give feedback in regards to the clarity and appropriateness of each survey question. They were also asked to provide any further feedback that could help the process in gathering information for this research. This feedback was valuable in refining the survey process.

Qualitative Interviews

As Michaela Amora (2010) states,

Qualitative research is by definition exploratory, and it is used when we don't know what to expect, to define the problem or develop an approach to the problem. It's also used to go deeper into issues of interest and explore nuances related to the problem at hand. Common data collection methods used in qualitative research are focus groups, triads, dyads, in-depth interviews, uninterrupted observation, bulletin boards and ethnographic participation/observation. (Amora, 2010, p. 1)

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with eight individuals with expertise in school reorganization in Nebraska who are willing to share information with regards to their views. These individuals included current and past state senators, individuals from the Nebraska Department of Education, retired professors of education and others currently involved in public education in Nebraska. Pseudo names were used to protect the identity of these individuals.

The purpose of the face-to-face interviews with these individuals was to ask questions related to reorganization and their thoughts on the next 30 years of reorganization in Nebraska. These individuals had a wealth of knowledge on

reorganization and were able to make a strong prediction of where we will be headed in the future. The questions that were used are noted in Appendix E. The interviews were transcribed and coded. Areas of similarity and themes emerged from this process.

Prior to the interviews, the researcher determined a Recording Protocol for the interviews. This included putting together a form that I used for each interview. This protocol included taping and having the interview results transcribed. This form included:

1. A header on the interview paper of essential information such as the purpose of the study and confidentiality.
2. Place space between the questions in the protocol form because the interviewee might skip between questions.
3. Memorize the questions and their order to minimize losing eye contact with the participant.
4. Write out the closing comments that thank the individual for the interview and request follow-up information, if needed, from them. (Creswell, 2007, p. 134)

Data Analysis for the Interviews

The researcher used MAXQDA for analysis of the interviews. MAXQDA is a software program that organized the interviews and broke the information down for readers to understand. MAXQDA focuses on a number of areas. These areas include:

1. Data Management
2. Coding
3. Code System
4. Analysis
5. Transcription
6. Visual Tools (MAXQDA website www.maxqda.com).

The triangulation of data included information from the survey and interviews.

The Nebraska Department of Education provided information in regards to the number of districts that have been involved in reorganization over the past 30 years.

Summary

In trying to find information on the research question, “What is the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and how might that history be used to predict what future public school reorganizations will look like in the next 30 years,” a number of ways to obtain information occurred. First, a survey was sent out to superintendents whose school districts have gone through some form of reorganization in the past 30 years. This survey used the Qualtrics program to organize the data that was collected. The survey was made up of both “yes-no” questions as well as questions that were based on a 4 and 5 point Lickert Scale. These questions were analyzed by determining a percentage for each question and the standard deviation from the mean.

Interviews were conducted with people closely associated with public school reorganization in Nebraska. These interviews were based on a recording protocol. MAXQDA software was used to categorize the data and identify key themes from the interviews.

Chapter 4

Results

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to trace the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and determine how this history might be used to predict what future public school reorganizations will look like in the next 30 years.

Research Questions

The primary research question for this study was: What is the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and how might this history be used to predict what future public school reorganizations will look like in the next 30 years? There were three sub questions that revolved around the primary research question.

1. What forms of school reorganization have taken place in Nebraska over the past 30 years?
2. What factors led school districts in Nebraska to reorganize when they did?
3. How can we use these factors and our knowledge about the past 30 years of school reorganization in Nebraska to predict the next 30 years?

Research Design

This research used a mixed method approach. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used throughout this research. The quantitative results were derived from a survey that was sent to superintendents in Nebraska. Results were gathered from interviews conducted with superintendents who were involved in education in Nebraska in their current positions.

As part of the literature review, information was gathered about the major legislative bills that have impacted public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years. Also, the number of public schools and their class affiliations were broken down over the past 30 years for Class I, II, III, IV, V and VI. Nebraska has fewer overall public school districts open in the years 2014-2015 than they did in 1984-1985. In 1984 there were 977 Class I through VI school districts in Nebraska. In 2014, there were 249 Class I through VI school districts in Nebraska. This is a difference of 728 school districts. The legislation that has occurred over the past 30 years has had a tremendous impact on the number of current school districts in Nebraska. More specific information was gathered using the survey that shows why districts experienced a reorganization. The specific factors that led to their reorganization were determined. Additionally, interviews were also conducted that provided more qualitative information about reorganization.

It is with the greatest intention that this dissertation followed the three standards of expectation for research that Byrant (2004) described as:

1. The standard of objectivity
2. The standard of clarity
3. The standard of replicability (Bryant, 2003, p. 117).

Quantitative Findings

Population. The survey was sent to 199 public school superintendents in Nebraska. These superintendents were determined by locating the school districts that experienced some form of reorganization in Nebraska during the past 30 years representing the years 1983-1984 through 2013-2014. These reorganizations ran the

gamut of the closing of Class I school districts in 2006, to consolidations of the districts that are now part of the Learning Community in Nebraska. Many of the districts that the survey was sent to have gone through more than one reorganization within the past 30 years. The survey asked superintendents to complete the survey based on the last reorganization they went through in their district.

The superintendents were sent an initial e-mail to complete the survey on January 19, 2014. Within this e-mail (Appendix C) the reason for conducting this research was provided. A reminder e-mail (Appendix D) was sent to the same group of superintendents on January 29th reminding them to complete the on-line survey. A final e-mail reminder (Appendix D) was sent on February 2nd to those superintendents who had not completed the survey. The final day to complete the survey was February 6th and no further surveys were accepted after this date. The information obtained through the surveys is as accurate as possible.

One of the limitations of the superintendents that participated in the survey is that they might not have been in their current position when the reorganization occurred in their district. They may have relied on the history that someone left for them or told them in order to complete the survey. I received many e-mails from superintendents who believed their district had not gone through a reorganization during the past 30 years. I send the superintendent an e-mail after I sent out the survey the first time that reminded them they had gone through the closing of the Class I schools and this is a form of reorganization. And in many cases, I would send them information on which district dissolved and they received as a district.

There were a total of 133 superintendents that completed the survey. The survey went out to 199 superintendents, with a total response rate of 67% for completing the survey.

The purpose of the survey was to identify the reasons for each school district's last reorganization. Were the reasons based on enrollment issues? Did finances play a part in their reorganization? Was the decision to reorganize based on improving student opportunities or was the district's reorganization based upon a legislative decision? Additionally, did the reorganization have an impact on staffing and did it impact their community in some form? And finally, if there was some other reason behind why they went through a reorganization the survey did not address. The responses provided a definitive answer in many districts as to why their reorganization occurred.

Valid percent. Many of the questions were based off their responses using valid percent. Valid percent is the percentage without the number of survey questions that were left unanswered. So, it determines percentage only on those superintendents who responded and it does not determine percentage using the unanswered questions.

Survey Results

Question A: What year did your school district last reorganize? There were 133 superintendents that responded to the survey. There were 101 superintendents who could answer what year their district last reorganized (see Table 23). There were 12 superintendents who didn't know when they last reorganized. Four superintendents responded they had not reorganized while one responded they were in a coop. And finally, there were 15 superintendents that didn't answer the question.

Table 23

School District Reorganization Year & Number of Reorganized

Year in which reorganization occurred in Public Schools	Number of Public School Districts that reorganized that year	Year in which reorganization occurred in Public Schools	Number of Public School Districts that reorganized that year
1948	1	1994	4
1955	1	1995	0
1956	1	1996	0
1964	1	1997	1
1965	1	1998	1
1967	2	1999	5
1968	4	2000	4
1978	1	2001	1
1982	1	1995	0
1984	1	1996	0
1985	1	1997	1
1986	1	1998	1
1987	1	1999	5
1988	1	2000	4
1989	1	2001	1
1990	3	1995	0
1991	1	1996	0
1992	1	1997	1
1993	0	1998	1

Table 23 continues

Year in which reorganization occurred in Public Schools	Number of Public School Districts that reorganized that year
1999	5
2000	4
2008	2
2009	1
2010	0
2011	3
2012	1

Year in which reorganization occurred in Public Schools	Number of Public School Districts that reorganized that year
2013	0
2014	4
Don't Know	12
Has Not	4
Other coop	1
Didn't Answer	15

Question B: Has your school district gone through a unification? There were 20 districts that answered; “Yes” they had gone through a unification. There were 104 districts that answered “No” they had not gone through a unification. And there were nine that didn’t answer the question. So, using valid percent, 16.1% of those surveyed said their district had gone through a unification.

Question C: If it did go through a unification, what year did this occur?

There were school districts that had gone through a unification from 1986 through 2011 (see Table 24). Nineteen (19) superintendents responded that they had gone through a unification since 1984. There were 11 superintendents who responded in the category “not available” or “other responses.” There was one response that indicated they did not unify while 103 superintendents did not answer the question.

Table 24

School District Unification Year & Number of Schools Unified

What year did the unification occur?	Number of school districts that went through a unification	What year did the unification occur?	Number of school districts that went through a unification
1984		2001	1
1985		2002	1
1986	1	2003	
1987		2004	3
1988		2005	2
1989		2006	
1990		2007	1
1991		2008	
1992		2009	
1993		2010	1
1994		2011	1
1995		2012	
1996		2013	
1997		2014	
1998	1	Not Available/ Other	11
1999	1	No Unification	1
2000	6	Didn't Answer	103

Question D: Has your school district become a member of a Learning

Community? The number of school districts that were part of this survey that have become a member of a Learning Community using valid percent was .8%. This accounts for 1 school district. The number of school districts that were a part of this survey and have not become a member of a Learning Community using valid percent was 99.2%. This accounts for 122 school districts. There were 10 surveys returned that did not answer this question.

Question E: Place an X on the current classification of your school district.

The percentages of school district classes that took part in this survey are in relation to the 133 surveys that were returned completed from Class A, B, C and D public school districts in Nebraska. The percentages were figured using valid percent and shown in Table 25. The percentage of Class A school districts that took part in the survey was 4.0%. The percentage of Class B school districts that took part in the survey was 10.4%. The percentage of Class C school districts that took part in the survey was 43.2%. The percentage of Class D school districts that took part in the survey was 42.4%. There were eight districts that did not answer this question.

Table 25

Current Classification of School District

Classification	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
Numbers	5	13	54	53

Survey Part 1: Enrollment.

Question #1: What level of importance did your school enrollment factor into your reorganization? The number of responses, using valid percent, showed that 24 districts or 20.2% responded as Very Important. There were 25 districts or 21.0% that responded as Important. There were 21 districts, or 17.6% responded as Somewhat Important. There were 31 districts or 26.1% responded as Not Important and 18 districts or 15.1% responded, as they don't know. There were 14 districts that did not answer this question.

Enrollment impacting reorganization. There were 41.2% of respondents who stated the level of importance of enrollment factored into their reorganization was Very Important or Important (see Table 26). There were also 43.7% who responded as either Somewhat Important or Not Important. There were 15.1% who didn't know if their enrollment factored into their reorganization.

When a reorganization occurred, 70.8% stated it increased their enrollment. There was no impact from a decrease in a district's enrollment as only 2.5% stated they saw a decrease in their enrollment after a reorganization. A reorganization did have an impact upon keeping a school site open at 70.3%. Approximately 53.8% of the reorganizations forced an attendance center to close. Most districts that reorganized with another district did so with a district smaller than their own at the rate of 83.1%. And finally, when two districts reorganized, only 6.7% of the time were their enrollments about the same.

Table 26

Enrollment Impacting Reorganization

Question:	Yes %	No %	Don't Know %
#2 Did your reorganization increase your enrollment?	70.8	12.5	16.7
#3 Did your reorganization decrease your enrollment?	2.5	81.7	15.8
#4 Did your reorganization allow your school site to continue to be open?	70.3	17.8	11.9
#5 Did your reorganization force an attendance center to close?	53.8	34.2	12.0
#6 Did the other school district have a larger enrollment than yours?	3.4	82.4	14.3
#7 Did the other school district have a smaller enrollment than yours?	83.1	3.4	13.6
#8 Did the other school district have an enrollment about the same as yours?	6.7	79.8	13.4

Survey Part 2: Finances.***Question #9: Did School finances play a role in why you went through***

reorganization? The number of responses, using valid percent, showed that 26 districts or 22.8% responded finances were Very Important. There were 24 districts or 21.1% who responded as Important. There were 15 districts or 13.2% who responded as Somewhat Important while 30 districts or 26.3% responded as Not Important and 19 districts or 16.7% responded, as they don't know. There were 19 districts that did not answer this question.

Finances impacting reorganization. There were 43.9% of respondents who stated finances played a Very Important or Important role in their reorganization (see Table 27). There were 39.5% respondents who stated finances were Somewhat Important or Not Important in their reorganization. And there were 16.7% who identified they Didn't Know if finances played a role in their reorganization.

Table 27

Financing Impacting Reorganization

Question:	Yes %	No %	Don't Know %
#10 Was your school district in bad shape financially at the time of the reorganization?	14.8	65.2	20.0
#11 Did you reorganize to stabilize your finances?	25.2	51.3	23.5
#12 By reorganizing, did your district's finances improve?	55.8	21.2	23.0
#13 By reorganizing, did your district's finances get worse?	2.7	78.8	18.6
#14 Did your overall valuation improve by the reorganization?	74.3	10.6	15.0
#15 Did your reorganization cause your overall valuation to get worse?	0.9	85.8	13.3
#16 Did your reorganization force you to a levy override?	1.8	85.8	12.4
#17 Did you receive incentive money to reorganize?	14.9	57.9	27.2
#18 Did money as an incentive, factor into your decision to reorganize?	8.8	65.8	25.4

At the time of their reorganization, 65.2% of districts said they were not in bad shape financially when it occurred. Only 25.2% said they reorganized to

stabilize their finances. By reorganizing, 55.8% said their finances improved after reorganizing. Only 2.7% said their finances got worse after reorganizing. After reorganizing, 74.3% said their overall valuation improved. There was a very small percentage, .9%, who said their valuation decreased by reorganizing. Only 1.8% said they were forced to a levy override by reorganizing. For those districts that reorganized, 14.9% received incentive money to do so. Finally, 65.8% stated that money did not factor into their decision to reorganize.

Survey Part 3: Improving student opportunities. (Please remember that Mean is the same as average. Standard Deviation is how far away from the mean people's responses were on average).

The impact of improving student opportunities upon reorganization. There were 46.4% of respondents that stated the reorganization increased academic opportunities to a great or moderate degree (see Table Table 28). At 18.2%, there was some degree of impact on academic opportunities while 35.5% thought there was no impact on academic opportunities. The mean was 2.72 while the standard deviation was 1.126.

There was not one superintendent who responded that reorganization decreased academic opportunities for students a great to moderate degree. At 2.8%, there was some degree of impact on decreasing academic opportunities while 97.2% of superintendents thought there was no impact on decreasing academic opportunities. The mean was 3.97 while the standard deviation was .164.

Table 28

Impact of Improving Student Opportunities upon Reorganization

Question:	To a Great Degree	To a Moderate Degree	To Some Degree	Not At all	Mean	Standard Deviation
#19 Did your reorganization increase academic opportunities for your students?	17.3%	29.1%	18.2%	35.5%	2.72	1.126
#20 Did your reorganization decrease academic opportunities for your students?			2.8%	97.2%	3.97	.164
#21 Did your reorganization increase athletic opportunities for your students?	13.8%	22.9%	20.2%	43.1%	2.93	1.103
#22 Did your reorganization decrease athletic opportunities for your students?		.9%	1.8%	97.2%	3.96	.233
#23 Did your reorganization increase activity opportunities for students?	14.7%	25.7%	20.2%	39.4%	2.84	1.107
#24 Did your reorganization decrease activity opportunities for your students?	.9%	.9%	1.8%	96.4%	3.94	.365

There were 36.7% of respondents that stated the reorganization increased athletic opportunities for students in a great or moderate degree. At 20.2% there was some degree of impact on increasing athletic opportunities while 43.1% thought there was no

impact on increased athletic opportunities. The mean was 2.93 while the standard deviation was 1.103.

There were no respondents who stated the reorganization decreased athletic opportunities for students to a great degree while .9% stated there was a moderate degree of effect. At 1.8%, there was some degree of impact on decreasing athletic opportunities while 97.2% thought there was no impact at all. The mean was 3.96 while the standard deviation was .233.

There was 40.4% of respondents that stated the reorganization increased activity opportunities for students in a great to moderate degree. At 20.2%, there was some degree of impact on increasing activity opportunities while 39.4% thought there was not any impact at all. The mean was 2.84 while the standard deviation was 1.107.

There were 1.8% of respondents that stated the reorganization decreased activity opportunities for students to a great or moderate degree. At 1.8% there was some degree of impact on decreasing activity opportunities for students while 96.4% thought there was not any impact at all. The mean was 3.94 while the standard deviation was .365.

Survey Part 4: Legislative decisions.

Legislative decision impacting reorganization. There were 44.4% of respondents who believed a decision made by the legislature was prominent in their reorganization to a great or moderate degree (see Table 29). At 7.5% a decision made by the legislature impacted their reorganization to some degree while 48.1% didn't believe that impacted their reorganization at all. The mean was 2.63 while standard deviation was 1.423.

Table 29

Legislative Decision Impacting Reorganization

Question:	To a Great Degree	To a Moderate Degree	To Some Degree	Not At all	Mean	Standard Deviation
#25 Was a decision made by the Legislature prominent in your reorganization?	40.6%	3.8%	7.5%	48.1%	2.63	1.423
#26 Did a change in the TEEOSA (state funding formula) force your district into a reorganization?	2.8%	4.6%	13.0%	79.6%	3.69	0.690

There were 7.4% of respondents that believed a change in the TEEOSA (state funding formula) forced their district into a reorganization. At 13.0% a change in the funding formula had an impact to some degree while 79.6% didn't believe the funding formula impacted their reorganization at all. The mean was 3.69 while the standard deviation was .690.

Survey Part 5: Staffing.

Staffing impacting reorganization. There were 41.1% of respondents that believed reorganization had an impact on staffing in a great to moderate degree (see Table 30). At 32.7% staffing had some degree of impact on staffing after the reorganization took place while 26.2% didn't feel this had an impact at all. The mean was 2.73 while standard deviation was .986.

Table 30

Staffing Impacting Reorganization

Question:	To a Great Degree	To a Moderate Degree	To Some Degree	Not At all	Mean	Standard Deviation
#27 Did the reorganization of your district have an impact upon staffing?	12.1%	29.0%	32.7%	26.2%	2.73	0.986
#28 Did teachers in your school district lose their jobs because of the reorganization?	2.8%	4.7%	17.8%	74.8%	3.64	0.704
#29 Did your school district gain staff by the reorganization?	11.1%	21.3%	31.5%	36.1%	2.93	1.011

There were 7.5% of respondents, that indicated teachers, lost their jobs because of the reorganization to a great or moderate degree. At 17.8% teachers losing their jobs because of the reorganization had some degree of impact while 74.8% felt teachers did not lose jobs because of reorganization. The mean was 3.64 while the standard deviation was .704.

There were 33.4% of respondents that believed their district gained staff by the reorganization to a great to moderate degree. At 31.5%, respondents felt their district gained staff by the reorganization in some degree while 36.1% felt their district did not gain staff by the reorganization at all. The mean was 2.93 while the standard deviation was 1.011.

Survey Part 6: Community.

Community impacting reorganization. There were 42.2% of respondents who believed their reorganization had a positive impact on their community from a great to

moderate degree (see Table 31). At 32.1%, to some degree, the reorganization had a positive impact on the community while 25.7% felt the reorganization did not impact the community in a positive way. The mean was 2.74 while the standard deviation was .947.

Table 31

Community Impacting Reorganization

Question:	To a Great Degree	To a Moderate Degree	To Some Degree	Not At all	Mean	Standard Deviation
#30 Did the reorganization have a positive impact on your community?	9.2%	33.0%	32.1%	25.7%	2.74	0.947
#31 Did the reorganization have a negative impact on your community?	2.8%	6.5%	35.5%	55.1%	3.43	0.741

There were 9.3% of respondents who felt the reorganization had a negative impact on the community to a great to moderate degree. At 35.5%, to some degree, the reorganization had a negative impact on the community while 55.1% felt there was no negative impact on their community. The mean was 3.43 while the standard deviation was .741.

Survey Part 7: Open ended question.

Question #30: Was there anything this survey didn't ask that we needed to know about your reorganization, please comment below.? When asked this question on the survey, not everyone who filled out the survey answered this question. In fact, the researcher didn't have a great number of people share information to this question after they had completed the survey. This question was qualitative in nature and the majority

of answers to this question were personalized. I did not use pseudo names as the comments were made through the survey process which did not allow for the researcher to identify who commented. There were some cases in which the superintendents who wrote comments in this section identified themselves or their districts through their comments. The researcher wrote these comments in the way they were stated on the survey.

When discussing if the survey failed to ask something that we need to know about a district's reorganization, the majority of responses dealt with the closing of Class I schools within their district. The reorganization that occurred in many of these responses was tied directly with the closing of Class I schools under LB 126 in 2005.

The large majority of superintendent's comments discussed the reorganizations that took place because of LB 126 which closed the Class I schools across Nebraska. As one of the respondents stated, "The reorganization in our district consisted of the closing of Class I districts and buildings and bringing those students into the same district." Another stated, "The description of our reorganization was to close four rural attendance centers and reconfigure the two elementaries in town to a K-2 and a 3-4 instead of two K-4 buildings." Another respondent stated,

The Class I issue was a classic example of the state forcing local decision makers to do the politically challenging work as the responsibility of deciding which Class I schools would remain open and which would be closed was thrust onto school boards.

This superintendent went on to share, "By and large, it has been a positive and I believe the legislature should look to further consolidation around the State in some circumstances where small districts (<500-600) are within a fifteen minute drive of a larger district."

As respondents continued to answer Section 7 of the survey, they continued to discuss the impact that LB 126 had on reorganization within their district. A respondent stated, “Reorganization was a result of closing Class I schools that had no attendance at the time of legislative directed reorganization.” A number of responses were simple one or two sentence answers that dealt directly with the Class I bill effecting reorganization in their district. This included statements such as, “Our reorganization was the closure of all Class I schools, we had a small portion of the land.” And, “the only reorganization activity my district had been involved with is the closure of two Class I schools with very little impact on the district.” A couple of other comments included, “This was the closing of our Class I schools. . . . Reorganization was due to LB 126 so high school district (Class VI district absorbed Class I districts to become a Class III.” And finally, “This reorganization was merely the assimilation of a Class I district and was significant, the impact on the Class III district was inconsequential.”

Within the Class I closings, some districts shared specific information on how it impacted their district. As one respondent stated:

The reorganization was a result of legislation to eliminate Class 1 school districts in Nebraska. We had several, and the emotions of the folks who were forced to close ran pretty high at the time. Some of those feelings are still prominent today. In all, the reorganization was good for those kids and good for our school district as well.

There was information shared as a result of this survey question that did not tie everything back to the Class I school’s closing. This included information regarding unifications. One comment from a respondent in regards to unification included, “Unification is not the same as reorganization in that we could still legally go back to the original three districts that unified in the beginning. The main goal of our unification was

to keep the community schools open and not to save money.” Another comment on unification included,

The school did not stay in their unification very long. They paid back the incentive funds and have been on their own since the divorce from the other school. I was not the superintendent at the time, but the two that were trying to make this work did not have a good working relationship. I am not sure how it would have turned out if there would have been different leadership at the time.

And as we looked at other ways in which superintendents answered this question, there were a number of different answers and views of reorganization were shared. The first one started with:

I was not the superintendent when the reorganization happened. I was able to get some information from a long time staff member who was hired at the present facility when the reorganization occurred. Our district closed its Class I schools in 1999. They RIF'd a few teachers when all the country schools closed and students were then educated in another district. Fifteen years later, nearly everyone would say its was an excellent decision for the district.

Another respondent to this question stated:

The closure of the smaller school was not immediate. That facility was retained for about 4 years as a middle school before it was determined inefficient and finally closed. All of this happened prior to my arrival in the district, so I can not guarantee everything is 100% accurate, many of these responses are my opinions based on 2nd hand comments I have heard.

Another view shared for this question discussed the ability for land owners to choose which district they wanted to send their land to. As one respondent stated, “So it is extremely frustrating knowing that our valuation could be higher, but when the Class I schools were being closed, no one thought of the problems that were created when the legislators allowed people to ‘pick’ their school district.” Another comment shared, “Our farms are getting larger and out farm families are getting fewer and fewer.” This was stated in relation to the size and populations of towns becoming smaller.

A couple of respondents described the drop in enrolment as a factor in their reorganization. One superintendent stated, “Reorganization came about because of decline in enrollment numbers of the other district.” And another stated,

The reorganization added the southern most rural school district, which closed because the school went from approximately 30 students to 2 students over the summer. The two students were brought to our district. The reorganization increased our property valuation. The rural school lost two teachers as we did not have students for them to teach.

Another stated, “Our reorganization resulted from an adjoining school district closing and we absorbed many of their students.”

Another impact the reorganization had on districts was, “A positive effect for us is having all of our high school students learning together as well as participating in extra-curricular activities together. Eliminating a sports cooperative has made practice and travel times much more efficient.”

Survey Part 7: Open ended question summary. In summarizing, the answers to “If there is anything this survey didn’t ask that we need to know about your reorganization?” there were a number of varied responses. This included the large majority of respondents that stated the closing of Class I schools through LB 126 was where reorganization occurred in their district. This closed schools and forced some reconfigurations of buildings in school districts. It had both a positive impact and for some districts no impact at all. It left high emotions in districts and hard feelings. Along the way, superintendents said it was good for both students and their districts. When districts did go through a unification, it was to keep their community schools open and a district even paid back their incentive funds to unify.

Amongst the other ideas noted about this question, teachers were RIF'ed and facilities that were in poor shape were closed. People also had a chance to pick which school district received their land. A superintendent stated that fewer people farmed larger farms today which has decreased rural population. Therefore, a drop in enrollment caused reorganization to occur. It also grew some districts' enrollment as they took in students from closing districts. And finally, a superintendent stated, "that it was good for students to learn and participate together in activities. "

Survey results summary. In returning the surveys, 133 were completed out of a possible 199. This is a 67% return rate. Most of the reorganizations that occurred in Nebraska the past 30 years happened in the 2005-2007 school years. These were the years when the Class I school districts were closed because of LB 126, which was passed by the Nebraska Legislature during the 2005 session. There were 20 districts that have gone through a unification during the past 30 years. These unifications occurred from 1986 through 2011 with a high of 6 taking place in 2000. Of the superintendents that responded to the survey, only 1 indicated they had gone through the Learning Community reorganization. The majority of districts that responded to the survey were Class C and D school districts. These comprised 85.6% of the districts that responded while Class A and B districts accounted for 14.4%.

When the question was asked about how enrollment factored into a district's reorganization, almost 71% responded that their reorganization increased their enrollment while only 2.5% responded that it decreased their enrollment. Over 70% of the superintendents responded that their reorganization allowed their school site to continue to be open. Respondents were split on whether their reorganization forced an attendance

center to close. Almost 54% responded that it did force them to close while 34% said it didn't. And when it came to the size of the districts that were reorganizing together, only 3% of districts reorganized with a district larger than its own. When school's reorganized together, the enrollment of both districts were different. Almost 80% of respondents stated that the other school district did not have an enrollment about the same as their own.

When the question was asked as to how finances played a role in why school districts went through a reorganization, it seemed as if finances were not a major factor. Only 15% responded that their district was in bad shape financially when they reorganized and 25% reorganized to stabilize their finances. Almost 56% of the superintendents did respond that by reorganizing, it improved their districts finances while only 3% stated their finances got worse because of the reorganization. A large percentage of 74% stated that their valuation did improve by reorganizing. A very small percentage of 2% stated they needed to do a levy override after reorganizing. Fifteen percent (15%) of the districts received incentive money to reorganize even though only 9% stated incentive money was a factor in their decision to reorganize.

In understanding if a reorganization improved student opportunities, over 46% stated that it had to a great or moderate degree on increasing academic opportunities for students. Around 97.2% of respondents stated that their reorganization did not decrease academic opportunities for students. Over 63% of respondents felt that the reorganization had little impact on increasing athletic opportunities for students. Around 97.2% of respondents stated that their reorganization did not have an effect on decreasing athletic opportunities for students. Around 60% of respondents felt that the reorganization

had some to no effect on increasing activity opportunities for students. However, over 96% of respondents stated the reorganization did not decrease activity opportunities for students. The largest movements between mean and standard deviation was on the question that asked, “Did your reorganization increase academic opportunities for students?” Standard deviation was 1.126 points from the mean on that question.

When factoring the Legislative impact on a reorganization, it was split on the effect this had. Over 44% stated that to a great or moderate degree the decision to reorganize was because of the legislature. Over 48% stated that this was not a factor at all. And a change in the TEEOSA (state aid formula), was not a factor in why a district reorganized. Over 80% stated that this did not play a factor at all in their decision to reorganize. The largest movements between mean and standard deviation was on the question that asked, “Was a decision made by the Legislature prominent in your reorganization.” Standard deviation was 1.423 points from the mean on that question.

To determine if a reorganization had an impact on staffing, 41% stated that it had a great to moderate degree of effect on staffing. Approximately 33% stated it had some degree of impact. Over 75% of respondents stated that teachers did not lose their jobs because of the reorganization, and it was mixed as to whether a school district gained staff because of their reorganization. Around 32% stated there was a great to moderate degree of staff gained while 32% stated there was some degree of staff gained. Over 36% stated there was no effect at all. The largest movements between mean and standard deviation was on the question that asked, “Did your school district gain staff by the reorganization.” Standard deviation was 1.011 points from the mean on that question.

And finally, how did a reorganization effect the community that it was occurring in? Forty two percent (42%) of respondents stated that there was a great to moderate degree positive effect that the reorganization had on the community. A little over 32% stated that it had some degree of positive effect. And conversely, only a little over 9% stated that there was a great to moderate degree of negative impact on the community, where over 55% stated it did not have a negative impact on the community. The largest movements between mean and standard deviation was on the question that asked, “Did the reorganization have a positive impact on your community.” Standard deviation was .947 points from the mean on that question.

Qualitative Findings

Interview Participants. The researcher conducted eight interviews in January 2015 with individuals associated with education in the state of Nebraska. These interviewees were in positions within the Nebraska Department of Education, State Legislature and leaders of groups that support public education in the State of Nebraska. All but one of the interviews took place face-to-face while one of the interviews took place over the phone. Prior to the interviews, the researcher shared with the interviewees that their names would not be used in the dissertation, unless they wanted their name used. When showing their responses from the interviews, they were given pseudo names to protect their identity. The pseudo names were given in the order the interviews took place (see Table 32). The interviewees’ responses to the questions were recorded and transcribed. At the beginning of the interview each participant was provided with the purpose behind the research and how their position puts them in a unique situation to understand public school reorganization in Nebraska. The interviewer then asked each of

Table 32

Interview Participants

Pseudo Names of Interviewees	Order in Which They were Interviewed
John Smith	1
Darren Jackson	2
Steven Drummond	3
Tyson Johnson	4
Mitchell Abraham	5
Danny Wilson	6
Cindy Lillian	7
Terry Michaels	8

the six questions that had been sent to the interviewees prior to the interview. In some instances, the interviewer probed for more information or added follow up statements to what the interviewee was sharing. Six questions were asked of each interviewee. The main themes from each point are listed below each question and highlighted in black.

The six questions that were asked about the key factors of school reorganization were:

1. What have been the key factors that have led to school reorganization in Nebraska since you have been in your current position?
 - Shrinking rural population.
 - Declining enrollments in public schools also changes offerings in schools.
2. In what ways do you believe Nebraska is unique as a state in regards to how reorganization is impacted by factors within the state?
 - Geography Factors

- High number of school districts compared to population
3. What role do you believe the state legislature currently has in regards to school reorganization in Nebraska?
 - How to better understand reorganization in Nebraska
 - Hands off approach
 4. What key elements exist in the future that may lead to the need for reorganization?
 - Move from Rural to Urban Areas
 - Diminishing Populations
 5. What factors do you believe will influence school reorganization in Nebraska in the future?
 - Dropping rural population
 - Ag economy factors in reorganization
 6. How do you see school reorganization impacting Nebraska schools in the future?
 - No major changes in reorganization for the future
 - Planned programming and curriculum for schools in Nebraska

When looking at the data retrieved from the interviews, it is important to remember what Wolcott (1990) described, “Display formats provide alternatives for coping with two of our most critical tasks, data reduction and data analysis.”

Interview question responses.

Question 1. The first question that was asked of the interviewees was: What have been the key factors that have led to school reorganization in Nebraska since you have

been in your current position? The key factors that emerged from the first question were shared by many of the interviewees. The de-population of rural areas in the state of Nebraska was mentioned numerous times throughout the interviews. Another key factor as to why reorganization occurred in school districts across Nebraska was the inability of school districts to be able to provide a quality program of education for their students. As Darren Jackson stated,

I think in the ag community you're seeing larger and larger farms because that's what it takes to survive and thrive. It used to be an 80 acre plot and a family here and a family there. A lot of them had kids and the schools were a common place. You had Class I's and they were all over the place, I mean how many districts did we have, we had well over a thousand districts.

Mr. Jackson went on to state that,

Yeah, so we've seen a lot of that change, a lot of it has to do with the ag community with the larger farms, with the technology in the ag sector, it doesn't take as many people to work the land. And even if it did take that amount of people, I think because the profit margins have gone down significantly over the years and the way to make a dollar is to add technology and because we're seeing fewer and fewer people work on the farms in the state of Nebraska in the ag community.

Mitchell Abraham stated the following in regards to why reorganization has occurred in Nebraska,

I think the key factors are diminishing population. And the diminishing population then drives the question, is the school district scaled enough to provide a kid with the educational opportunity that they ought to have? That's the real question that drives it. However, I'm going to be factious, board members throughout my career have said, 'Well, when should we consolidate?' And I've always said, 'Well there's two motivations. There's the right one, and the one you're going to use. The right motivation is, we need to consolidate when we can, when we're not big enough any more to provide a kid the educational opportunities they need. However, the answer you're going to rely on, when we go from 11-main to 6-main football.

As Cindy Lillian stated,

Well I have been in the legislature for six years and I have to say probably the biggest thing that has driven school consolidation and reorganization has been the quite dramatic decline in population. Yes, there have been other factors and where I have seen discussions take place, I've not been intimately involved in them but the other thing which is good, I think, is that the school boards are looking for making sure they can provide the best quality education. And so they have had challenges with recruiting teachers to particular positions and that starts to also make them look at some of the opportunities.

And as Terry Michaels stated,

Yeah, usually the number one thing that leads to reorganization is the population. So the amount of students that you have and the ability to serve them based on the requirements that school districts have around Rule 10 or around minimum requirements basically on the operating of the school. So the depopulation leads to that.

Terry goes on to further state,

The other part, I think, that leads to reorganization is at a point in time where communities decide that they want more for their kids or that they believe that in order to control their future, their destiny, they're going to have to engage in some conversation. Depopulation, community perspective, I would take it to the educational leadership side of the equation, both from a board level and from an administrator level. As you know, just trying to set a path and a vision for a district, making sure that you're doing well by the students that are there. I think that obviously starts the influence of, it's kind of a swirling of all of those issues together. Finance can also lead into this conversation, I think probably less so over the last few years, certainly more so in the prior years. Finance policy has driven a lot.

As Mr. Michaels stated at the end of his answer to the question, finance has played a role in reorganizations in Nebraska. As John Smith stated,

I think probably the first thing is finance. I mean it's the money that some of the smaller school districts, I guess maybe the money issues they run into as far as the cost of operating a school and the numbers. It's two things, it's the finances and it's the lack of students. The two of those create a finance issue that most of the time leads to reorganization, and the second one, the lack of students, also creates additional issues as far as what schools can offer. You know, to be able to allow those kids the opportunities, maybe, that they won't get at a very, very small school that only has a handful of kids in their grade. Before they get to this point where they are basically forced, for lack of options, to reorganize or at least co-op their school for sports or all the other kind(s) of extra-curricular activities that they do.

And to play off the finance issue again, Danny Wilson gave a short answer as to what are the key factors to reorganization in Nebraska when he replied, “Yeah, without question I would say that the evolution of the school finance formula is the driving force behind school reorganization.”

And de-population of the community or a drop in enrollment are both factors in a school district’s need to reorganize. As Steve Drummond stated,

the number one factor is declining enrollment, that automatically forces pressure on teacher salaries because you need to cover the class even if you don’t have enough kids to cover third year Spanish or second year French or physics or chemistry. You’ve got to buy a teacher, a certified teacher to fill that space. A high quality teacher and it gets very expensive if you only have 3 kids in the class.

As Steve continues on,

That single dilemma is a huge driving force. Declining enrollment pushes on that cost, and those two things in tandem, really the declining enrollment pushes that, on the other side, and related to it but a different factor, is the increasing expectation on the part of parents that kids will go to school districts and a high school that must offer a college prep curriculum. Typically about 80 percent of the parents believe that their child is going to go on to a postsecondary college.

As Tyson Johnson stated very bluntly when asked what factors have influenced reorganization in Nebraska;

Declining enrollment. And there’s a concern about program offerings. If you don’t have enough kids you might not be able to offer some of the programs that you would like to have. And if you have a really small school district, it’s really expensive per student. You’ve got, first of all, enrollments and secondly, you’ve got program, which is based on enrollments, really that’s the deciding factor. And finally finance, which is key to enrollment, so it’s really like enrollments, enrollments, enrollments.

In summarizing the first question, “What have been the key factors that have lead to school reorganization in Nebraska since you have been in your current position,” most of the interviewees described the de-populations of communities as a key factor. This also included the notion that when population drops, so does the school district’s

enrollment. As school districts are not able to provide their students with a proper education following Rule 10, then reorganization becomes a possibility. We have also seen that finances play a role in reorganization as well. When school districts struggle to finance their school district, they need to look at reorganization as an option.

Question 2. The second question asked of our interviewees was: In what ways do you believe Nebraska is unique as a state in regards to how reorganization is impacted by factors within the state? A number of those interviewed stated that Nebraska's unique geography was a factor in reorganization. As John Smith stated,

Well Nebraska is unique because of how our state is set up geographically, the eastern side being more populated, the western side being more sparse. In the panhandle, you get these districts that span a lot of ground and still have a lot of kids, but you have to keep some of those small districts open because if you don't kids can be driving over a 100 miles to a school. There are districts out there that size-wise you'd think, if you just looked at numbers you'd think this district has no business being open. But if you understand the full picture of Nebraska you say, 'Well, that if this school's not open, these kids are going to be driving 2 hours one way to school.' You know, that can't happen, so this school has to stay open. And that's the way the law, in Nebraska was written and it forces reorganizations once schools get so small it gives them exemption. It says if you're, basically over 15 miles from another school on a paved road you don't have to, you're not going to be forced to close. So it gives them exemption for that where the districts that have another district within 15 miles and then once their high school falls below so many kids for 2 years are forced, basically forced to close. If you fall below 25 kids in your high school for 2 consecutive years and you're less than 15 miles from other school district, the high school building by a highway, they send you a letter. And if you don't reorganize the reorg committee will come in and redistribute your land to the districts around, which nobody wants. You want to be the one to pick where you are going to go and what you do and the reorg committee doesn't really want to do that anyway so it's not going to be a fun process. Once they get to that point we send letters out to those districts and say 'Hey, you know, you're in this situation it's best for your interest if you figure out what you want to do.'

Tyson Johnson also sees Nebraska's unique geography playing a role reorganization. As Johnson stated,

The one thing that's a little different in Nebraska is that we have a concentration of population in 3 counties. Douglas, Sarpy and Lancaster count for over half of the population of the state. That means that out west, we have a lot of counties that just don't have very many people. And I'm assuming that happens in some other places but I don't know for sure, but we do have a fairly large metropolitan area down here and I'm not sure about the other states that would have the same thing. So we may be a little bit unique in that respect. But again, it just has to do with enrollment.

And as Mitchell Abraham stated,

Well I guess, if I understand the question, so much of it bares on geography and demographics. When you look at the concentration, I'm rounding up or down here but, 51,000 students in OPS, bumped up against the Missouri River and then you go to Sioux County with total K-12 about 8-85 students bumping up against Wyoming. And that distance and economic base of ag and livestock, it's just pure numbers, I think are what driving any conversation about school organization.

Another piece of how reorganization is impacted by factors within the state is local control. Communities and school districts want to keep control on a local level and not on a state or federal level. As Darren Jackson stated,

Nebraska, as you know, is a very local controlled state and I think it truly is compared to some of our peers in other states. That's a common slogan you hear, not just in Nebraska but nation-wide. There really is something that we believe in here in Nebraska, local control concept. And because of that, schools don't want to be told necessarily by the state that you have to reorganize. The very formal plans for reorganization struggle, I think, from the statewide level. What we've seen from reorganization, outside of the Class I bill that came several years ago, has been the organic reconsolidation.

As Cindy Lillian mentioned, both the local control of districts and the number of districts factor together. Lillian stated,

We're in the upper tier in terms of numbers of school districts and that tells you one thing, and that's that people value their school at the local level. They think it's an integral part of the community and right along with that I think there is a value in the state of local control. So I think those two things, impact the way that we look at reorganization, but again I think the population decline in rural Nebraska makes necessary the conversation about how we are going to provide a quality education to our students.

As Danny Wilson puts it, “Nebraska has a relatively high number of school districts for a small population people.”

And not only does Nebraska have a high number of school districts with few people but as Wilson stated, “too few people to tax. And therefore our total state revenue is limited, to fund a large number of schools.”

And along the line of revenue, as Tyson Johnson stated about Nebraska public school finance that it is,

unique in terms of our school finance. There would be differences in Nebraska than there would be in other places. That, some of the, excuse me, some of the other states, I’ll mention a couple of others, Wyoming and South Dakota, they look kind of like us, and both Wyoming and South Dakota have lots of space and not very many kids.

And finally, demographics might play a factor in reorganization in the state of Nebraska. As Steve Drummond stated,

The census folks start telling you that a county has more deaths than births and there is not a lot of population to begin with. Math tells you that at some point in time there will be nobody home. And that means that school, particularly that high school population is going to decline and that forces folks to work together in a more collaborative way. To go clear back to one room schools. I’m not sure that methodologically that was terrible. You can’t really say you’re running a comprehensive high school and then you have one or two teachers certified in all those areas. So that becomes a huge challenge. But the changes in the economy have changed the economic fortunes of ranchers and farmers, and costs consolidation in those sectors of the economy have created another factor here there are really very few family farms anymore.

In summary, we saw multiple views on how the interviewees responded to the question of, “In what ways do you believe Nebraska is unique as a state in regards to how reorganization is impacted by factors within the state?” Nebraska’s unique geography plays a part in how reorganization is impacted. With the majority of the states population in the east, reorganization is impacted by sparsely populated areas in our state. That is,

we have a number of districts in western Nebraska that are not highly populated, however, the school districts are fairly far apart from each other which makes it difficult to reorganize. School districts and communities like local control. They don't want to be told what to do and they don't want anyone interfering in their business, so to speak. This can limit districts from reorganizing.

Question 3. The third question asked, "What role do you believe the state legislature currently has in regards to school reorganization in Nebraska?" A number of the interviewees discussed that the state legislature did have a role in reorganization in public schools in Nebraska. The discussion might have stopped there as not everyone was totally sure what that role might be. As Darren Jackson stated,

And so they're (Legislature) saying, "Look how do we deal with this?" But they understand the issues, the concepts of local control. So I think there are people at the legislature who are looking at what is the state's role. Obviously if there are resources the incentives funds that we've had in the past would be a very useful role. But then where do you get that money? Where do you take it from? Do you take it from state aid? Where's that going to come from? Take it from Medicaid? Or is it going to come from, so if they are able to identify consistent reliable source of funding that would be enough, the state? I think the state would have an incentive type of role saying that schools are not mandating this but schools that go through this procedure, go through the reorg. committee and do all this stuff, we'll make resources available for you to get that done. So I think that would be a role that, if they had the money, would be useful.

John Smith also touched on the reorganization incentive money when he stated,

Well we just kind of touched on that, but the statute there, what they require, the other thing that they do is the reorg incentive money. Where it really is about a 2-year on, 2-year off thing, is kind of how they do that. They continue to incent the reorgs but if they had it all the time it really wouldn't be an incentive so I think they roll it out and say for these 2 years there's this reorg money available and then they let it expire for 2 years. That's been my experience. I've been here for 5 years but that's what it's kind of looked like since I've been here. From my understanding that's kind of been the history of it a little bit. I guess in an effort to be more efficient as a state with education they have incentivized those reorganizations.

A guiding factor in reorganizations through the legislative side is policies that are created to help in reorganization. As Steve Drummond stated,

The policy rule for any kind of reorganization is to make the pathways clear, and not to force it. There are some times that the policy is necessary to provide a strong negative sanction if reorganization doesn't occur, but for the most part, I think you can still have a reasonably small high school and if you do it right you, you cannot make it a disadvantage for the kids. There's a balance of both the advantages and disadvantages from a high school of 150 or 300 kids to a high school of 5,000 kids. I would go to the smaller size somewhere maybe in the middle, but to the smaller side rather than to the 5,000 side in terms of benefiting kids. But a lot of communities have a full measure of self-determination to a large extent, and provide processes that facilitate, encourage, or demand that introspection and community engagement. That's different than, its sort of forcing them to confront the issues, and what's in the best interest of their own kids and in my experience in Iowa and Nebraska, so far, and in the other states I mentioned, has been that if you give good people enough time and the right information they will make the right decision.

What other roles does the legislature have in regards to reorganization in Nebraska? As Mitchell Abraham stated,

Well, if I want to take it to an extreme, given that all school districts in the state of Nebraska are creatures to state statute, the state legislature has ultimate control over whatever kind of reorganization they want to see. But as you know, the legislature, particularly since the Class I battles, have really kept their hands off of consolidation. They've let school districts, and school boards and constituents decide.

Abraham continues with this train of thought, "And we take such pride in local control in Nebraska. Maybe to the point of our own detriment, but we take an extreme amount of pride in local control." Another similar statement was made by Terry Michaels who said,

Yeah, I mean, in Nebraska, school districts are created by the legislature, so they're not entities in of themselves without the authority of the legislature to be created. And some of that's been challenged over time, but they're essentially creatures of the legislature. So all powers come from the legislature as far as the creation of school districts. And I think that the legislature didn't necessarily own that from a perspective of school reorganization, and outside of the Class I issue, that's probably the closest. The Learning Community is another example of conversations around that. Currently, I think the legislature is really going to go down this path of continuing incentives. Thinking about that, we have had paths

in the past, you know, bills introduced that said “School per county,” I think we’ve had someone that’s talked about that, I don’t know for sure if there’s a bill or setting some minimum size, but it’s very possible that they could go down that path again. But right now I just don’t see it. And I don’t see the human cry for reorganization from a legislative stand-point at the moment. School finance will play into this again, and I think my concern right now would be around the perceptions of inequity in school finance for different reasons, and we certainly have with ag land values being where they’re at this moment in time. The perspective that somehow that the value based behind each student would have to be addressed in a different way. So finance could play a role, but again, I don’t see that with term limits in place. I don’t see the legislature is going to take it on in that same regard.

Continued discussion of the legislatures’ role includes Danny Wilson stating,

The history has been, and continues to be, within the Nebraska legislature, one of authorizing school reorganization and not requiring school reorganization. The exception to that was in 2005 with passage of LB 126, which required the reorganization of Class I’s. But otherwise the staunch belief is that schools should be allowed to reorganize but not required to do so. Local choice.

And finally, comments were made that would set the legislature up to better understand reorganization in Nebraska. And by understanding it, they would make better decisions based on what the facts tell them. As Tyson Johnson stated,

Every since I’ve been here at the University there has been talk about having a reorganization study. Now I’m going to say about 10 years ago that there was a bill introduced, to have a comprehensive study of school district reorganization in the state. I testified on behalf of the bill, and I was really hopeful that that bill would pass and at that time I was Director of the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services here. And I thought, you know, we’d have a good shot at being a player in that.

Johnson goes on to further state in regards to a study, “The legislature has a responsibility, I think, they’re primary function should be to get a study going about comprehensive school district reorganization in the state of Nebraska.” Also,

But, now the other part of it is, if you’ve got to have, the people that do that have to be driven by the right motives. Like how many kids does it take to have a viable school district? Now we’ve got some people over there, they’re motives would strictly be how many kids does it take so we can get the cost per pupil down.

In summary of the question, “What role do you believe the state legislature currently has in regards to school reorganization in Nebraska,?” The question was raised as to how will the legislature deal with reorganization. Are they set up to deal with it? They have given reorganization incentive money to districts to encourage them to reorganize. It was also stated that policies need to be in place that will allow districts to reorganize with little problems. And yet, as stated by a few, the legislature has taken a hands off approach to reorganization in Nebraska. Other than the closing of Class I districts with LB 126, the legislature has really not gotten involved in reorganization. Maybe part of the problem is that they don’t understand all of the facets of reorganization. And with term limits in place and new senators coming aboard, it takes time to educate them on education issues in Nebraska. It was recommended that a reorganization study be conducted that would help our legislature make decisions on reorganization. This study could also look into what school districts in Nebraska look like in regards to curriculum offerings.

Question 4. The fourth question asked of the interviewees was, “What key elements exist in the future that may lead to the need for reorganization?” One of the key themes stated from the interviewees was that rural Nebraska will continue to see population diminish and public school enrollments go down. As John Smith stated,

There’s been a big change in the last 5 to 10 years. I don’t see it changing so I think it will continue in the future. We continue to see more and more kids from out state Nebraska move from the rural. The jobs have moved to the urban areas and so you continue to lose kids. You continue to have districts that are shrinking in size and so they’re going to be bumping up against those statutes we talked about of the 25 kids, or the 35 kids. And also just the cost of running schools are increasing with property valuations going crazy like they have, the school districts are not receiving any kind of equalization aid and the state aid they are receiving is primarily through special education reimbursements. Maybe option enrollment, but if they’re a district that’s shrinking that much they’re probably not getting

option enrollment. The finances again, start to clamp down because, you know, the residents they are saying 'Ok, why are we paying for all this ourselves. We're not getting any help from the state and our kids are shrinking so it's time for us to look at,' it's always a hard decision. I'm sure in your research and talking to people and just being in the field you understand that it is very difficult.

As Darren Jackson puts it,

Well I think that continued depopulation, when, for every district it's going to be a little bit different because in some of these districts where they have very few students they still have very strong valuations. They've got money, they've some spending issues, some spending cap problems that create issues, but at some point when a school has so few students and your neighboring schools are dealing with this, there's got to be a tipping point. We've seen it happen, and happened well in some places and in some places where it's been a complete disaster. And to be honest, I don't know what the common thread would be from those districts that made this work and work well. And I don't know if there is a common thread, there may not be, it depends upon the leaders in those communities and I would even say some communities where they had strong leadership. The community just wasn't ready for it. It's how you bring the community along with it. And you've heard this before, it's the adults, the kids are fine with it, the adults are the ones who struggle, and I get that.

As Darren Jackson continued on this train of thought, he stated, "It seems like there's got to be a willingness within the community to let certain things happen."

Along this same thread in answering the question, Tyson Johnson stated,

Enrollments. And the enrollment is going to change, the rural area will continue to be more sparsely populated and the urban areas down in this part of the state will continue to be more populated. I see no reason that the trend would change.

One final comment on this theme was from Mitchel Abraham who stated,

Well I think it's going to be diminishing population, very simply. Now the flip side to that is, if you take that at face value you could say, Well, ok Nebraska's population jumped by 2 percent, or whatever, in the last census. Yeah, right, but where did that population occur? East, sure. So, on it's face we could say that the death of most school districts in Nebraska is inevitable, it's just a matter of time. I don't believe that. Because constitutionally in Nebraska, the state has an obligation to provide an education for a kid. It doesn't say how many kids there has to be in a district. And I'm not so sure, it's going to have to look different, but as population continues to dwindle in the western part of the state, then the technology is going to offer an alternative. Just like getting Calculus into Wakefield, you can do it on-line. You know the other thing that's curious, and I

just caught myself doing it all of my talk about consolidation has been west. There isn't room for much more consolidation to the west. The real consolidation effort in Nebraska is in the eastern third of the state, probably from what, Grand Island east. Where you have school districts that are within, 7-8-9 miles of one another.

In summarizing the results from the fourth question of "What key elements exist in the future that may lead to the need for reorganization," we saw a strong answer emerge. Rural Nebraska will continue to see a drop in population which will negatively impact the enrollments in school districts. And any reorganization that might take place in Nebraska might happen on the eastern side of the state. We have seen a number of reorganizations occur in the western parts of Nebraska. The reorganization that occurs in the future, will probably happen more to the east.

Question 5. The fifth question that was asked of the interviewees was, "What factors do you believe will influence school reorganization in Nebraska in the future?" We continue to see answers that depict populations dropping and this influence on school districts. And we see the discussion of the ag economy in Nebraska having a big impact on reorganization. As John Smith stated,

Well again I think you're going to see reorg. money be made available from time to time. I think, you know, the kids, the moving of the population. I mean farms, you get outstate Nebraska the big farming and ranching and those have grown so much and got so big that they don't require the number of people out there that they used to. And so that changes all those communities and who's out there. I think it's the same thing that we've kind of touched on. It's just kids moving and what kind of funding those schools are getting. I would just say I would expect a similar trend of what we've seen in the last 5 to 10 years. I think it will continue. I don't know how, at some point you're going to run up, bump up against those limits where schools have combined and now there's really not a lot more for them because they're too far apart. At some point it has to slow down because, out in the panhandle, those districts out there are already so far apart they can't merge. I think on the eastern side of the state we still have room for that, there's a lot of districts that are close enough that could be merged but that will slow down in time as well.

Steve Drummond continued this train of thought when he stated,

The declining enrollment is a different situation than it was 10 or 15 years ago, because the increasing immigrant population, which could add with it an increasing refugee population, those folks have a different status. So if that starts to happen to a great degree, then that may be an influence. I think it's almost inevitable that the degree of poverty is going to increase and with it, not just because of the immigrant population but because of other changes in the economy. The middle class is kind of getting squeezed out, and that's a politically sensitive issue, but the data is awfully clear.

Is it possible that the economy will influence reorganization in Nebraska? As stated by Steve Drummond,

So, I think the demographics in the economy will drive it more than anything else. I think there will be some increasing, not to use a confusing term but standardization of educational approaches. Which will actually, not demand it but facilitate it. Because I think most people already realize you don't have the unique algebra course in every district. And some of the technology is getting better to support that instruction. And the need for increased professional development to support more intensive or more effective ways to teaching you're coming together and that's happening in some parts of Nebraska. This is coming together with ESU's to provide really high quality professional development, cause it's very hard to do that in a small district within the degree of efficiency.

To continue this discussion, Mitchell Abraham stated,

You know, yeah I guess we kind of have answered it, and it's my fault for not being more creative, but it's going to be numbers. It will be, you know the other thing that could happen here and you know this much better than I, but in our predominantly ag based districts, what we're experiencing in Nebraska is the good and the bad. How do you measure success in agriculture? By how many bushels you produce at the least number of man hours. And we're damn good at it. So that inherently means, as we get better and better at what we do in this state, we need fewer and fewer people to do it. Are there some ancillary businesses, yeah, seed corns, sure? But it's not like there 200-400 employee operations, they're going to bring all kinds of new homes and kids to rural Nebraska. They're not going to. So you have that dilemma to contend with, and then it compounds the issue on the taxation side. So, Boone County wants to build a gym, and you look at your ag base and I'm a farmer and I'm saying, "I got one vote, well the wife's got a vote too, I've got two votes in this bond issue, but proportionally ag's going to pay about 50 percent of the bill on this bond. That's not fair. I'm done voting for bonds.

As Abraham continued, “So I think the property values and numbers of people are the key factors. I just don’t see the legislature doing anything with it. I just don’t.”

As Danny Wilson stated in regards to land valuations impacting reorganization,

Yeah, we should discuss what I had feared, and that is the bottom dropping out on the ag land value. Thereby requiring the infusion of more dollars at the state aid formula to deal with these sudden new equalized school district and the state won’t be prepared to belly up to the bar, so to speak, to pay a tab. And so I see that as a huge problem, when the ag land value does drop out and all of those will need more of the state aid dollars to make up the difference, it won’t be there.

Is it possible that technology might be a factor in reorganization in the future? As stated by Steve Drummond,

So, I think the demographics in the economy will drive it more than anything else. I think there will be some increasing, not to use a confusing term but standardization of educational approaches. Which will actually, not demand it but facilitate it because I think most people already realize you don’t have the unique algebra course in every district. And some of the technology is getting better to support that instruction.

Terry Michaels also stated,

Technology, I really do think technology is going to change our viewpoint, one way or another. I’m not quite sure which way, but the ability to partner. Where we are going to go for dual credit classes, how we intersect with different educational entities, even from the post-secondary side.

Also, Tyson Johnson stated,

But I think, we can use television, but just to say you can do it on television, or you can’t, I don’t think that’s necessarily true, or on-line, or not. But I think you can have low enrollment but now the other factor, you know, what’s changing? Now the thing that I should have added in, cause I thought about that when I went through the question, I think a big factor is technology. And that’s changing, and I think that it makes a huge difference as to whether a school with 100 kids in the district, can stay, if you’re the only one in the county, what are going to do if you shut the school down? Does that make any sense? Was there a way you can deliver programming to those kids? Yes there is, and it’s called learning. And it can be on-line, it can be by television. Now, you can say, “Well should it be one or should it be the other?” Should be both, whatever works best.

Another factor that will influence reorganization is programming in schools. As Tyson Johnson stated,

Enrollment, enrollment, enrollment. You've got to have enough, you need to figure out "what do we need to have to have a good program?" Let's see if we really want to keep the school in our community. How many, what program do we need to offer? And you don't have to say how many kids does it take, or what program do we need to offer? Well we should have had this and this. Figure that out. We say we need to take pre-calculus. You need to offer pre-calculus. Well how many kids would that be? Well you'd probably need to have maybe 5 kids to have that kind of a course. Are you going to have 5? Well, no. So how do you get them? Well that's maybe when we're on television or we do on-line classes, I think television, I know I've often thought about teaching high school math on-line, cause they need so much of that here. I don't think I could teach Math classes on-line, but I could do it on television.

In summary of the fifth question which was, "What factors do you believe will influence school reorganization in Nebraska in the future?" There is continued discussion of the dropping population in rural areas in Nebraska. And again, this dropping population effects the enrollments in schools in a negative way. And as we see reorganizations occur, they will probably occur in the eastern side of our state as the western districts have reorganized as much as they possibly can. Our agricultural economy is impacted because we need fewer workers on farms as we have become more efficient in production. This means the need for less people in ag based communities. And a lot of these ag producers don't want to support public schools because of their property tax requirements. And technology plays a large role in our ability to offer quality programming to students in communities that don't have as many resources.

Question 6. The final question asked of interviewees was, "How do you see school reorganization impacting Nebraska schools in the future?" As stated by John Smith,

I think there's definitely positives to it. I think you see more opportunities for kids in some situations when schools merge. It just seems to be the right thing to do for certain districts, but, I don't know, I guess I think you'll continue to see it but how that's impacting schools? I don't know if I have a lot more to add on to that one either, it's just, you're going to have the schools that are going to remain small and you're going to have schools that are merging. There's one up in northeast Nebraska, it's like 5 school districts that talked about merging up there to form a pretty good sized district. How that will impact the schools? You'd think there would be more opportunities for kids but at the same time there's disadvantages to that too. There are advantages to the smaller schools and kids that would have made the sports team at the smaller school won't make it at the bigger school. And there's more travel, more time spent on school buses and so there's challenges with it as well. There definitely is, but you would think they would become a more efficient school as far as financially. You get all those in one building you're providing less guidance teachers, probably, because you don't have to have one for every building. Yeah, it would become more efficient, you would expect, so on the financial end of it, on the education side of it, you would expect more opportunities but there's challenges as well. Bigger class sizes potentially, I mean that's good. It's good financially but there's some advantages to having a 10-person class, too. So the teachers know the kids really well in those settings.

As some of the interviewees stated, they don't see major changes occurring with reorganization in the future. As stated by Steve Drummond,

The trend of reorganization will be pretty modest, and it's usually a cluster of districts that have to see declining enrollment, or a single district, in the midst of some others. And that will be a pretty much incremental change. I think, the pattern of declining enrollment is different now than it was 10 or 15 years ago, it was very rapid, there were a lot of what the census folks lovingly called 'Dead Counties.' And you don't see as much of that anymore because of the increases in Latino population, so that's a mixed variable, but really will drive for increasing quality force, or encourage districts to proceed differently. I don't think the legislature will likely, or should, impact that very much.

As Tyson Johnson stated,

I think it's going to look a lot like it has looked. I'm not sure there will be a whole lot of dramatic changes. I think the population is going to continue to go down in rural areas. Technology is going to make some things possible that weren't possible before. So those are some changes, but that's kind of been happening over the last 30 years. The one thing that I think won't change, is that I think a lot of these small communities don't want to give up their school system.

Natural causes might be force that drives reorganization in the future stated Mitchel Abraham. “I was assuming that there was going to be some reorg, and I just don’t think there’s going to. I think it’s going to be driven by natural causes.” Abraham stated further,

I just think nature’s going to take it’s course more than any superficial intervention by the legislature. I think curriculum ought to be what’s driving it and it’s generally probably not. And curriculum may reverse it, it may offer an opportunity for, hey if we can offer Calculus now, we don’t need to consolidate with the X-Y-Z school district. We can do that on our own.

There is still a fear of losing your school as that might impact your community.

As stated by Tyson Johnson,

But I remember a public meeting this person’s said something to this effect, I’m not going to get exactly right on the facts, but he said, “You know we lost our bank, we lost our grocery store, we lost our restaurant, if you take our school away, we’ll lose our community.” And I’m thinking, “I think you’re community’s pretty much gone.” They want to keep the school in the community because a school, probably more than anything else, is sort of a community focus. It’s a community gathering place. And it seems to me that if we can, some of those schools can be pretty dog-gone small, but maybe you can still have a good school system there if you do it right, and you will be able to keep the doors open and a place for the community to meet and they can still play, can play ball.

Cindy Lilian shared a similar theme when she stated,

Well again I maybe in some ways talk around the issue, but I think we have to get away from the discussion always revolving around certain parameters. One is if we lose our school our town dies. I think that’s too limiting a parameter. I think even the brick and mortar is limiting, however by the same token I don’t think that we can solve these dwindling populations in the sparcity of certain school districts by just saying technology is going to solve that problem as well.

Another take on this same theme is from Mitchell Abraham who stated,

And the flip side of that is, and I’ve seen it happen across county, I’m sure it’s happened elsewhere where you get community organized, we need to look a consolidation and one of the ways that they try to sell it to the nay-sayers or the outsiders is, well if we could put 3 or 4 schools together we’ll go build a brand new school out on Farmer Joe’s 80 acres, and it will be kind of in the middle of this consolidation. And we’ll be a small Class B for starters. And this could be

good. And then along comes some of the people that say, and then let's see, 20 or 25 years when a bond's mature, will there be any more people in that brand new building than we've got combined right now. If the trend is to lose population.

And how might reorganization impact the Learning Community approach to education in Nebraska. As stated by Steve Drummond,

I haven't said anything really about the Learning Communities specifically, because most of these are districts of pretty good size, either from 50,000 kids to a 1,000 or just a little less. And the pressure for them, although a couple of the ones on the small side are sensitive to the fact that they might get eaten up by another district, just as you see that sensitivity in much smaller districts. But, I really don't see that happening. I don't see the need for it. I don't see the need for their consolidation in the metro area there are always going to be people that think that's more efficient. I've look a lot at efficiency in consolidation of school districts, and you don't get much. You don't save much money, at any rate. You can sometimes improve the quality pretty significantly, but you don't save much money.

Steve continued to share about the Learning Community approach, "And the fact of the matter is, most of the school districts in the learning community, I'm in one of the lowest spending districts in the state."

A further question about school reorganization impacting Nebraska schools in the future is do we have a plan for it? As Cindy Lillian stated,

So then that brings you to what I've always said. What do we want our state, what do we want our communities to look like in the future? Because certainly education becomes a pivotal point in that conversation. And then the other thing that just I've always been surprised about communities in rural Nebraska. We don't talk enough to each other just until we get to that point of either confrontation. Or you gonna come over and reorganize that, reorganize with me or somebody else, we need to have more robust conversations about the larger issues. I think we need to think of our state, delivery of services and conversations more regionally. That doesn't necessarily automatically mean reorganization, but you get more of an interchange of ideas and fresh perspectives just by doing that. And then maybe we're talking about coming up with some new models. I have been talking learning community all week with my colleagues, that is a model, some will say we have the unification model out here as that's very similar in some respects to the learning community. But, maybe there's something else out there that we haven't discovered, and that's how I think these conversations are so important. For the last six years I have served on the

legislative planning committee and you might want to check out that web site of theirs, because the people at UNO in the School of Public Affairs has done some reviewing of data for us and there are some, nuggets of information that with respect to population even schools that I think might be helpful to you. But you can't replace, people coming together and not having, just a comfortable conversation about what our state wants to look like and maybe the creativity that might come from that.

Terry Michaels mentions similar points of emphasis that Cindy Lilian did as well.

Michael's mentioned,

Yeah, I hope, I mean this is more of a hope, that we can start to talk about that question of how we offer education in these places and figure out models that would look better than just simply leaving it to everyone fights at a local level to figure out what their best system is for that set of kids. I hope to see a little more integrated effort on policy and best practices in schools and seeing that come together would be more beneficial than just simply the hands-off *laissez-faire* approach that I think that we've had. To me it could be a more meaningful conversation, not about school districts' boundaries, but really about school programs. So I think that could become a focus. Facilities I think can become a focus for the future. If we think of it as an investment instead of thinking about losing something at a community level, those will be important parts of the conversation. So, I think ultimately there's an opportunity actually in front of us. But in thinking through this a little bit more that we give, we don't just let things happen. But we're a little more planful in that and if we are able to do that I think it could be more of a positive influence than a negative one. However, I know for context it doesn't necessarily play out that way just yet. It's going to take some work with communities for that effort to really have a vision for the future in each of those places.

In summary to the question, "How do you see school reorganization impacting Nebraska schools in the future?" a number of themes play out. Reorganization can cause both advantages and disadvantages for students in the future. The interviewees stated they don't see major changes with reorganization in the future and that natural causes will cause it to happen. There will be little legislative intervention. And while some fear that losing their school will kill their community, that is maybe not a valid argument. The learning community doesn't see major changes happening with it going into the future because of the size of the districts that inhabit it. And maybe our time should be spent on

figuring out what we want to offer students through programming and curriculum in our schools rather than reacting negatively to any discussion of reorganization.

Summary of interviews. In summarizing the interviews that were conducted, a few major themes emerged from our interviewees' responses. This included a continued de-population in our rural areas. As agriculture has changed through the years, there is a need for fewer people to do those jobs. There are fewer people farming more of the land than in the past. This obviously means fewer people are living in those rural areas where farming is done. Therefore there are fewer students enrolled in the local public schools which then leads to the issues that cause reorganization. The majority of people in the state of Nebraska live on the eastern side of the state where the majority of jobs lie. And as a district struggles to make ends meet financially, this can have an impact on a potential reorganization as well.

One of the themes that emerged from the interviews was that communities and school districts in Nebraska value local control. They don't want others telling them what to do. And this is the same when it comes to reorganization. School districts don't want others telling them when or if they need to reorganize in some format. While conducting the interviews, many stated that they don't think the legislature will take an active role in reorganization. They don't see any major changes happening with the legislature's stance on reorganization. Incentive money might continue to be offered to those districts who are on the verge of a reorganization. I think the incentive money is there to help a district initiate and pull off a reorganization. However, as one of my interviewees stated, he thinks reorganization will occur because of "natural causes." And what he meant by this was that the legislature would not interfere. The decision to

reorganize would be made because of the situation the district finds itself in. This might be a decision based upon financial or declining enrollment factors. However, it won't be from a decision made by the legislature.

One of the ideas that was broached in one of the interviews focused upon putting a study together on reorganization in Nebraska. This study would allow legislators to know the history of reorganization in Nebraska and it could act as a guide for them when they make decisions on reorganization. When you have turnover of senators and senators who have no history of school reorganization based on the community they come from, this study could help to educate them. This dissertation could help to balance out the knowledge level of senators on this issue. As of right now, state senators all have a different perspective on reorganization. This study could help them when they are looking to make decisions on education of students in Nebraska.

Finally, some of the most compelling information shared during the interviews about reorganization had to deal with education. That is, maybe as a state we should spend our time focused on what we want to see in our schools rather than reacting to problems.

Summary of Survey Responses and Interviews

As a reminder, the primary research question of this study was: What is the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and determine how might this history might be used to predict what future public school reorganizations will look like in the next 30 years.

When approaching the summary of both the quantitative survey information and qualitative survey results, I will summarize by showing similarities and differences between both the quantitative and qualitative information in which they fit together.

The majority of reorganizations occurred between the years 2005-2007 due to LB 126 which forced the closures of Class I schools. There have been 20 districts that have gone through a unification during the past 30 years. Only 1 district indicated they had gone through the Learning Community Reorganization.

Enrollment is a factor when it comes to reorganization. On the survey, almost 71% that their reorganization increased their enrollment while only 2.5% decreased their enrollment. Over 71% responded that their reorganization allowed their school site to continue to be open. Declining populations and decreased enrollments were major factors that the interviewees repeatedly stated were factors in reorganizations across Nebraska. As Tyson Johnson stated in his interview when discussing how enrollments impact reorganization, his words were short and simple, “Enrollments, enrollments, enrollments.” And when these drop, then school districts are forced to look at reorganization options. One factor to remember is that when more than one reorganizes to form a new district, the enrollment of both districts is usually different. Survey results show that almost 80% of respondents stated that the other school district did not have an enrollment about the same as their own.

One of the areas where there was a difference between the survey and interviews was the impact finances has on reorganization. The survey showed that only 15% responded that their district was in bad shape financially when they reorganized and only 25% reorganized to stabilize their finances. When conducting interviews, finances did

play a role in reorganization. As Danny Wilson stated, “I would say that the evolution of the school finance formula is the driving force behind school reorganization.” John Smith also stated,

I think probably the first thing is finance, I mean it’s the money that some of the smaller school districts, I guess maybe the money issues they run into as far as the cost of operating a school and the numbers, it’s two things, it’s the finances and it’s the lack of students. The two of those create a finance issue that most of the time leads to reorganization.

In looking at the issue of improving student opportunities through the survey, over 46% stated that it had a great or moderate degree of impact upon increasing academic opportunities. Around 97.2% of the respondents on the survey stated that their reorganization did not effect academic opportunities for students. And this percentage might be reflected in the comments by John Smith who said, “I think there’s definitely positives to it, I think you see more opportunities for kids in some situations when schools merge.” He went on to further state,

You’d think there would be more opportunities for kids but at the same time there’s disadvantages to that too. There are advantages to the smaller schools and kids that would have made the sports team at the smaller school won’t make it at the bigger school and there’s more travel, more time spent on school buses and there’s challenges with it as well.

In discussing the impact that the legislature has on reorganization, respondents to the survey felt to a great or moderate degree that the decision to reorganize was because of the legislature at 44%. Over 48% stated this was not a factor at all. When doing the interviews, reorganization incentive money was mentioned. Darren Jackson stated that, “Obviously if there are resources the incentive funds that we’ve had in the past would be a very useful role.” John Smith also touched on this when he stated,

Well we just kind of touched on that, but the statute there, what they require, the other thing that they do is the reorg. Incentive money. Where it really is about a

2-year-on, 2-year-off thing, is kind of how they do that. They continue to incent the reorgs. But if they had it all the time, it really wouldn't be an incentive so I think they roll it out and say for these 2 years there's this reorg. money available and they let it expire for 2 years and that's been my experience.

On the survey, when questions asked about the effect on staffing, 41% stated that it had a great to moderate degree of effect on staffing. Around 33% stated it had some degree of impact. When conducting the interviews, I did not hear any real factors on staffing. This was an area that was not touched upon in the interviews. A final section of the survey was the impact that reorganization had on the community that it occurred in. Forty-two percent (42%) responded on the survey that it had a great to moderate degree of positive effect on the community. And a little over 32% stated it had some degree of positive effect. In doing the interviews, a couple of comments were made that the perception is that if a school closes in a community, the whole town will die. As Tyson Johnson stated,

But I remember a public meeting, this person's said something to this effect, I'm not going to get exactly right on the facts, but he said, 'You know we lost our bank, we lost our grocery store, we lost our restaurant, if you take our school away, we'll lose our community.' And I'm thinking your community's pretty much gone. They want to keep the school and the community focus. It's a community gathering place. And it seems to me they still have a good school system there if you do it right. You will be able to keep the doors open and a place for the community to meet and they can still play ball.

Cindy Lillian also stated,

Well again I may be in some ways talk around the issue, but I think we have to get away from the discussion always revolving around certain parameters. One is if we lose our school, our town dies. I think that should not always, that's too limiting a parameter. I think even the brick and mortar is limiting, however, by the same token, I don't think that we can solve these, dwindling populations in the sparcity of certain school districts by just saying technology is going to solve that problem as well.

Chapter 5

Overview

The purpose of this study was to trace the history of public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years and determine how this history might be used to predict what future public school reorganization will look like in the next 30 years. The sub research questions that revolved around the primary research question were:

1. What forms of school reorganization have taken place in Nebraska over the past 30 years?
2. What factors led school districts in Nebraska to reorganize when they did?
3. How can we use these factors and our knowledge about the past 30 years of school reorganization in Nebraska to predict the next 30 years?

In trying to answer these questions, the researcher used a mixed method approach. This included sending out surveys and conducting interviews.

Survey Findings

The information that was retrieved from the surveys painted a picture of why districts went through the reorganization(s) they did. The vast majority of reorganizations occurred in Nebraska around the years 2005-2007. There were 41 reorganizations that took place at this time. LB 126 was passed in 2005. This forced the closing of Class I school districts across Nebraska. In the past 30 years, this bill had the most profound impact on school closings as any other bill.

There were 20 districts that unified over the past 30 years while 104 did not. Unifications are not a common practice in Nebraska. On average, there has been .66 unifications every year over the past 30 years in Nebraska. The largest number of

unifications that occurred in any one year was 6 in 2000. Other than that, the unifications have been spread out over the past 30 years.

There were six major areas examined using the survey. They were: enrollment, finances, improving student opportunities, legislative decisions, staffing and community.

In looking at enrollment, and answering the question of “What level of importance did your school enrollment factor into your reorganization?” that question appears to be split between being important and not. There is no doubt that reorganization has an impact on a school’s enrollment in looking at the other questions on the survey. Almost 71% stated that their reorganization increased their enrollment while only 2.5% stated it decreased their enrollment. It is clear that enrollment increases improve in a district once it has gone through a reorganization. Approximately 70% of schools indicated that a reorganization allowed their school site to continue to be open. On the other hand, almost 54% stated a reorganization forced an attendance center to close. Eighty-three percent (83%) of superintendents shared that when reorganizing with another district, the other district was smaller than their own.

In discussing the impact of reorganization on finances, it appears this was not a large factor. Around 44% stated this was very important or important. However, 39.5% of superintendents indicated that it was somewhat important or not important. In interpreting the data around finances, I don’t believe finances played a big role in reorganization. When asked if their district was in bad shape financially when they reorganized, 65% of respondents stated “No.” And when asked if the reason they reorganized was to stabilize their finances the respondents stated at 51% “No” this was not a reason. Only 25% stated it was a factor in reorganizing. A little over 55% said

their district finances did improve by reorganizing while 79% stated their finances did not get worse. Valuations improved in districts by reorganizing at a rate of 74% and hardly any districts were forced into a levy override because of the reorganization. Almost 86% of the survey respondents stated this. One of the factors that people claim improved the chances of reorganization was that districts could receive incentive money to do so. Only 15% stated they received money to reorganize and 66% stated this was not a factor in their decision to reorganize.

It is very clear that finances did not play a large role in public school reorganization in Nebraska. In fact, the perception that districts find themselves in a position where they need to reorganize because of poor finances is not true. If this occurs, it is in a very small minority of districts. The majority of districts did not reorganize because of financial problems.

When examining the relationship between student opportunities and school reorganization, it did not seem to have an impact. When the question was asked if reorganization increased academic opportunities for students, over 46% stated that to a great or moderate degree it did increase opportunities. A little over 18% stated to some degree while 36% stated it did not have an effect at all. It is clear reorganizations did not decrease academic opportunities to students at a rate of 97%. In looking at how it effected athletics, almost 37% stated to a great or moderate degree it had an effect. A little over 20% stated it somewhat had an effect while 43% stated it had no effect. Over 97% of respondents stated it did not decrease athletic opportunities for students. Once again, it seems that reorganization did not have an impact on increasing activity opportunities for students. Over 40% stated that to a great or moderate degree activity

opportunities increased for students. Around 20% stated that to some degree it had an impact while over 39% stated it has no effect. Again, the reorganization did not decrease activity opportunities for students as indicated by 97% of respondents.

It seems that reorganization had no impact on improving opportunities for students as half of the respondents stated that it had a positive impact on students by increasing academic, athletic and activity opportunities. The other half of the respondents stated it didn't improve those same areas.

In examining how legislature decisions impacted reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years, it seems as if there was little impact. Around 44% stated that a decision made by the legislature was prominent in why they reorganized. This compares to over 7% who stated it was somewhat of a factor while 48% stated this was not a factor at all. It was extremely clear that a change in the state aid formula (TEEOSA) did not factor into a district's decision to reorganize. Only 7% of respondents stated to a great degree or a moderate degree that this factored into their reorganization. To some degree, 13% responded this was a factor while over 79% stated that a change in the state funding formula did not have any effect at all in their decision to reorganize.

In examining the role the state legislature plays in district reorganization, it appears to be negligible. Districts did not reorganize because of a decision made by the legislature. And it was overwhelmingly true that a change in the state aid formula did not factor into their decision.

However, it is clear that reorganization did impact staffing in some ways. When asked if staffing was impacted by reorganization, over 41% stated it had a great to moderate degree of impact. Over 32% stated it had some degree of impact on staffing

while over 26% stated it had no impact. One of the areas that was referred to a great deal that occurs in a reorganization was that teachers lose their jobs in the process. Slightly over 7% stated that this was true to a great or moderate degree. Seventeen percent (17%) stated that this was true to some degree. A larger majority of respondents, 75%, stated this was not a factor at all. Superintendents indicated that their districts gained staff by reorganizing. Over 32% stated to a great or moderate degree. Over 31% stated to some degree this was true while 36% stated that they did not gain staff at all by a reorganization.

It appears to the researcher that staffing is impacted by a reorganization. The vast majority of teachers that are effected in a reorganization did not lose their jobs. School districts gained staff when they reorganized.

Additionally, the impact on a community when a reorganization occurred seemed to be positive in nature. Over 43% stated that to a great degree or a moderate degree the reorganization had a positive impact on the community. Over 32% stated it did somewhat while 26% stated it did not at all. And conversely, over 9% stated to a great or moderate degree the reorganization had a negative impact on their community. Around 36% stated it had somewhat of a negative impact on their community while 55% said it did not at all have a negative impact on the community.

It appears to be clear that reorganization has a positive impact on the communities of superintendents that responded to this survey.

Summary of Interpretation of Findings from Surveys

The data from the surveys provides a clear picture as to what was and what was not a factor for districts in regards to why they reorganized. Reorganization clearly

impacted enrollment. Reorganization has allowed districts to stay open who might have normally closed. And, reorganization usually occurs between two districts that are different in size (enrollment) from one another. Finances do not seem to be a factor in why districts reorganize. The majority of districts don't reorganize because of financial problems. And when it comes to improving student opportunities, it seems that reorganization has a minimal effect on improving the areas of academic, athletic and activities for students. Reorganization does not have much of an impact on improving opportunities for students in these areas. However, reorganization is also not taking away opportunities for these students either.

Additionally, it does not appear that the legislature has a large impact on reorganization as well. Nor does the state aid formula. These two areas did not seem to impact reorganization in our state. When discussing staffing, reorganization has a positive impact on this area. Districts gained teachers. Also, teachers generally did not lose their jobs when a reorganization occurred. And for the most part, a reorganization was positive for the community.

The majority of respondents to the open-ended question believed that LB 126 had a major impact on their district and forced the closing of the Class I schools in our state. A drop in enrollment also factored into their reorganization.

Summary of Interpretation of Findings from Interviews

From those that were interviewed for this dissertation, it is clear they continued to see the de-population of rural Nebraska as an area that will impact reorganization. As communities lose people, the local school district will also lose students in their district. There is currently a need for less agricultural producers than what was needed in the past.

This causes communities to lose community members. Communities and school districts also value their local control. They don't want the legislature telling them what they need to do in regards to reorganization. We have seen the legislature step away from becoming involved in reorganization. However, incentive money might still continue to be offered to districts to encourage them to reorganize. There is still a need for the legislature to better understand what reorganization is all about and its impact on public schools across Nebraska. And some see that natural causes will force districts to look towards reorganization in the future. The majority of reorganizations will occur in the eastern half of the state rather than the west. The districts to the west have already gone through reorganizations of some sort. They are at a point where they cannot stretch anymore because of the vast distances they are located from each other.

As agricultural valuations continue to rise, so could the need for changes to the state funding formula. Many see that the legislature will continue to take a hands off approach to reorganization. And finally, instead of districts being in a reactive mode to reorganization, maybe what should be driving this discussion is programming and curriculum? What do we want our state and communities to look like and how does this drive reorganization? The role of technology will be huge as course offerings can be offered online for areas that need a class for a few students.

Discussion

In examining the similarities and differences between the survey results and the interviews, there were a few key areas worth noting. In both instances, the declining rural population and its impact on school district enrollments were key factors in the reorganization discussion. We will continue to see enrollment be a major factor in

reorganization and the decisions that are made because of it. This researcher believes that an area that is different is the role that finances play in a districts' decision to reorganize. It is clear through the survey results that finances were not a major factor in reorganization. Some of the interviewees believed finance played a larger role than it maybe does. It is also clear based on both the survey and interview results, that the legislature does not play as large of a role in this discussion as maybe thought of before.

In both the survey and interviews, the discussion focused on the impact a reorganization can have on a community. This is a major talking point when discussing reorganization and will be further looked at in the predictions and recommendations section of this dissertation.

Predictions

In trying to predict what the next 30 years of school reorganization will look like in public schools across Nebraska, we need to examine the past to find those answers. Information can be gained from learning from the past as it can guide us as we move forward. In looking at public school reorganization, natural causes may force schools to reorganize in some way. And we will see reorganization continue. However, it will probably continue at a slower pace than it is now or has been in the past.

These natural causes will be a continued declining population in rural Nebraska that will have a great impact on school districts in rural areas. We will continue to see dropping enrollments in rural area school districts which will cause districts to reorganize. We will continue to see agricultural production using the newest technology through machinery and this will reduce the need for more people to work in agriculture causing a greater drop in rural areas.

As we have seen with the Nebraska legislature over the past 30 years, we will see little impetus from them to become more involved in public school reorganization in the future. They will continue to offer incentives for school districts to reorganize. And they might even increase the amount that school districts may be able to receive as an incentive to reorganize. However, since the closing of Class I schools across Nebraska with the passage of LB 126 in 2005, we have not seen any significant legislation that deals with reorganization. The reason this may be true is that term limits may hamper our legislature as it limits legislators ability to truly understand the issues surrounding public school education in Nebraska such as reorganization. It takes a state senator awhile to understand the process it takes to push legislation through and before you know it, they are voted out of office after 4 years or they are term limited out after 8 years. This makes it difficult to keep a cohesive legislator focused on singular issues within education.

Much of the discussion with reorganization in Nebraska seemed to focus on our rural communities west of Lincoln. That is, those communities that are out “west” as we consider it. The vast majority of people in Nebraska look at the communities that are in our panhandle as in need of reorganization as they are in sparsely populated areas. It seems that a lot of the reorganization that has occurred out “west” has been done in a way that will last awhile. Meaning, most of the reorganization that has already occurred probably prevents it from happening anytime in the future. For the state of Nebraska, the majority of reorganizations in the future will probably happen towards the eastern side of our state. Currently, we are starting to see some of that happen already with discussions of a 5 district potential in Northeast Nebraska. This includes the towns of Wausa,

Bloomfield, Creighton, Plainview, and Osmond. There has been some discussion on a merger of districts that include Oakland-Craig and Tekamah-Herman. These districts all fall in the eastern half of the state. At this time, whether these discussions will lead to a merger is unknown. It is quite possible however. It does illustrate that reorganizations will probably be more frequent in the eastern half of the state.

Another prediction might be that, as a state, we may continue to make decisions on public school reorganizations without having all the facts when discussing the issue. In looking at this issue, it appears that decisions are made based upon emotion and with the heart rather than with the correct data. This includes state senators that do not truly understand the factors and mechanisms that influence reorganization. We have allowed our emotions and the history of school districts to factor into decisions that influence our youth. We need to take a more scientific approach to this and take the emotion and passion out of the discussion.

Recommendations

In conducting the interviews, one of the interviewees suggested that a study be conducted by the legislature to study public school reorganization in Nebraska. This researcher would make this same recommendation. The purpose behind this study is that you have a number of state senator positions that turn over every year and the ability of senators to understand reorganization becomes limited and inconsistent. This study could provide a history of reorganization in Nebraska for the past 75 years. In the same manner that this dissertation is trying to answer certain questions regarding public school reorganization in Nebraska over the past 30 years, this study would trace the same areas. What have been the causes and factors that play into reorganization in Nebraska? How

has this impacted communities? How has this impacted the budget of the state of Nebraska in regards to educational spending? How many students does it take to have a comprehensive program? This study would be one that could be continually updated as well. As the years go by, it would be up to date and ready to be referred to by any state senator that needed to see it. The study would suggest that the Nebraska Department of Education and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln education departments work together and keep it current. As of now, as far as I know, there is no where for decision makers to turn to get a grasp on what has happened in the past.

In Nebraska, we have Rule 10 that is the guiding force behind the minimum offerings and rules Nebraska public schools must follow in running a school. There is also an accreditation process that districts must follow which shows if they are following Rule 10 requirements. One of the suggestions that emerged through the interview process was that we should be making decisions on reorganization based on curriculum and programming for students and that we should be looking at these areas instead of the often focused upon in reorganization discussions such as the ability to field athletic teams on the middle school and high school level. At times we have also focused upon school colors and the mascot when discussions have taken place. One thing that might help guide districts through this process is to know what we are trying to accomplish in our communities, state and schools. Besides looking at minimum requirements in Rule 10 we should determine what are the curriculum and programming offerings that schools must offer in Nebraska to be considered the type of school we want for our students? Maybe by having this information as a foundation piece of a reorganization discussion, the players in this process could be guided by those areas that factor into a child's growth

and success. Another part of this discussion should be the use of technology. As we currently have districts that use distance learning and technology to provide their students with class offerings and programming that they wouldn't be able to get another way. Are there ways we can further use technology that can enhance the opportunities for districts to collaborate and share resources that can benefit students? As technology continues to advance and allow us to do great things, how can we continue to take advantage of it in our school districts across Nebraska. How might this help to benefit those districts who may become part of a reorganization now or in the future?

Another great suggestion that came from one of the interviewees was for an education support group to help communities through the process of a reorganization. The support groups would support teachers, administrators and school boards. This idea is basically a community engagement initiative. The goal would be to engage communities across Nebraska to set goals for their communities and their future. Perhaps this process could encourage communities to talk to each other. This might allow for discussions involving the education of children that could provide a format for communities to start discussions about reorganization in a manner that is civil and collaborative. It would also give communities a foundation of how to proceed through this issue as it is a very difficult road to travel when those in charge might not have the needed background to be successful. This type of support would also be able to answer those age old questions and mis-information about school reorganizations? It could put facts behind some of the myths that plague reorganization's today. For example, the thought that losing your school will kill your community is a discussion point many times. This group could provide more facts behind this myth. The fear is that most people lose

their jobs in a reorganization, which is not true. They could discuss how finances would work in a reorganization and how land could be moved around in the district. These are areas that get discussed many times over and over. This group could help school districts and community patrons by providing the answers to many of the questions that inevitably follow reorganization discussions.

This researcher would suggest that the legislature re-examine the use of a reorganization incentive fund. It is not a factor in why districts reorganize and it is truly not an incentive. It feels like we are giving extra money to districts to do something that was inevitably going to happen; reorganize.

Finally, the time has come to go back to allowing senators to be part of the legislature as long as they are being voted in. Current term limits do not allow senators enough time to understand the many issues they will deal with as a senator in Nebraska. Understanding how public school education functions in Nebraska is not easy to do especially in only two terms. Doing away with term limits allows senators to make better decisions over time and will be of greater benefit to our students and communities in Nebraska.

Future Research

This researcher would suggest that any further research completed on this topic focus on the impact that reorganization has on the communities that were involved. That is, what happened to the communities that took part in the reorganization after it occurred? Did the reorganization “kill” the community like so many people state will happen to a community? Or, was that community already dying before the reorganization took place?

In continuing the discussion on communities and how further research could be conducted, this researcher believes that community attitudes and outlook on reorganization go a long way towards determining success in that reorganization. Gathering data from school districts that have gone through reorganizations in the past with regards to community input could be very helpful for future reorganizations. It would be helpful to understand how community members viewed the reorganization before it took place and after it occurred. What were some of the key points that were learned through the process that could help others to achieve success in a reorganization? Was it how the reorganization was communicated that determined success or hard feelings? Was it how the community was involved in the process that made it work? Was it being able to work through the history and pride of two districts coming together that at times caused stress and hard feelings? This researcher believes finding out some of these key community pieces could be helpful for future reorganizations in Nebraska.

Another suggested area for research would be the student enrollment of districts right before they reorganized? Is it possible that we might see similar enrollment numbers arise before schools need to reorganize? Or, is there a small range of numbers that we would see emerge? This information could be extremely useful for school districts and communities in planning a reorganization. It could give them a type of “pre-warning” that they are at the typical enrollment point where districts reorganize. School districts have become extremely good at projecting their enrollment out 5 or 10 years. They keep track of the birth of babies in their school district and counties and can make fairly good predictions on class sizes. By combining the local birth data and enrollment

projections with knowing the projected enrollment where reorganization occurs, schools and communities could make their transition through this process easier.

Further research could also help determine the lengths that technology could help school districts who are reorganizing. Specifically, how can school district's offer courses through technology that will benefit their students before, during or after a reorganization? We are aware of distance learning and web-based learning. Are there further advances made by technology that could help schools going through the reorganization process?

One of the areas of reorganization that has been discussed in Nebraska is the notion of one school district per county. This concept would be one where a centrally located school district in each county would be the hub of education in that area. This researcher believes this would be an idea that should be researched. It might not be possible geographically. However, the research derived from this study would be helpful for further discussions on reorganization in Nebraska. It is possible that this idea would not work. However, at least the question should be answered once and for all when discussing reorganization in Nebraska.

Summary

In summarizing the survey information, the majority of reorganizations that occurred in Nebraska the past 30 years have occurred between the years 2005-2007. Most of these reorganizations occurred because of LB 126 in 2005 which closed the Class I school districts. Enrollment is a key factor as why districts have to reorganize. And some districts were able to stay open because of a reorganization. Finances have not had much of an impact on why reorganizations occurred. And incentive money to

reorganize has not really been a factor as to why or when a district reorganized.

Reorganization has not had much of a positive or negative impact on student opportunities. The state legislature has not also played much of a role in reorganization as they have taken a hands-off approach to this topic. And reorganization has not been impacted much by the state aid formula. Staffing has been impacted by reorganization as districts have gained staff through a reorganization. However, very few teachers lose their jobs in a reorganization. And generally speaking, reorganization is viewed as a positive in the communities that it impacts.

In looking at information gained from the interviews, the de population of rural Nebraska will continue to impact enrollment in those school districts. In the future, we will see more reorganization in the eastern side of Nebraska. A larger question to discuss would be, How do we want schools to look like in the future? What offerings and programs should be available in schools? This should give districts a focus when discussing what their districts need to have in order to survive. And the legislature will continue to take a hands off approach to reorganization.

In making predictions for reorganization in Nebraska in the future, one predication will be that reorganization will continue in Nebraska to the east. Reorganizations will occur because of natural causes in districts. This includes the declining population in rural Nebraska and its effect on school district enrollment. And again, the legislature will have little impact on reorganization. School districts and communities will continue to make decisions on reorganization with little factual data. More decisions will be made with emotion rather than hard facts.

This researcher recommends that a larger study be done on the history and reasons why school districts reorganize. This study would help state senators in making decisions that effect children. We need to determine what needs to be the programming that needs to take place in schools today. And for those communities and districts going through a reorganization, support should be given to them to help them through the process by one of our state education groups. Incentive money to reorganize should be done away with as it doesn't really give districts an incentive to reorganize. And finally, the state should do away with term limits for state senators. Currently with term limits, senators are not able to fully understand reorganization before their limit is up and another new senator is in office. This hurts education and children in the state of Nebraska.

For future research, it would be good to find out the impact that reorganizations had in towns across Nebraska. Did the reorganization kill the community or is the community okay after the reorganization? It is also important to gather data from communities who went through a reorganization. For example, what was their enrollment at the time that reorganization occurred? This data could help other districts as they plan for reorganization in the future. What role could technology help in the reorganization process? Could it keep districts open or might it help them as they merge with another district? And finally, the idea of having one school district per county in Nebraska should be researched. If anything, it could determine if this idea is feasible or not.

References

- Amora, M. (2010). *Survey Gizmo*. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/quantitative-qualitative-research/>
- Bryant, M. (2003). *The portable dissertation advisor*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Busha, C., & Harter, S. (1991). *What is historical research?* Retrieved April 2014, from <http://realhistoricalresearch.wordpress.com/2012/11/30/what-is-historical-research/>
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hagle, T. M. (2004). Dichotomus variables. In M. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. Futing Liao (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of social science research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Learning Community of Douglas and Sarpy Counties. (2014). Focused on student achievement sharing data driven success. Retrieved March 2014, from <http://www.learningcommunityds.org/about/>
- Nebraska Department of Education. (1982). *Department of Education. School finance and organization services. Cumulative district dissolutions—1982 District dissolutions until 1990 hard copy from NDE*.
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2002). *Statistical information for public school districts*. Retrieved March 2014, from <http://www.education.ne.gov/fos/StatInfo/0203Stats.pdf>

- Nebraska Department of Education. (2005). *Rule 83 procedures of the state committee for the reorganization of school districts*. Retrieved March 2014, from <http://realhistoricalresearch.wordpress.com/2012/11/30/what-is-historical-research/>
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2011). *Statistics and facts about Nebraska schools*. Retrieved May 2014, from http://www.education.ne.gov/DataServices/PDF/1011%20_STATS_AND_FACTS_Final_report.pdf
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2013a). *County membership by grade*. Retrieved May 2014, from <http://www.education.ne.gov/DataServices/PDF/2013-14%20county%20membership%20by%20grade.pdf>
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2013b). *Department of Education. School finance and organization services. Cumulative district dissolutions—1990/91 to 2012-13*. Retrieved February 2014, from <http://www.education.ne.gov/FOS/OrgServices/Reorganization/Downloads/1990TO2013.pdf>
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2013c). *Statistics and facts about Nebraska schools*. Retrieved April 2013, from http://www.education.ne.gov/DataServices/Data_and_Information.html
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2014). *Statistics and facts about Nebraska schools*. Retrieved March 2014, from http://www.education.ne.gov/DataServices/Data_and_Information.html
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1985). *LB 662*, p. 1.

- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1988). *LB 940*, p. 1.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1990). *LB 259*, p. 1.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1990a). *LB 259*, p. 4.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1990b). *LB 1059*, pp. 2, 6.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1991a). *LB 511*, pp. 11, 15, 18.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1991b). *LB 829*, p. 2.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1993a). *LB 348*, p. 39.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1993b). *LB 839*, p. 3.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1994). *LB 1290*, p. 6.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1995). *LB 840*, pp. 3, 4.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1996). *LB 1050*, p. 18.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1997a). *LB 806*, p. 29.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1997b). *LB 710*, p. 6.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1998a). *LB 1134*, pp. 1, 4.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1998b). *LB 1219*, pp. 6, 9.
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (1999). *LB 272*, p. 11. Retrieved August 2014, from
<http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2001). *LB 313*, pp. 3, 5. Retrieved August 2014, from
<http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2002). *LB 460*, p. 5. Retrieved August 2014, from
<http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2003a). *LB 540*, p. 6. Retrieved August 2014, from
<http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>

- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2003b). *LB 67*, p. 9. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2004). *LB 1091*, p. 9. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2005a). *LB 126*, pp. 2, 3, 20. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2005b). *LB 503*, p. 10. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2005c). *LB 198*, p. 1. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2006). *LB 1024*, pp. 49, 50. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2007). *LB 641*, pp. 9, 26. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2008a). *LB 988*, p. 9. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2008b). *LB 1154*, p. 2. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2010). *LB 711*, pp. 2, 91. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2011). *LB 558*, p. 1. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>

- Nebraska Legislature Library. (2014). *LB 967*, p. 3. Retrieved August 2014, from <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/>
- Nebraska State Activities Association. (2014). *Coop statement*. Retrieved April 2014, from <http://nsaahome.org/>
- NSAAA Yearbook. (2014-15 and 2015-16).
- Shah, N. (2014, March 27). Smallville, USA, fades further. *WSJ*. Retrieved from [http://online.wsj.com/news/articles.SB!\)\)\)!\\$@4052702303325204579463761632103386](http://online.wsj.com/news/articles.SB!)))!$@4052702303325204579463761632103386)
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Thon, V. (2013, January 30). The end of rural America? *American Free Press*. Retrieved, from <http://americanfreepress.net/?p=8303>
- Thorndike, R., & Thorndike, T. (2010). *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and method* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Appendix A

District Dissolutions

I would like to share the school districts that have gone through reorganization of some sort. The large majority of these reorganizations have been Class 1 school districts being absorbed into a Class 111 school district. There were some Class 2 school districts that were absorbed into Class 111's and some Class 6 school districts absorbed into Class 111s. Through examining Nebraska Department of Education data, the following school districts were identified from 1984-2014. Not all of the data from 1984-1989 was available. The names of the receiving districts were not all available. That is why you will see some areas that are blank in this information. The years 1989-2014 were available from NDE (Nebraska Department of Education) and is complete.

1984

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Decatur Public 11 Schools	2	1/27/84	Lyons	3
Dist. 28	1	8/31/84	School District #19	1
			School District # 21	1
			School District #22	1
			West Point	3
			Beemer	3
Dist. 31	1	8/31/84	School District #82	1
			School District # 19	1
			Wisner-Pilger	3
Dist. 49	1	8/31/84	Wisner-Pilger	3
Dist. 72	1	8/31/84	Rosalie-Bancroft	3
Dist. 6	1	9/1/84		
Dist.103	1	6/1/84		
Dist. 4	1	5/22/84		
Dist. 22	1	7/1/84		
Dist. 502	1	5/31/84		
Dist. 25	1	8/31/84	School District #16	1
			Wood River Rural High	6

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 60	1	6/30/84	Wallace Public Schools	
District 72	1	6/1/84		
Dist. 4	1	8/28/84	Loup City	3
Dist. 45	1	10/12/84	Wayne	3
			School District #15	1
			School District # 47	1
			School District # 51	1
1985				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 39	1	6/1/85	School District # 60	1
Dist. 26	1	7/12/85	David City	3
Dist. 81	1	11/14/85	Waverly	3
			Ashland	3
Dist. 28	1	0/1/85	Laurel-Concord	3
Dist. 9	1	8/1/85	Wisner-Pilger	3
			Beemer	3
Dist.14	1	8/1/85	School District #28	1
			Stanton	3
			Wisner-Pilger	3
			Howells	3
			West Point	3
Dist. 40	1	8/1/85	School District #17	1
			School District #5	1
			Wisner Pilger	3
Dist. 75	1	8/1/85	Wisner-Pilger	3
			West Point	3
			School District #34	1
			Howells	3
Dist.74	1	6/1/85		
Dist. 21	1	9/1/85		
Dist. 99	1	6/10/85	Beaver City	3
Dist. 146	1	6/30/85	Ewing	2

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 3	1	6/30/85		
Dist.104	1	7/8/85		
Dist.34	1	7/1/85	School District #95	1
			School District #96	1
			School District #114	1
			Elkhorn Valley	3
Dist. 36	1	6/1/85		
Dist. 52	1	10/29/85	School District # 53	1
			School District #37	1
Dist. 17	1	6/30/85	School District #24	1
			(Both districts are part of #2R Lakeview)	
Dist. 39	1	6/30/85		
Dist. 83	1	6/1/85	School District #19	1
			School District #24	1
			School District # 73	1
			Prague	2
			East Butler	3
Dist. 87	1	6/1/85	School District #44	1
			School District #70	1
Dist. 14	1	6/17/85	School District #28	1
			Stanton	3
			Wisner-Pilger	3
Dist. 14	1	6/17/85	Howells	3
1986				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Roseland Public 1 Schools	2	1/5/86		3
Dist. 50	1	6/30/86		
Dist. 80	1	8/1/86	Amherst #119	2
Dist. 21	1	7/01/86	Tekamah-Herman Uehling #49	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
			School District #17 of Washington County	
Dist. 135	1	6/1/86	Arnold	3
Dist. 500	1	6/23/86	School District #49	
Dist. 25	1	8/19/86	Scribner	3
Benkelman Public Schools	3	8/1/86	Formed new District With Haigler	3
Haigler Public Schools	2	8/1/86	Formed new District with Benkelman	3
Dist. 504	1	7/1/86	Franklin Alma	3 3
Wilsonville Public Schools	2	5/21/86		
Dist. 30	1	8/31/86	School District #1R (Both are part of GI Northwest AA classification)	1 6
Republican City Public Schools	2	7/01/86	Alma Public Schools Franklin Public Schools	3 3
Dist. 213	1	7/1/86		
Dist. 21	1	7/31/86		
Dist. 23	1	6/30/86	petition to transfer land between Nemaha County class 111 district Johnson bork and Johnsnon County class 111 district Nemaha Valley	
Dist. 6-Bushnell	1	8/18/86	Kimball Kimball County High School	1 6
Dist. 61	1	6/30/86 10/18/85	Norris Public Schools Crete Public Schools	3 3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 11	1	8/20/86		
Dist.7	1	6/11/86	Belgrade Fullerton Cedar Rapids	1 3 3
Dist. 28	1	6/11/86		
Dist. 54	1	8/31/86	School District #36	1
Beaver Valley	2	5/21/86		
Dist. 47	1	2/5/86 12/19/85	Morill	3
Melbeta Public Schools	2	7/1/86	Gering	3
Dist. 83	1	8/1/86	Bayard	3
Dist. 88	1	9/19/86	Centennial Exeter Friend	3 3 3
Dist. 126	1	8/15/86		
Dist. 13	1	7/28/86		
Bladen Public Schools	2	1/6/86 9/13/85	Form a new class 3 district	3
Gresham Public Schools	2	3/1/86		
1987				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 060-Antelope County	1	7/1/87		
Dist. 018-Boone County	1	7/21/87	School District # 13 School District # 60 Petersburg	1 2
Dist. 008-Box Butte County	1	8/18/87		

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 100-Box	1	6/25/87	might be in May 11, 1989	
Butte County				
Dist. 040-Boyd County	1	6/5/87		
Dist. 014-Cheyenne County	1	6/30/87 12/11/86	Lodgepole	2
Dist. 032-Cheyenne County	1	6/30/87	Leyton Lodgepole	3 2
Dist. 039-Cheyenne County	1	6/30/87	Fremont Public Schools Sidney Leyton Lodgepole	3 3 3 2
Dist. 075-Cheyenne County	1	6/30/87	Sidney	3
Dist. 097-Cheyenne County	1	6/30/87	Fremont Public Schools	3
Dist. 064-Clay County	1	6/22/87	Davenport Sutton Shickley	2 3 3
Dist. 010-Cuming County	1	8/31/87		
Dist. 054-Dixon County	1	7/1/87	Ponca Allen	3 3
Dist. 059-Dixon County	1	7/1/87	Wayne School District #15	3 1
Dist. 062-Dixon County	1	7/1/87	Allen Laurel	3 3
Dist. 012-Dodge County	1	7/13/87	School District #27 School District #93 North Bend Central jr/sr high Scribner	1 1 6 3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 024-Dodge County	1	6/26/87	Scribner	3
Snyder Public Schools	2	2/23/87	Scribner	3
Dist. 042-Dodge County	1	7/13/87	School District #88	1
			School District # 91	1
			Fremont Public Schools	3
Dist. 063-Dodge County	1	7/13/87	Fremont Public Schools	3
Hordville Public Schools	2	8/17/87 12/1/86	Polk	3
Dist. 009-Holt County	1	7/15/87	School District #90	1
Dist. 014-Holt County	1	7/15/87		
Dist. 039-Holt County	1	7/15/87		
Dist. 053-Holt County	1	7/15/87		
Dist. 088-Holt County	1	7/15/87 6/20/89	District #49 –Antelope District # 29-Holt	3 3
Dist. 092-Holt County	1	7/15/87	District #1Holt District # 27 Holt District # 60 Holt District # 90 Holt	1 1 1 1
Dist. 092-Holt County	1	7/15/87		
Dist. 006-Johnson County	1	5/30/87		
Dist. 009-Keith County	1	7/1/87	Ogallala	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 015-Keith County	1	1/31/87	Ogallala	3
Dist. 018-Keith County	1	7/1/87	Ogallala	3
Dix Public Schools	2	7/6/87	Potter	3
Dist. 107-Lancaster County	1	7/1/87	Lincoln Public Schools	4
Dist. 109-Lancaster County	1	7/1/87	Lincoln Public Schools	4
			Waverly	3
			Raymond	3
Dist. 001-Merrick County	1	4/1/87	Chapman	1
Dist. 018-Nance County	1	6/1/87	Fullerton	3
Dist. 054-Pawnee County	1	7/30/87	Lewiston	2
			Pawnee City	3
Dist. 078-Sheridan County	1	6/1/87		
Dist. 047-Sioux County	1	7/16/87	School District # 73	1
Dist. 065-Sioux County	1	6/30/87	School District #68	1
			School District #12	1
Dist. 002-Stanton County	1	8/31/87		
1988				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 008 Adams County	1	6/1/88 12/18/87	Blue Hill	3
Dist. 067-Adams County	1	7/14/88	Trumbull Doniphan	2 3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 097 Antelope County	1	6/1/88	Elgin	3
Spencer Public Schools	3	3/9/88	Naper #21 not approved	
Naper Public Schools	2	3/9/88	Spencer # 17 not approved	
Dist. 019-Brown County	1	5/16/88		
Dist. 045-Buffalo County	1	6/30/88	Amherst Pleasanton	2 3
Dist. 114-Buffalo County	1	6/30/88	Kearney Public Schools	3
Dist. 058-Cass County	1	7/14/88	Murdock Louisville Ashland-Greenwood	2 3 3
Dist. 056-Colfax County	1	6/15/88	School District #4R	1
Dist. 016-Cuming County	1	4/18/88	Wisner-Pilger School District #82 School District # 23	3 1 1
Dist. 021-Cuming County	1	4/18/88	School District #1 School District #20 School District #30 School District # 55 School District #19 School District # 82	3 3 3 3 1 1
Dist. 048-Dawson County	1	9/1/88		
Dist. 015-Douglas County	1	6/20/88	Valley	3
Dundy County Public Schools	3	6/20/88		
Dist. 027-Gage	1	6/30/88	Wymore	3

Dissolved District County	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District Lewiston	Class
			Lewiston	2
Dist. 165-Barneston County	1	7/29/88	Wymore Southern Odell Lewiston	3 3 2
Dist. 037-Hall County	1	8/31/88	School District # 16	1
Dist. 041-Johnson County	1	7/15/88		
Kimball Elementary Schools	1	8/31/88		3
Dist. 098-Lincoln County	1	7/1/88	Maxwell	2
Dist. 047-Madison County	1	6/1/88	School District # 48 School District # 25	1 1
Dist. 87-Victory Schools	1	6/30/88	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Dist. 091-Madison County	1	6/30/88	School District #48 School District #25	1 1
Dist. 009-Mc Pherson County	1	7/18/88	District #4	1
Dist. 015-Merrick County	1	6/22/88	Clarks	2
Dist. 055-Nance County	1	8/1/88	Fullerton Palmer School District # 23	3 3 1
Dist. 018-Saunders County	1	6/1/88 12/18/87	School District # 115	1
Dist. 019-Saunders County	1	6/1/88		
Dist. 008-Scotts Bluff County	1	6/1/88	School District #60	1
Dist. 033-Wayne	1	7/31/88	Wayne	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
County			School District # 25	1
			School District # 57	1
			School District # 47	1
Dist. 068-Wayne County	1	7/31/88		
1989				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 113- Antelope County	1	6/30/89	Orchard Public Schools	3
Dist. 007-Arthur County	1	7/3/89	Arthur Elementary School	1
Dist. 045-Boone County	1	6/14/89	Petersburg Public Schools	2
Dist. 045-Boone County	1	6/14/89	Elgin Public Schools	3
Dist. 124-Box Butte	1	6/30/89	Dist. 001 Box Butte County	1
Dist. 007-Boyd County	1	6/30/89	Butte Public Schools	2
Dist. 014-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Kearney Public Schools	3
Dist. 071-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Ansley Public Schools	3
Dist. 071-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Amherst Public Schools	2
Dist. 071-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Pleasanton Public Schools	3
Dist. 071-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Sumner-Eddyville Miller Schools	3
Dist. 052-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Shelton Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 052-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Centura Public Schools	3
Dist. 052-Buffalo County	1	6/30/89	Ravenna Public Schools	3
Dist. 011-Cedar County	1	6/1/89	Crofton Community Schools	3
Dist. 011-Cedar County	1	6/1/89	Hartington Public Schools	3
Dist. 057-Cedar County	1	7/7/89	Crofton Community Schools	3
Dist. 057-Cedar County	1	7/7/89	Wynot Public Schools	3
Dist. 057-Cedar County	1	7/7/89	Hartington Public Schools	3
Dist. 021-Cuming County	1	6/1/89	Beemer Public Schools	1
Dist. 021-Cuming County	1	6/1/89	Bancroft-Rosalie Community Schools	3
Dist. 021-Cuming County	1	6/1/89	Dist. 082-Cuming County	1
Dist. 021-Cuming County	1	6/1/89	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
Dist. 021-Cuming County	1	6/1/89	West Point Public Schools	3
Dist. 021-Cuming County	1	6/1/89	Dist. 019-Cuming County	1
Emerson-Hubbard Public Schools	3	9/1/89	Emerson-Hubbard Public Schools	3
Dist. 031-Hall County	1	8/31/89	Centura Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist.031-Hall County	1	8/31/89	Dist. 501-Hall County	1
Dist.031-Hall County	1	8/31/89	Plainview Public Schools	1
Dist. 038-Hall County	1	8/31/89	Cedar Hollow Public Schools	1
Dist. 039-Holt County	1	7/31/89	Ewing Public Schools	2
Dist. 039-Holt County	1	7/31/89	Orchard Public Schools	3
Dist. 039-Holt County	1	7/31/89	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Dist. 092-Holt County	1	7/31/89	Dist. 001-Holt County	1
Dist. 092-Holt County	1	7/31/89	Opportunity Public Schools	1
Dist. 092-Holt County	1	7/31/89	Dist. 090-Holt County	1
Dist. 092-Holt County	1	7/31/89	Meek Public Schools	1
Dist. 019-Howard County	1	6/27/89	Palmer Public Schools	3
Dist. 019-Howard County	1	6/27/89	St. Paul Public Schools	3
Dist. 043-Madison County	1	4/1/89	Sunny Meadow Public Schools	1
Dist. 050-Merrick County	1	6/1/89	Central City Public Schools	3
Dist. 050-Merrick County	1	6/1/89	Polk-Hordville Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 050-Merrick County	1	6/1/89	Clarks Public Schools	2
Dist. 018-Nemaha County	1	1/1/89	Locust Grove Public Schools	1
Dist. 021-Nemaha County	1	6/30/89	Johnson-Brock Public Schools	3
Dist. 021-Nemaha County	1	6/30/89	Auburn Public Schools	3
Dist. 074-Otoe County	1	6/20/89	Smallfoot Public Schools	1
Dist. 074-Otoe County	1	6/20/89	Syracuse-Dunbar-Avoca Schools	3
Dist. 046-Pierce County	1	4/1/89	Pierce Public Schools	3
Dist. 105-Saunders County	1	9/12/89	Mead Public Schools	3
Dist. 105-Saunders County	1	9/12/89	Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3
Dist. 105-Saunders County	1	9/12/89	Fremont Public Schools	3
Dist. 031-Stanton County	1	6/30/89	Leigh Community Schools	3
Dist. 031-Stanton County	1	6/30/89	Clarkson Public Schools	3
1990				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Park Center Public Schools	1	4/9/90	Elgin Public Schools	3
Primrose Public Schools	1	6/15/90	Cedar Rapids Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Greenhill Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Kearney Public Schools	3
Greenhill Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Riverdale Public Schools	1
Greenhill Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Amherst Public Schools	2
Eight Mile Grove Public Schools	1	6/1/90	Plattsmouth Community Schools	3
Eight Mile Grove Public Schools	1	6/1/90	Louisville Public Schools	3
Eight Mile Grove Public Schools	1	6/1/90	Conestoga Public Schools	3
Elmwood Public Schools	3	2/14/90	Elmwood-Murdock Public Schools	3
Murdock Public Schools	2	2/14/90	Elmwood-Murdock Public Schools	3
Tufford Public Schools	1	6/16/90	Mason City Public Schools	1
Tufford Public Schools	1	6/16/90	Ansley Public Schools	3
Tufford Public Schools	1	6/16/90	Flat Bottom Public Schools	1
Tufford Public Schools	1	6/16/90	Sumner-Eddlyville-Miller Schools	3
Bloomington Public Schools	1	6/1/90	Franklin Public Schools	3
Hutchinson Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Oshkosh Elementary Schools	1
Hutchinson Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Lewellen Public Schools	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Hutchinson Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Well Valley Public	1
Hutchinson Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Goose Lake Public Schools	1
Horace Public Schools	1	6/30/90	North Loup-Scotia Public Schools	3
Sunny Slope Public Schools	1	6/4/90	Cedar Hollow Public Schools	1
Emporia Public Schools	1	6/1/90	Ewing Public Schools	2
Emporia Public Schools	1	6/1/90	Orchard Public Schools	3
Cotesfield Public Schools	1	6/20/90	North Loup Scotia Public Schools	3
Cotesfield Public Schools	1	6/20/90	Elba Public Schools	2
Spotted Tail Public Schools	1	9/1/90	Pleasant View Public School	1
Born Public Schools	1	7/1/90	Sunny Meadow Public School	1
Rural Merrick Public School	1	8/6/90	Chapman-Dist. 9	1
Rural Merrick Public Schools	1	8/6/90	Central City Public Schools	3
Ruskin Public School	1	2/26/90	Deshler Public Schools	3
Grant Elementary School	1	9/1/90	Grant Public Schools	3
Perkins County High School	6	9/1/90	Grant Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Salem Public School	1	6/30/90	Falls City Public Schools	3
Salem Public Schools	1	6/30/90	Dawson-Verdon Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/1/90	Wiber-Clatonia Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/1/90	Friend Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/1/90	Dorchester Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/1/90	Milligan Public Schools	2
Wann Public School	1	8/2/90	Mead Public Schools	3
Wann Public School	1	8/2/90	Ashland-Greenwood Public Schools	3
Wann Public School	1	8/2/90	Dist. 005-Saunders County	1
Wann Public School	1	8/2/90	Yutan Public Schools	3
Otoe Creek Public School	1	8/2/90	Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3
Otoe Creek Public School	1	8/2/90	Dist. 060-Saunders County	1
Otoe Creek Public School	1	8/2/90	Mead Public Schools	3
Otoe Creek Public School	1	8/2/90	Platteville Public School	1
Otoe Creek Public School	1	8/2/90	Fremont Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Riveview Public School	1	8/1/90	Missouri Valley Public School	1
Blue Grass Valley Public School	1	6/29/90	Fairplay Public School	1
Blue Grass Valley Public School	1	6/29/90	Ord Public Schools	3
Blue Grass Valley Public School	1	6/29/90	Eureka Public School	1
Dist. 009-Wayne County	1	7/1/90	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Dist. 047-Wayne County	1	9/14/90	Dist. 057-Wayne County	1
Dist. 047-Wayne County	1	9/14/90	Dist. 025-Wayne County	1
Dist. 047-Wayne County	1	9/14/90	Wayne Community Schools	3
Dist. 047-Wayne County	1	9/14/90	Wakefield Public Schools	3
Dist. 076-Wayne County	1	6/26/90	Randolph Public Schools	3
1991				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
New England Valley School	1	5/23/91	Neligh-Oakdale Schools	3
Pick Public School	1	6/13/91	Clearwater Public Schools	2
Pick Public School	1	6/13/91	Neigh-Oakdale Schools	3
Pick Public School	1	6/13/91	Valley View Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 022-Box Butte County	1	7/15/91	Hemingford Public Schools	3
Dist. 022-Box Butte County	1	7/15/91	Dist. 044 Box Butte County	1
Paramount Public School	1	6/21/91	Rose Public School	1
Paramount Public School	1	6/21/91	Paradise Valley Public School	1
Paramount Public School	1	6/21/91	Raven Public School	1
West Olive Public School	1	6/30/91	Rising City Public Schools	2
West Olive Public School	1	6/30/91	Bellwood Elementary School	1
West Olive Public School	1	6/30/91	Garrison Public School	1
West Olive Public School	1	6/30/91	David City Public Schools	3
Taylor Public School	1	6/19/91	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Taylor Public School	1	6/19/91	Connestoga Public Schools	3
Pleasant Ridge Public School	1	6/24/91	Louisville Public Schools	3
Pleasant Ridge Public School	1	6/24/91	Connestoga Public Schools	3
Pleasant Ridge Public School	1	6/24/91	Plattsmouth Community Schools	3
College Hill Public School	1	6/24/91	Louisville Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
College Hill Public School	1	6/24/91	Weeping Water Public Schools	3
Northwest Cherry Public School	1	6/1/91	Fieldside Public School	1
Northwest Cherry Public School	1	6/1/91	Gordon Jr High/Elem Schools	1
Northwest Cherry Public School	1	6/1/91	Highway District School	1
Northwest Cherry Public School	1	6/1/91	Pioneer Public School	1
Northwest Cherry Public School	1	6/1/91	Irwin Public School	1
Fairview Public School	1	6/30/91	West Point Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/30/91	Bancroft-Rosalie Community Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/30/91	Lyons-Decatur Northeast Schools	3
Dist. 034-Cuming County	1	6/30/91	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
Willis Public School	1	6/15/91	Ponca Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	7/15/91	Hemingford Public Schools	3
Dist. 018-Dawson County	1	7/1/91	Dist. 013-Dawson County	1
Dist. 018-Dawson County	1	7/1/91	Dist. 016-Dawson County	1
Dist. 018-Dawson County	1	7/1/91	Dist. 019-Dawson County	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 018-Dawson County	1	7/1/91	Dist. 022-Dawson County	1
Dist. 018-Dawson County	1	7/1/91	Dist. 044-Dawson County	1
Two Rivers Public School	1	6/5/91	Valley Public Schools	3
Sunnyside Public School	1	7/1/91	Bennington Public Schools	3
Sunnyside Public School	1	7/1/91	Elkhorn Public Schools	3
Edison Public School	1	7/1/91	Oxford Community Schools	3
Edison Public School	1	7/1/91	Arapahoe Public Schools	3
Ash Creek Public School	1	7/9/91	Lewellen Public School	1
Mascot Public School	1	6/15/91	Orleans Public Schools	3
Mascot Public School	1	6/15/91	Oxford Community Schools	3
Mascot Public School	1	6/15/91	Holdrege Public Schools	3
Dist. 014-Holt County	1	6/1/91	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Dist. 014-Holt County	1	6/1/91	Spencer-Naper Public Schools	3
Dist. 014-Holt County	1	6/1/91	Phoenix Public School	1
Dist. 014-Holt County	1	6/1/91	Meek Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Inez Valley Public School	1	6/1/91	Clover Cove Public School	1
Inez Valley Public School	1	6/1/91	Amelia Public School	1
Inez Valley Public School	1	6/1/91	Dist. 231-Holt County	1
Dist. 002-Keith County	1	7/1/91	Ogallala Public Schools	3
Dist. 027-Keith County	1	7/1/91	Lewellen Public School	1
Dist. 027-Keith County	1	7/1/91	Ogallala Public Schools	3
Gilchrist Public School	1	6/1/91	Alliance Public Schools	3
Dist. 040-Platte County	1	6/1/91	Newman Grove Public Schools	3
Willow Creek Public School	1	7/15/91	Sand Creek Public School	1
Willow Creek Public School	1	7/15/91	Morse Bluff District 014	1
Willow Creek Public School	1	7/15/91	Prague Public Schools	2
Willow Creek Public School	1	7/15/91	Morse Bluff District 054	1
Riverside Public School	1	6/5/91	Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3
Riverside Public School	1	6/5/91	Morse Bluff District 054	1
Riverside Public School	1	6/5/91	Sand Creek Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Riverside Public School	1	6/5/91	Morse Bluff District 014	1
Memphis Public School	1	7/29/91	Waverly School District 145	3
Memphis Public Schools	1	7/29/91	Ashland-Greenwood Public Schools	3
Memphis Public Schools	1	7/29/91	Mead Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/30/91	Morril Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/30/91	Mitchell Public Schools	3
Dist. 036-Stanton County	1	7/22/91	Ackerman Public School	1
Dist. 036-Stanton County	1	7/22/91	Spring Branch Public School	1
Dist. 036-Stanton County	1	7/22/91	Stanton Community Schools	3
Dist. 036-Stanton County	1	7/22/91	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Thurston County	1	8/15/91	Wakefield Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Thurston County	1	8/15/91	Pender Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Thurston County	1	8/15/91	Dist. 025-Wayne County	1
Dist. 015-Thurston County	1	8/15/91	Emerson-Hubbard Public Schools	3
Pleasant Valley Public School	1	6/1/91	Arcadia Public Schools	2

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Pleasant Valley Public School	1	6/1/91	Vinton Public School	1
Pleasant Valley Public School	1	6/1/91	Ord Public Schools	3
Hillside Public School	1	6/1/91	Richland Public School	1
Dist. 005-Wayne County	1	9/1/91	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
Dist. 005-Wayne County	1	9/1/91	Wayne Community Schools	3
Dist. 005-Wayne County	1	9/1/91	Dist. 025-Wayne County	1
Dist. 005-Wayne County	1	9/1/91	Dist. 057-Wayne County	1
Centennial Public School	1	6/30/91	York Public Schools	3
Centennial Public School	1	6/30/91	Mc Cool Junction Public Schools	3
1992				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Happy Dale Public School	1	8/1/92	Alliance Public Schools	3
Dist. 016-Box Butte County	1	8/1/92	Dist. 044-Box Butte County	1
Dist. 016 Box Butte County	1	8/1/92	Alliance Public Schools	3
Prairie Bell School	1	6/1/92	Westside Public School	1
Prairie Bell School	1	6/1/92	Johnstown Public School	1
Prairie Bell School	1	6/1/92	Highland Grove Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Ervin Public School	1	6/1/92	Conestoga Public Schools	3
Ervin Public School	1	6/1/92	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Cullom Public School	1	6/1/92	Louisville Public Schools	3
Cullom Public School	1	6/1/92	Plattsmouth Community Schools	3
Heil Public School	1	6/1/92	Plattsmouth Community Schools	3
Heil Public School	1	6/1/92	Louisville Public Schools	3
Dist. 017-Cuming County	1	6/1/92	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
Dist. 019-Cuming County	1	6/1/92	West Point Public Schools	3
Dist. 019-Cuming County	1	6/1/92	Beemer Public School	1
Dist. 019-Cuming County	1	6/1/92	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
Dist. 032-Cuming County	1	6/1/92	Bancroft-Rosalie Community Schools	3
Dist. 032-Cuming County	1	6/1/92	Lyons-Decatur Northeast Schools	3
Dist. 032-Cuming County	1	6/1/92	West Point Public Schools	3
Flat Bottom Public School	1	6/1/92	Burr Oak Public School	1
Flat Bottom Public School	1	6/1/92	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
Flat Bottom	1	6/1/92	Ansley Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Public School				
Flat Bottom Public School	1	6/1/92	Round Hill Public School	1
Flat Bottom Public School	1	6/1/92	Sumner-Eddyville-Miller Schools	3
Flat Bottom Public School	1	6/1/92	Mason City Public School	1
Highland Center Public School	1	6/1/92	Hemingford Public Schools	3
Highland Center Public School	1	6/1/92	Table Center Public School	1
Highland Center Public School	1	6/1/92	Crawford Public Schools	3
Corn Valley Public School	1	6/1/92	Crawford Public Schools	3
Dist. 002-Dawson County	1	7/1/92	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Dist. 002-Dawson County	1	6/1/92	Cozad Public Schools	3
Dist. 003-Dawson County	1	7/1/92	Overton Public Schools	3
Dist. 003-Dawson County	1	7/1/92	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dist. 047-Dawson County	1	6/1/92	Dist. 100-Dawson County	3
Dist. 047-Dawson County	1	6/1/92	Dist. 081-Dawson County	1
Dist. 047-Dawson County	1	6/1/92	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Elk City Public	1	5/25/92	Arlington Public Schools	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Elk City Public School	1	5/25/92	Elkhorn Public Schools	3
Riverton Public School	1	6/1/92	Franklin Public Schools	3
Holbrook Public Schools	1	6/1/92	Arapahoe Public Schools	3
Dorsey Public School	1	6/1/92	Starview Public School	1
Dorsey Public School	1	6/1/92	Redbird Public School	1
Dorsey Public School	1	6/1/92	Verdigre Public Schools	3
Prairie Rose Public School	1	6/1/92	Phoenix Public School	1
Prairie Rose Public School	1	6/1/92	Union Public School	1
Prairie Rose Public School	1	6/1/92	Dustin Public School	1
Deloit Public School	1	6/1/92	Clearwater Public Schools	2
Deloit Public School	1	6/1/92	Elgin Public Schools	3
Deloit Public School	1	6/1/92	Ewing Public Schools	2
Deloit Public School	1	6/1/92	Sunnybrook Public School	1
Deloit Public School	1	6/1/92	Wheeler Central Schools	3
Windy Meadows	1	6/1/92	Dist. 231-Holt County	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Public School				
Windy Meadows Public School	1	6/1/92	Emmet Public School	1
Windy Meadows Public School	1	6/1/92	Atkinson Elementary School	1
Windy Meadows Public School	1	6/1/92	Dist. 035-Holt County	1
Windy Meadows Public School	1	6/1/92	Dist. 076-Holt County	1
Windy Meadows Public School	1	6/1/92	Clover Cove Public School	1
Steele City Public School	1	6/1/92	Diller Community Schools	2
Endicott Public School	1	6/1/92	Fairbury Public Schools	3
Reynolds Public School	1	6/1/92	Fairbury Public Schools	3
Farmstead Public School	1	6/1/92	Fairbury Public Schools	3
Norman Public School	1	6/1/92	Kenesaw Public Schools	3
Norman Public School	1	6/1/92	Minden Public Schools	3
Emerald Public School	1	6/1/92	Lincoln Public Schools	4
Emerald Public School	1	6/1/92	Malcolm Public Schools	3
Pleasant View Public School	1	6/1/92	Maywood Public Schools	3
Pleasant View	1	6/1/92	North Platte Public	3

Dissolved District Public School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District Schools	Class
Pleasant View Public School	1	6/1/92	Maxwell Public Schools	3
Howe Public School	1	6/1/92	SE Nebraska Consolidated Schools	3
Howe Public School	1	6/1/92	Auburn Public Schools	3
Julian Public School	1	6/1/92	Auburn Public Schools	3
Wyoming Public School	1	6/1/92	Giles Public School	1
Wyoming Public School	1	6/1/92	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Walnut Creek Public School	1	1/1/92	MC Cartney Public Schools	1
Walnut Creek Public School	1	1/1/92	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Walnut Creek Public School	1	1/1/92	Giles Public School	1
Douglas Public Schools	1	6/1/92	Sterling Public Schools	3
Burr Public School	1	6/1/92	Sterling Public Schools	3
Burr Public School	1	6/1/92	Nemaha Valley Schools	3
Burr Public School	1	6/1/92	Syracuse-Dunbar-Avoca Schools	3
Perry Public School	1	6/1/92	Mc Cook Public Schools	3
Pleasant Hill Public	1	6/1/92	Crete Public Schools	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Pleasant Hill Public School	1	6/1/92	Wilber-Clatonia Public Schools	3
Pleasant Hill Public School	1	6/1/92	Dorchester Public Schools	3
Evergreen Public School	1	6/1/92	Wilber-Clatonia Public Schools	3
Evergreen Public School	1	6/1/92	Dorchester Public Schools	3
Evergreen Public School	1	6/1/92	Crete Public Schools	3
Red Brick Public School	1	6/1/92	Dorchester Public Schools	3
Red Brick Public School	1	6/1/92	Crete Public Schools	3
Red Brick Public School	1	6/1/92	Wilber-Clatonia Public Schools	3
Walnut Grove Public School	1	6/1/92	Friend Public Schools	3
Walnut Grove Public School	1	6/1/92	Milligan Public Schools	2
Happy Hollow Public School	1	6/1/92	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Happy Hollow Public School	1	6/1/92	East Butler Public Schools	3
Dist. 075-Saunders County	1	6/1/92	Colon Public School	1
Dist. 075-Saunders County	1	6/1/92	Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3
Dist. 075-Saunders	1	6/1/92	Wahoo Public Schools	3

Dissolved District County	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 075-Saunders County	1	6/1/92	Sand Creek Public School	1
Dist. 075-Saunders County	1	6/1/92	Prague Public Schools	2
Dist. 075-Saunders County	1	6/1/92	Malmo Public School	1
Rushville Public Schools	1	6/1/92	Rushville High School	6
Rushville Public Schools	1	6/1/92	Rushville School	1
Green Valley Public School	1	6/1/92	Rushville School	1
Green Valley Public School	1	6/1/92	Prairie View Public School	1
Green Valley Public School	1	6/1/92	Hay Springs Public Schools	3
Golden Rod Public School	1	6/1/92	Hay Springs Public Schools	2
Mount Hope Public School	1	6/1/92	Valley Union Public School	1
Gilead Public School	1	4/14/92	Fairbury Public Schools	3
Gilead Public School	1	4/14/92	Hebron Public Schools	3
1993				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 040-Box Butte County	1	6/1/93	Alliance Public Schools	3
Dist. 040-Box Butte County	1	6/1/93	Hemingford Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Long Pine Public School	1	6/1/93	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Pleasant Hill Public School	1	8/1/93	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Sunol Public School	1	6/1/93	Lodgepole Public Schools	2
Pleasantview Public School District 81	1	5/3/93	Scribner-Snyder Community Schools	3
Pleasantview Public School District 81	1	5/3/93	Uehling Public School	1
Pleasantview Public School District 81	1	5/3/93	Oakland Craig Public Schools	3
Pleasantview Public School District 81	1	5/3/93	West Point Public Schools	3
Dist. 012-Dawson County	1	7/1/93	Elm Creek Public Schools	3
Dist. 012-Dawson County	1	7/1/93	Overton Public Schools	3
Dist. 012-Dawson County	1	7/1/93	Lexington Public Schools	3
Broadview Public School	1	6/1/93	Luther-Broadview Public School	1
Beaver City Public	1	7/1/93	Southern Valley Schools	3
Oxford Community Schools	3	7/1/93	Southern Valley Schools	3
Orleans Public Schools	3	7/1/93	Southern Valley Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 017-Holt County	1	8/1/93	Meek Public Schools	1
Dist. 017-Holt County	1	8/1/93	Dist. 090-Holt County	1
Dist. 017-Holt County	1	8/1/93	Ewing Public Schools	2
Dist. 017-Holt County	1	8/1/93	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Dist. 017-Holt County	1	8/1/93	Pleasant View Public	1
Dist. 017-Holt County	1	8/1/93	Opportunity Public School	1
Bluetop Public School	1	6/1/93	Dist. 169-Holt County	1
Dist. 205-Holt County	1	6/1/93	Dist. 077-Holt County	1
Dist. 205-Holt County	1	6/1/93	Dist. 169-Holt County	1
Dist. 205-Holt County	1	6/1/93	Clover Cove Public School	1
Spring Creek Public School	1	6/1/93	Nemaha Valley Schools	3
Spring Creek Public School	1	6/1/93	Johnson-Brock Public Schools	3
Spring Creek Public School	1	6/1/93	Tecumseh Public Schools	3
Heartwell Public School	1	6/1/93	Kenesaw Public Schools	3
Heartwell Public School	1	6/1/93	Minden Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Stange Public School	1	7/1/93	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Stange Public School	1	7/1/93	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
Stange Public School	1	7/1/93	Warnerville Public School	1
Olive Public School	1	7/1/93	Cedar Rapids Public Schools	3
Olive Public School	1	7/1/93	Wolbach Public Schools	2
Midway Public School	1	7/1/93	Silver Creek Public Schools	2
Midway Public School	1	7/1/93	Fullerton Public Schools	3
Midway Public School	1	7/1/93	Genoa Public Schools	3
Cochran Public School	1	4/7/93	Auburn Public Schools	3
Baker Public School	1	6/30/93	Syracuse-Dunbar Avoca Schools	3
Baker Public School	1	6/30/93	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Dist. 029-Platte County	1	7/1/93	Humphrey Public Schools	3
Riverside Public School	1	6/1/93	Silver Creek Public Schools	2
Riverside Public School	1	6/1/93	Polk-Hordville Public Schools	3
Riverside Public School	1	6/1/93	Osceola Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Riverside Public School	1	6/1/93	Clarks Public Schools	2
Riverside Public School	1	6/1/93	Stromsburg Public Schools	3
Dist. 031-Red Willow County	1	6/1/93	Republican Valley Schools	3
Dist. 031-Red Willow County	1	6/1/93	Fitch Public School	1
Dist. 031-Red Willow County	1	6/1/93	MC Cook Public Schools	3
North Public School	1	6/1/93	Wilber-Clatonia Public	3
North Public School	1	6/1/93	Crete Public Schools	3
Portal Public School	1	7/1/93	Papillion-La Vista Public Schools	3
Dist. 024-Saunders County	1	6/1/93	Prague Public Schools	2
Dist. 024-Saunders County	1	6/1/93	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Dist. 024-Saunders County	1	6/1/93	East Butler Public Schools	3
Morse Bluff District 054	1	6/1/93	Morse Bluff District 014	1
Rock Creek Center Public School	1	6/1/93	Raymond Central Public Schools	3
Rock Creek Center Public School	1	6/1/93	East Butler Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Rock Creek Center Public School	1	6/1/93	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Lyman Public Schools	1	6/1/93	Morril Public Schools	3
Sandridge Public School	1	6/30/93	Hay Springs Public Schools	3
Sandridge Public School	1	6/30/93	Rushville School	1
Sandridge Public School	1	6/30/93	Antelope Public School	1
Kenoma Public School	1	7/1/93	Boiling Springs Public School	1
Kenoma Public School	1	7/1/93	Roadside Public School	1
Kenoma Public School	1	7/1/93	Antioch Public School	1
Kenoma Public School	1	7/1/93	Dist. 065-Box Butte County	1
Kenoma Public School	1	7/1/93	Golden Rule Public School	1
Kenoma Public School	1	7/1/93	Lakeside Public School	1
Moon Creek Public School	1	7/1/93	Arcadia Public Schools	2
Moon Creek Public School	1	7/1/93	Litchfield Public Schools	2
Moon Creek Public School	1	7/1/93	Loup City Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Cotton Wood Public School	1	6/1/93	Hat Creek Public School	1
Dist. 081-Stanton County	1	7/1/93	Stanton Community Schools	3
Dist. 081-Stanton County	1	7/1/93	Ackerman Public School	1
Dist. 081-Stanton County	1	7/1/93	Madison Public Schools	3
Dist. 081-Stanton County	1	7/1/93	Reiche Public School	1
Dist. 081-Stanton County	1	7/1/93	Duffy Public School	1
Dist. 081-Stanton County	1	7/1/93	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Springdale Public School	1	7/1/93	Ord Public Schools	3
Eureka Public School	1	7/1/93	Ord Public Schools	3
Eureka Public School	1	7/1/93	Vinton Public School	1
Eureka Public School	1	7/1/93	Elyria Public School	1
Eureka Public School	1	7/1/93	Richland Public School	1
Eureka Public School	1	7/1/93	Banner Public School	1
Telbasta Public School	1	5/25/93	Sheridan Public School	1
Telbasta Public School	1	5/25/93	Arlington Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Wranch Public School	1	6/30/93	Fort Calhoun Community Schools	3
Wranch Public School	1	6/30/93	Blair Community Schools	3
Wranch Public School	1	6/30/93	Bennignton Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Wayne County	1	6/1/93	Laurel-Concord Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Wayne County	1	6/1/93	Winside Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Wayne County	1	6/1/93	Dist. 051-Wayne County	1
Dist. 015-Wayne County	1	6/1/93	Wayne Community Schools	3
Dist. 077-Wayne County	1	6/1/93	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Dist. 077-Wayne County	1	6/1/93	Winside Public Schools	3
Dist. 077-Wayne County	1	6/1/93	Pierce Public Schools	3
1994				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 001-Box Butte County	1	6/1/94	Bridgeport Public Schools	3
Dist. 001-Box Butte County	1	6/1/94	Alliance Public Schools	3
Dist. 022-Cuming County	1	5/18/94	Bancroft-Rosalie Community Schools	3
Dist. 022-Cuming County	1	5/18/94	West Point Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Goose Lake Public School	1	5/24/94	Well Valley Public School	1
Goose Lake Public School	1	5/24/94	Lakeside Public School	1
Goose Lake Public School	1	5/24/94	Oshkosh Elementary School	1
Goose Lake Public School	1	5/24/94	Antioch Public School	1
Goose Lake Public School	1	5/24/94	Lisco Public School	1
Dist. 001-Holt County	1	8/1/94	Meek Public School	1
Dist.001-Holt County	1	8/1/94	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Dist. 001-Holt County	1	8/1/94	Redbird Public School	1
Dist. 001-Holt County	1	8/1/94	Spencer-Naper Public Schools	3
Bunker Hill Public School	1	6/1/94	St. Paul Public Schools	3
Dist. 022-Keith County	1	6/1/94	Ogallala Public Schools	3
Jordon Valley Public School	1	7/1/94	Burton Public School	1
Star Public School	1	6/1/94	Crete Public Schools	3
Star Public School	1	6/1/94	Dorchester Public Schools	3
Star Public School	1	6/1/94	Milford Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Colon Public School	1	6/1/94	Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3
Colon Public School	1	6/1/94	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Dist. 046-Sioux County	1	6/1/94	Harrison Public School	1
Grandview Public School	1	6/1/94	Hillview Public School	1
Spring Branch Public School	1	6/1/94	Ackerman Public School	1
Spring Branch Public School	1	6/1/94	Bega Public School	1
Spring Branch Public School	1	6/1/94	Stanton Community Schools	3
Spring Branch Public School	1	6/1/94	Norfolk Public Schools	3
1995				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 094-Buffalo County	1	1/3/95	Elm Creek Public Schools	3
Chase County Elementary School	1	7/1/95	Imperial Elementary School	1
Big Springs Public Schools	3	8/1/95	South Platte Public Schools	3
Dist. 077-Holt County	1	6/1/95	Dist. 169-Holt County	1
Dist. 077-Holt County	1	6/1/95	Clover Cove Public School	1
Dist. 077-Holt County	1	6/1/95	Dist. 231-Holt County	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 077-Holt County	1	6/1/95	Dist. 035-Holt County	1
Swan Public School	1	6/1/95	Dist. 238-Holt County	1
Swan Public School	1	6/1/95	Dist. 070-Garfield County	1
Swan Public School	1	6/1/95	Clover Cove Public School	1
Swan Public School	1	6/1/95	Chambers Public Schools	2
Brule Public Schools	2	8/1/95	South Platte Public Schools	3
Wild Horse Valley Public School	1	8/1/95	Dist. 100-Dawson County	1
Wild Horse Valley Public School	1	8/1/95	Brady Public Schools	2
Wild Horse Valley Public School	1	8/1/95	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/1/95	Madison Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	6/1/95	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
Cadams Public School	1	8/1/95	Superior Public Schools	3
Cadams Public School	1	8/1/95	Nelson Public Schools	3
Nora Public School	1	7/1/95	Nelson Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 003-Platte County	1	7/1/95	Dist. 024-Platte County	1
Mitchell Valley Public School	1	8/1/95	Mitchell Public Schools	3
Mitchell Valley Public School	1	8/1/95	Morrill Public Schools	3
Dist. 030-Stanton County	1	7/15/95	Leigh Community Schools	3
Dist.030-Stanton County	1	7/15/95	Stanton Community Schools	3
Dist. 030-Stanton County	1	7/15/95	Ackerman Public School	1
Dist. 030-Stanton County	1	7/15/95	Clarkson Public Schools	3
Dist. 030-Stanton County	1	7/15/95	Madison Public Schools	3
1996				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Octavia Public School	1	7/1/96	Schuyler Grade School	1
Octavia Public School	1	7/1/96	David City Public Schools	3
Gordon Creek Public School	1	11/1/96	Redmill Public School	1
Lackey Public School	1	6/1/96	Redmill Public School	1
Lackey Public School	1	6/1/96	Dist. 005-Grant County	1
Dist. 030-Colfax County	1	7/1/96	Dist. 501-Colfax County	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 030-Colfax County	1	7/1/96	Dist. 505-Colfax County	1
Dist. 030-Colfax County	1	7/1/96	Howells Public Schools	3
Dist. 030-Colfax County	1	7/1/96	Schuyler Grade School	1
Dist. 030-Colfax County	1	7/1/96	Leigh Community Schools	3
Dist. 030-Colfax County	1	7/1/96	Clarkson Public Schools	3
Westerville Public School	1	6/1/96	Arcadia Public Schools	2
Westerville Public School	1	6/1/96	Sargent Public Schools	3
Westerville Public School	1	6/1/96	Ansley Public Schools	3
Westerville Public School	1	6/1/96	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
Banner Public School	1	6/1/96	Riverview Public School	1
Banner Public School	1	6/1/96	Midvale Public School	1
Banner Public School	1	6/1/96	Rosehill Public School	1
Banner Public School	1	6/1/96	Burwell Elementary School	1
Banner Public School	1	6/1/96	Richland Public School	1
Pleasantview Public School	1	8/1/96	Wood River Elementary School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Cache Creek Valley Public School	1	6/1/96	Chambers Public Schools	2
Cache Creek Valley Public School	1	6/1/96	Ewing Public Schools	2
Lost Creek Public School	1	6/1/96	Spring View Public School	1
Lost Creek Public School	1	6/1/96	Liberty Public School	1
Lost Creek Public School	1	6/1/96	Norden Public School	1
Spannuth Public School	1	8/1/96	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Spannuth Public School	1	8/1/96	Brady Public Schools	2
Buchanan Public School	1	6/1/96	MC Cartney Public School	1
Pleasant-View Public School	1	6/1/96	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Pleasant-View Public School	1	6/1/96	Pierce Public Schools	3
Valley Union Public School	1	6/28/96	Gordon Jr High/Elem Schools	1
1997				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Willowdale Public School	1	6/1/97	Neligh-Oakdale Schools	3
Farnam Public Schools	2	4/15/97	Eustis-Farnam Public Schools	3
Eustis Public Schools	2	4/15/97	Eustis-Farnam Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Lewellen Rural High School	6	3/15/97	Garden County Schools	3
Huntley Public School	1	8/1/97	Wilcox Public Schools	3
Huntley Public School	1	8/1/97	Alma Public Schools	3
Huntley Public School	1	8/1/97	Southern Valley Schools	3
Huntley Public School	1	8/1/97	Holdrege Public Schools	3
Dist. 169-Holt County	1	6/1/97	Clover Cove Public School	1
Dist. 169-Holt County	1	6/1/97	Atkinson Elementary School	1
Dist. 169-Holt County	1	6/1/97	Ridgeway Public School	1
Dist. 169-Holt County	1	6/1/97	Dist. 035-Holt County	1
Hall Public School	1	6/1/97	Tryon Public School	1
Hall Public School	1	6/1/97	Ringgold Public School	1
Dist. 006-Pierce County	1	6/1/97	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Dist. 006-Pierce County	1	6/1/97	Pierce Public Schools	3
Dist. 006-Pierce County	1	6/1/97	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
Dist. 009-Platte County	1	6/1/97	Lakeview Community Schools	3
Dist. 010-Platte County	1	6/1/97	Lakeview Community Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 024-Platte County	1	6/1/97	Lakeview Community Schools	3
Dist. 084-Platte County	1	6/1/97	Lakeview Community Schools	3
Lakeview High School	6	6/1/97	Lakeview Community Schools	3
Bartley Public Schools	2	3/1/97	Twin Valley Public Schools	2
Beaver Valley Public Schools	2	3/1/97	Twin Valley Public Schools	2
Dist. 060-Saunders County	1	6/1/97	Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3
Dist. 060-Saunders County	1	6/1/97	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Dist. 060-Saunders County	1	6/1/97	Yutan Public Schools	3
Dist. 060-Saunders County	1	6/1/97	Fremont Public Schools	3
Dist. 060-Saunders County	1	6/1/97	Mead Public Schools	3
Schaupps Public School	1	5/28/97	Loup City Public Schools	3
Canadian Public School	1	6/1/97	Stanton Community Schools	3
1998				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Pleasant Valley Public School	1	6/1/98	Elkhorn Valley Schools	3
Pleasant Valley Public School	1	6/1/98	Elgin Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Wilson Public School	1	7/1/98	Arthur Elementary School	1
Dist. 074-Boone County	1	6/1/98	Boone Central Schools	3
Dist. 065-Box Butte County	1	8/1/98	Antioch Public School	1
Dist. 065-Box Butte County	1	8/1/98	Hemingford Public Schools	3
Dist. 065-Box Butte County	1	8/1/98	Alliance Public Schools	3
Paradise Valley Public School	1	6/1/98	Raven Public School	1
Paine Public School	1	6/1/98	Bancroft-Rosalie Community Schools	3
Garrison Public School	1	8/1/98	East Butler Public Schools	3
Garrison Public School	1	8/1/98	David City Public Schools	3
Garrison Public School	1	8/1/98	Rising City Public Schools	2
Highway District School	1	4/24/98	Merriman Public School	1
Highway District School	1	4/24/98	Irwin Public School	1
Highway District School	1	4/24/98	Pioneer Public School	1
Tioga Burge Public School	1	6/1/98	Simeon Public School	1
Tioga Burge Public School	1	6/1/98	Merryland Park School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Tioga Burge Public School	1	6/1/98	Dist. 045-Cherry County	1
Tioga Burge Public School	1	6/1/98	Crookston Public School	1
Tioga Burge Public School	1	6/1/98	Evergeen Public School	1
Tioga Burge Public School	1	6/1/98	Valentine City Schools	1
Dist. 511-Colfax County	1	7/1/98	Dist. 504-Colfax County	1
Dist. 511-Colfax County	1	7/1/98	Fisher's Public School	1
Dist. 511-Colfax County	1	7/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Dist. 007-Dawson County	1	6/1/98	Lexington Public Schools	3
North Bend Elementary School	1	6/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Nickerson Public School	1	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3
Hooper Elementary School	1	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3
Webster Public School	1	6/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Uehling Public School	1	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3
Rosedale Public School	1	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3
Luther-Broadview Public School	1	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 088-Dodge County	1	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3
Ames Public School	1	6/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Dist. 092-Dodge County	1	6/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Cotterell Public School	1	6/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Logan View Jr-Sr High School	6	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3
North Bend Central Jr-Sr High	6	6/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Campbell Public Schools	1	6/1/98	Silver Lake Public Schools	3
Adams Public Schools	3	3/1/98	Freeman Public Schools	3
Filley Public Schools	2	3/1/98	Freeman Public Schools	3
Dist. 014-Keith County	1	6/1/98	Ogallala Public Schools	3
Liberty Public School	1	7/30/98	Spring View Public School	1
Dist. 005-Morrill County	1	8/1/98	Leyton Public Schools	3
Dist. 005-Morrill County	1	8/1/98	Bridgeport Public Schools	3
Dist. 005-Morrill County	1	8/1/98	Lisco Public School	1
Dist. 005-Morrill County	1	8/1/98	Alliance Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Nuckolls District 2R	1	8/1/98	Superior Public Schools	3
Nuckolls District 2R	1	8/1/98	Guide Rock Public Schools	2
Nuckolls District 2R	1	8/1/98	Nelson Public Schools	3
Harmony Public School	1	6/1/98	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Marion Public School	1	8/1/98	Twin River Public Schools	2
Morse Bluff District 014	1	6/1/98	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Pleasant Hill Public School	1	6/1/98	Clinton Public School	1
Austin Public School	1	6/1/98	Loup City Public Schools	3
Sheridan Pubic School	1	6/1/98	Logan View Public Schools	3
Dist. 025-Wayne County	1	6/1/98	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
Dist. 025-Wayne County	1	6/1/98	Pender Public Schools	3
Dist. 025-Wayne County	1	6/1/98	Wakefield Public Schools	3
Bradshaw Public Schools	2	3/3/98	Heartland Community Schools	3
Henderson Public Schools	3	3/3/98	Heartland Community Schools	3

1999				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Triangle Public School	1	5/28/99	Arthur Elementary School	1
Dist. 049-Boone County	1	6/1/99	Boone Central Schools	3
Cascade Public School	1	6/1/99	Goose Creek Public School	1
Cascade Public School	1	6/1/99	Elsmere Public School	1
Burr Oak Public School	1	8/1/99	Round Hill Public School	1
Fairmont Public Schools	3	5/24/99	Fillmore Central Public Schools	3
Geneva Public Schools	3	5/24/99	Fillmore Central Public Schools	3
Dist. 005-Hall County	1	6/1/99	Wood River Elementary School	1
Marquette Public Schools	1	6/1/99	Central City Public Schools	3
Marquette Public Schools	1	6/1/99	Hampton Public Schools	3
Marquette Public Schools	1	6/1/99	Aurora Public Schools	3
Marquette Public Schools	1	6/1/99	Polk-Hordville Public Schools	3
Birdwood Public School	1	8/1/99	Sutherland Public Schools	3
Birdwood Public School	1	8/1/99	Hershey Public Schools	3
Pleasant Valley Public School	1	7/31/99	Fullerton Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Sand Creek Public School	1	6/1/99	North Bend Central Public Schools	3
Sand Creek Public School	1	6/1/99	Prague Public Schools	2
Sand Creek Public School	1	6/1/99	Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3
Sand Creek Public School	1	6/1/99	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Milan Public School	1	6/30/99	Clinton Public School	1
Ackerman Public School	1	8/1/99	Good Cheer Public School	1
Ackerman Public School	1	8/1/99	Duffy Public School	1
Ackerman Public School	1	8/1/99	Bega Public School	1
Ackerman Public School	1	8/1/99	Dist. 028-Stanton County	1
Ackerman Public Schools	1	8/1/99	Stanton Community Schools	3
Ackerman Public Schools	1	8/1/99	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Ackerman Public Schools	1	8/1/99	Madison Public Schools	3
Ackerman Public School	1	8/1/99	Leigh Community Schools	3
Washington Public School	1	8/1/99	Arlington Public Schools	3
Washington Public School	1	8/1/99	Bennington Public Schools	3

2000				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Petersburg Public Schools	2	6/15/00	Boone Central Schools	3
Edholm Public School	1	6/1/00	Garfield Public School	1
Trumbull Public Schools	2	6/1/00	Doniphan-Trumbull Public Schools	3
Hard Scrabble Public School	1	7/1/00	Chadron Public Schools	3
Hard Scrabble Public School	1	7/1/00	Crawford Public Schools	3
Fairview Public School	1	7/1/00	Elkhorn Public Schools	3
Odell Public Schools	3	4/3/00	Diller-Odell Public Schools	3
Doniphan Public Schools	3	6/1/00	Doniphan-Trumbull Public Schools	3
Diller Community Schools	2	4/3/00	Diller-Odell Public Schools	3
Clarks Public Schools	2	7/1/00	High Plains Community Schools	3
Kremer Public School	1	7/31/00	Fullerton Public Schools	3
Giles Public School	1	7/1/00	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Maple Grove Public School	1	7/1/00	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Zion Public School	1	7/1/00	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Dist. 055-Pierce County	1	7/31/00	Pierce Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Polk-Hordville Public Schools	3	7/1/00	High Plains Community Schools	3
Thurman Public School	1	8/1/00	Bassett Grade School	1
Dist. 005-Saunders County	1	6/1/00	Ashland-Greenwood Public Schools	3
Hillview Public School	1	6/1/00	Extension Public School	1
Hillview Public School	1	6/1/00	Clinton Public School	1
Hillview Public School	1	6/1/00	Rushville School	1
Hillview Public School	1	6/1/00	Whiteclay Public School	1
Beaver Valley Public School	1	6/1/00	Hay Springs Public Schools	3
Beaver Valley Public School	1	6/1/00	Chadron Public Schools	3
Albany Pine Lodge Public School	1	6/1/00	Fieldside Public School	1
Missouri Valley Public School	1	6/1/00	Rushville School	1
Missouri Valley Public School	1	6/1/00	Prairie View Public School	1
Missouri Valley Public School	1	6/1/00	Clinton Public School	1
Missouri Valley Public School	1	6/1/00	Banner Public School	1
Missouri Valley Public School	1	6/1/00	Boiling Springs Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 057-Wayne County	1	6/1/00	Wayne Community Schools	3
Dist. 057-Wayne County	1	6/1/00	Windside Public Schools	3
Dist. 057-Wayne County	1	6/1/00	Pender Public Schools	3
Dist. 057-Wayne County	1	6/1/00	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
2001				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Beaver Valley Public School	1	8/1/01	Boone Central Schools	3
Surprise Public School	1	6/1/01	Shelby Public Schools	3
Surprise Public School	1	6/1/01	East Butler Public Schools	3
Surprise Public School	1	6/1/01	Rising City Public Schools	2
Surprise Public School	1	6/1/01	Centennial Public Schools	3
Surprise Public School	1	6/1/01	David City Public Schools	3
Bellwood Elementary School	1	6/1/01	David City Public Schools	3
Merryland Park School	1	6/1/01	Boardman Creek Public School	1
Merryland Park School	1	6/1/01	Simeon Public School	1
Mother Lake Public School	1	5/15/01	Ashby Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Weissert Public School	1	8/1/01	Sargent Public Schools	3
Weissert Public School	1	8/1/01	Ansley Public Schools	3
Weissert Public School	1	8/1/01	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
Round Valley Public School	1	7/1/01	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
Round Valley Public School	1	7/1/01	Sargent Public Schools	3
Dist. 019-Dawson County	1	6/1/01	Cozad Public Schools	3
Dist. 032-Dawson County	1	6/1/01	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Dist. 032-Dawson County	1	6/1/01	Cozad Public Schools	3
Dist. 032-Dawson County	1	6/1/01	Eustis-Farnam Public Schools	3
Elm Tree Public School	1	7/2/01	Valley Public Schools	3
Grafton Public School	1	6/1/01	Fillmore Central Public	3
Grafton Public School	1	6/1/01	Sutton Public Schools	3
Dist. 009-Grant County	1	5/15/01	Ashby Public School	1
Dist. 231-Holt County	1	6/1/01	Clover Cove Public School	1
Dist. 231-Holt County	1	6/1/01	Dist. 035-Holt County	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 231-Holt County	1	6/1/01	Amelia Public School	1
Sand Ridge Public School	1	8/1/01	Tecumseh Public Schools	3
Sand Ridge Public School	1	8/1/01	Sterling Public Schools	3
Silver Creek Public Schools	2	3/1/01	Twin River Public Schools	3
Genoa Public Schools	3	3/1/01	Twin River Public Schools	3
Monroe Public Schools	2	3/1/01	Twin River Public Schools	3
Dist. 083-Platte County	1	8/1/01	St. Edward Public Schools	3
Dist. 083-Platte County	1	8/1/01	Twin River Public Schools	3
Stromsburg Public Schools	3	6/1/01	Cross County Community Schools	3
Whiteclay Public School	1	7/1/01	Rushville School	1
Hinchley Public School	1	6/1/01	Gordon Jr High/Elem Schools	1
Spring Lake Public School	1	6/1/01	Golden Rule Public School	1
Hat Creek Public School	1	6/1/01	Harrison Public School	1
Dist. 028-Stanton County	1	8/1/01	Stanton Community Schools	3
Dist. 028-Stanton County	1	8/1/01	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Bega Public School	1	6/1/01	Stanton Community Schools	3
Bega Public School	1	6/1/01	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Bega Public School	1	6/1/01	Winside Public Schools	3
Dist. 051-Wayne County	1	6/1/01	Winside Public Schools	3
Dist. 051-Wayne County	1	6/1/01	Wayne Community Schools	3
Benedict Public Schools	2	6/1/01	Cross County Community Schools	3
2002				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Leader Public School	1	8/1/02	Boone Central Schools	3
Leader Public School	1	8/1/02	St. Edward Public Schools	3
Leader Public School	1	8/1/02	Newman Grove Public Schools	3
Johnstown Public School	1	8/1/02	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Johnstown Public School	1	8/1/02	Wood Lake Public School	1
Moonlake Public School	1	8/1/02	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Inland Public School	1	8/1/02	Dist. 015-Adams County	1
County Line Public School	1	7/1/02	Gothenburg Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Marsland Public School	1	6/1/02	Belmont Public School	1
Exeter Public Schools	3	5/29/02	Exeter-Milligan Public Schools	3
Milligan Public Schools	2	5/29/02	Exeter-Milligan Public Schools	3
Hildreth Public Schools	2	6/1/02	Wilcox-Hildreth Public Schools	3
Rosehill Public School	1	6/1/02	Midvale Public School	1
Rosehill Public School	1	6/1/02	Burwell Elementary School	1
Rosehill Public School	1	6/1/02	Dist. 070-Garfield County	1
Mile Bridge Public School	1	6/1/02	Cedar Hollow Public School	1
Dist. 035-Holt County	1	6/1/02	Atkinson Elementary School	1
Dist. 035-Holt County	1	6/1/02	Clover Cove Public School	1
Sunnybrook Public School	1	6/1/02	Ewing Public Schools	2
Sunnybrook Public School	1	6/1/02	Nebraska Unified District 1	3
Dist. 076-Holt County	1	6/1/02	Atkinson Elementary School	1
Dist. 238-Holt County	1	6/1/02	Amelia Public School	1
Wilcox Public Schools	3	6/1/02	Wilcox-Hildreth Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Venango Public Schools	1	7/1/02	Grant Public Schools	3
East Pride Public School	1	6/1/02	Gordon Jr High/Elem Schools	1
Leisy Public School	1	6/1/02	Sheridan County School District #131	1
Leisy Public School	1	6/1/02	Ellsworth Public School	1
Hebron Public Schools	3	6/1/02	Thayer Central Community Schools	3
Chester-Hubbell-Byron Schools	3	6/1/02	Thayer Central Community Schools	3
Thayer Central Community Schools	3	6/1/02	Thayer Central Community Schools	3
2003				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Hanover Public School	1	8/1/03	Dist. 015-Adams County	1
Hanover Public School	1	8/1/03	Ayr Public School	1
Plum Center Public School	1	8/1/03	Cedar Rapids Public Schools	3
Plum Center Public School	1	8/1/03	Boone Central Schools	3
Plum Center Public School	1	8/1/03	St. Edward Public Schools	3
Dist. 501-Colfax County	1	7/1/03	Dist. 505-Colfax County	1
Macon Public School	1	8/1/03	Wilcox-Hildreth Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Macon Public School	1	8/1/03	Franklin Public Schools	3
Midvale Public School	1	6/1/03	Richland Public School	1
Midvale Public School	1	6/1/03	Burwell Elementary School	1
Midvale Public School	1	6/1/03	Dist. 070-Garfield County	1
Bethel Public School	1	8/1/03	Elwood Public Schools	3
Bethel Public School	1	8/1/03	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dustin Public School	1	6/1/03	Union Public School	1
Dist. 147-Holt County	1	6/1/03	Union Public School	1
Dist. 147-Holt County	1	6/1/03	Dist. 102-Holt County	1
Dist. 147-Holt County	1	6/1/03	Phoenix Public School	1
Amelia Public School	1	6/1/03	Clover Cove Public School	1
Dist. 007-Keith County	1	6/1/03	Ogallala Public Schools	3
Miller Public School	1	8/1/03	Hershey Public Schools	3
Miller Public School	1	8/1/03	North Platte Public Schools	3
Ringgold Public School	1	8/1/03	Tryon Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Table Rock-Steinauer Schools	2	6/1/03	Humboldt Table Rock Steinauer	3
Republican Valley Schools	3	8/1/03	Southwest Public Schools	3
Twin Valley Public Schools	2	8/1/03	Southwest Public Schools	3
Humboldt Public Schools	3	6/1/03	Humboldt Table Rock Steinauer	3
Humboldt/Table Rock Steinauer USD 7	3	6/1/03	Humboldt Table Rock Steinauer	3
Dist. 044-Saunders County	1	8/1/03	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Antioch Public School	1	6/1/03	Alliance Public Schools	3
Antioch Public School	1	6/1/03	Oshkosh Elementary School	1
Antioch Public School	1	6/1/03	Lakeside Public School	1
Roadside Public School	1	8/1/03	Rushville School	1
Roadside Public School	1	8/1/03	Alliance Public Schools	3
Roadside Public School	1	8/1/03	Hemingford Public Schools	3
2004				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Unified Niobrara-Lynch	3	8/1/04	Lynch Public Schools	3
Unified Niobrara-Lynch	3	8/1/04	Nobrara Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Westside Public School	1	8/1/04	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Linwood Public School	1	8/1/04	Garfield Public School	1
Champion Public School	1	7/15/04	Imperial Elementary School	1
Lodgepole Public Schools	2	6/1/04	Creek Valley Schools	3
Dist. 027-Dawson County	1	8/1/04	Cozad City Schools	3
Dist. 027-Dawson County	1	8/1/04	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Chappell Public Schools	3	6/1/04	Creek Valley Schools	3
River View Public School	1	6/1/04	Burwell Elementary School	1
River View Public School	1	6/1/04	Richland Public School	1
Greely Public Schools	2	6/1/04	Greeley-Wolbach Public Schools	3
Wolbach Public Schools	2	6/1/04	Greeley-Wolbach Public Schools	3
Dist. 165-Holt County	1	6/1/04	Chambers Public Schools	2
Dist. 165-Holt County	1	6/1/04	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Norden Public School	1	6/1/04	Spring View Public School	1
Burton Public School	1	6/1/04	Spring View Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Brownville Public School	1	8/1/04	Auburn Public Schools	3
MC Cartney Public School	1	8/1/04	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Otoe Public School	1	8/1/04	Syracuse-Dunbar-Avoca Schools	3
Dawson-Verdon Public Schools	3	8/1/04	Falls City Public Schools	3
Dawson-Verdon Schools	3	8/1/04	Humboldt Table Rock Steinauer	3
Emerson-Hubbard Public Schools	3	8/1/04	Emerson-Hubbard Public Schools	3
Guide Rock Public School	2	12/31/04	Superior Public Schools	3
2005				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Rising Star Public School	1	8/1/05	Juniata Elementary School	1
Center Valley Public School	1	8/1/05	Arthur Elementary School	1
Eddy's School	1	8/1/05	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Bruno Public School	1	6/1/05	David City Public Schools	3
Bruno Public School	1	6/1/05	East Butler Public Schools	3
Imperial Elementary School	1	6/1/05	Chase County Schools	3
Chase County High School	6	6/1/05	Chase County Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Lamar Public School	1	6/1/05	Chase County Schools	3
Brugh Public School	1	8/1/05	Fremont Public Schools	3
Waterloo Public Schools	3	6/1/05	Douglas Co West Community Schools	3
Valley Public Schools	3	6/1/05	Douglas Co West Community Schools	3
Ohiowa Public School	1	6/1/05	Fillmore Central Public Schools	3
Ohiowa Public School	1	6/1/05	Bruning-Davenport Unified System	2
West Valley Public School	1	8/1/05	Garden County Schools	1
Lewellen Public School	1	8/1/05	Garden County Schools	1
Oshkosh Elementary School	1	8/1/05	Garden County Schools	1
Lisco Public School	1	8/1/05	Garden County Schools	1
Meek Public School	1	6/1/05	Union Public School	1
Meek Public School	1	6/1/05	West Boyd Unified System	3
Meek Public School	1	6/1/05	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Phoenix Public School	1	6/1/05	Union Public School	1
Dist. 102-Holt County	1	6/1/05	Ridgeway Public School	1

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 102-Holt County	1	6/1/05	Pleasant View Public School	1
Dist. 102-Holt County	1	6/1/05	Union Public School	1
Lemoyne Public School	1	7/31/05	Ogallala Public Schools	3
Hill Public School	1	9/1/05	Bayard Public Schools	3
Hill Public School	1	9/1/05	Bridgeport Public Schools	3
Hazel Dell Public School	1	8/1/05	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Grant Public Schools	3	6/1/05	Perkins County Schools	3
Wheatland Public Schools	2	6/1/05	Perkins County Schools	3
Phelps District R6	1	6/1/05	Loomis Public Schools	2
Phelps Districts R6	1	6/1/05	Holdrege Public Schools	3
Sybrant Public School	1	8/1/05	Pony Lake Public School	1
Weston Public School	1	8/1/05	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Bee Public School	1	8/1/05	Seward Public Schools	3
Bee Public Schools	1	8/1/05	East Butler Public Schools	3
Gordon High School	6	6/1/05	Gordon-Rushville K-8 Schools	3
Gordon High School	6	6/1/05	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Rushville School	1	6/1/05	Gordon-Rushville K-8 Schools	1
Rushville High School	6	6/1/05	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Bingham Public School	1	7/31/05	Ashby Public School	1
Bingham Public School	1	7/31/05	Garden County Schools	1
Carleton Public School	1	6/1/05	Bruning-Davenport Unified System	2
Carleton Public School	1	6/1/05	Thayer Central Community Schools	3
Emerick Public School	1	6/1/05	Newman Grove Public Schools	3
Emerick Public School	1	6/1/05	Madison Public Schools	3
Emerick Public School	1	6/1/05	Elkhorn Valley Schools	3
Emerick Public School	1	6/1/05	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
2006				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Juniata Elementary School	1	6/15/06	Adams Central Public Schools	3
Holstein Public School	1	6/15/06	Silver Lake Public Schools	3
Holstein Public School	1	6/15/06	Adams Central Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Adams County	1	6/15/06	Adams Central Public Schools	3
Tri-View Public	1	6/15/06	Adams Central Public	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District Schools	Class
Ayr Public School	1	6/15/06	Adams Central Public Schools	3
Wallace Public School	1	6/15/06	Adams Central Public Schools	3
Valley View Public School	1	6/15/06	Orchard Public Schools	3
Valley View Public School	1	6/15/06	Neligh-Oakdale Schools	3
Sunnyside Public School	1	6/15/06	Plainview Public Schools	3
Sunnyside Public School	1	6/15/06	Neligh-Oakdale Schools	3
Arthur Elementary School	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Arthur Elementary School	1	6/15/06	Arthur County Schools	2
Arthur Elementary School	1	6/15/06	MC Pherson County Schools	3
Shell Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Newman Grove Public Schools	3
Shell Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Boone Central Schools	3
South Akron Public School	1	6/15/06	Boone Central Schools	3
Eastpoint Public School	1	6/15/06	Alliance Public Schools	3
Dist. 039-Box Butte County	1	6/15/06	Hemingford Public Schools	3
Dist. 039-Box	1	6/15/06	Alliance Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Butte County				
Dist. 042-Box Butte County	1	6/16/06	Alliance Public Schools	3
Dist. 044-Box Butte County	1	6/15/06	Alliance Public Schools	3
Raven Public School	1	6/15/06	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Highland Grove Public School	1	6/15/06	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Highland Grove Public School	1	6/15/06	Keya Paha County Schools	2
Buffalo Flats Public School	1	6/15/06	Ainsworth Community Schools	3
Odessa Public School	1	6/15/06	Elm Creek Public Schools	3
Odessa Public School	1	6/15/06	Kearney Public Schools	3
Riverdale Public School	1	6/15/06	Amherst Public Schools	2
Riverdale Public School	1	6/15/06	Pleasanton Public Schools	3
Riverdale Public School	1	6/15/06	Kearney Public Schools	3
Pleasant Hill Public School	1	6/15/06	Pleasanton Public Schools	3
Pleasant Hill Public School	1	6/15/06	Kearney Public Schools	3
Center Public School	1	6/15/06	Kearney Public Schools	3
Center Public	1	6/15/06	Gibbon Public Schools	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Stone Public School	1	6/15/06	Kearney Public Schools	3
Stone Public School	1	6/15/06	Gibbon Public Schools	3
Dist. 065-Buffalo County	1	6/15/06	Ravenna Public Schools	3
Dist. 065-Buffalo County	1	6/15/06	Gibbon Public Schools	3
Elm Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Lyons-Decatur Northeast Schools	3
Garfield Public School	1	6/15/06	David City Public Schools	3
Garfield Public School	1	6/15/06	Schuyler Community Schools	3
Abie Public School	1	6/15/06	East Butler Public Schools	3
Abie Public School	1	6/15/06	Schuyler Community Schools	3
Abie Public School	1	6/15/06	David City Public Schools	3
Stull Public School	1	6/15/06	Plattsmouth Community Schools	3
Manley Public School	1	6/15/06	Weeping Water Public Schools	3
Valentine City Schools	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Kewanee Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Simeon Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Wood Lake Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Crookston Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Pioneer Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Dist. 045-Cherry County	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Brownlee Public School	1	6/15/06	Theford Public Schools	2
Evergeen Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Merriman Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Merriman Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Sparks Public School	1	6/15/06	Keya Paha County Schools	2
Sparks Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Irwin Pubic School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Dist. 083-Cherry County	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Elsmere Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Goose Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Willow Valley Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Hart Lake Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Redmill Public School	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Boardman Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Carver Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Ballard Marsh Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Cutcomb Lake Public School	1	6/15/06	Valentine Community Schools	3
Lorenzo Public School	1	6/15/06	Sidney Public Schools	3
Dist. 077-Cheyenne County	1	6/15/06	Sidney Public Schools	3
Dist. 077-Cheyenne County	1	6/15/06	Leyton Public Schools	3
Richland Public School	1	6/15/06	Schuyler Community Schools	3
Schuyler Grade Schools	1	6/15/06	Schuyler Community Schools	3
Fisher's Public School	1	6/15/06	Schuyler Community Schools	3
Dist. 504-Colfax County	1	6/15/06	Schuyler Community Schools	3
Dist. 505-Colfax County	1	6/15/06	Schuyler Community Schools	3
Dist. 505-Colfax County	1	6/15/06	Clarkson Public Schools	3
Dist. 505-Colfax County	1	6/15/06	Leigh Community Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Beemer Public School	1	6/15/06	West Point Public Schools	3
Dist. 082-Cuming Couty	1	6/15/06	Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3
Dist. 082-Cuming County	1	6/15/06	Bancroft-Rosalie Community Schools	3
Dist. 082-Cuming County	1	6/15/06	West Point Public Schools	3
Dist. 082-Cuming County	1	6/15/06	Pender Public Schools	3
Tappan Valley Public School	1	6/15/06	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
New Hope Public School	1	6/15/06	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Round Hill Public School	1	6/15/06	Callaway Public Schools	3
Round Hill Public School	1	6/15/06	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
Round Hill Public School	1	6/15/06	Ansley Public Schools	3
Round Hill Public School	1	6/15/06	Sumner-Eddyville-Miller Schools	3
Mason City Public School	1	6/15/06	Litchfield Public Schools	2
Mason City Public School	1	6/15/06	Ansley Public Schools	3
Berwyn Public School	1	6/15/06	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
Berwyn Public School	1	6/15/06	Ansley Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Oconto Public School	1	6/15/06	Broken Bow Public Schools	3
Oconto Public School	1	6/15/06	Callaway Public Schools	3
Oconto Public Schools	1	6/15/06	Sumer-Eddyville-Miller Schools	3
Gates Public School	1	6/15/06	Anselmo-Merna Public Schools	3
Gates Public School	1	6/15/06	Sargent Pubic Schools	3
Jackson Public School	1	6/15/06	So Sioux Community Schools	3
Jackson Public School	1	6/15/06	Homer Community Schools	3
Jackson Public School	1	6/15/06	Ponca Public Schools	3
Alpha Public School	1	6/15/06	Chadron Public Schools	3
Alpha Public School	1	6/15/06	Hay Springs Public Schools	3
Valley Star Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Valley Star Public School	1	6/15/06	Crawford Public Schools	3
Belmont Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Belmont Public School	1	6/15/06	Crawford Public Schools	3
Belmont Public School	1	6/15/06	Hemingford Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Table Center Public School	1	6/15/06	Hemingford Public Schools	3
Table Center Public School	1	6/15/06	Chadron Public Schools	3
Antelope Public School	1	6/15/06	Hay Springs Public Schools	3
Antelope Public School	1	6/15/06	Chadron Public Schools	3
Trunk Butte Public School	1	6/15/06	Chadron Public Schools	3
Whitney Public School	1	6/15/06	Crawford Public Schools	3
Whitney Public School	1	6/15/06	Chadron Public Schools	3
Prairie Home Public School	1	6/15/06	Hay Springs Public Schools	3
Prairie Home Public School	1	6/15/06	Chadron Public Schools	3
Cottonwood Public School	1	6/15/06	Hemingford Public Schools	3
Dist. 013-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Dist. 013-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Cozad City Schools	3
Dist. 015-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dist. 015-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Elwood Public Schools	3
Dist. 016-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Cozad Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 016-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dist. 017-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Overton Public Schools	3
Dist. 017-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dist. 022-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Cozad City Schools	3
Dist. 022-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dist. 025-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dist. 029-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Eustis-Farnam Public Schools	3
Dist. 029-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Dist. 029-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Cozad City Schools	3
Dist. 044-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Cozad City Schools	3
Dist. 044-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Callaway Public Schools	3
Dist. 044-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Lexington Public Schools	3
Dist. 081-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Dist. 081-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Cozad Public Schools	3
Dist. 081-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Callaway Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 100-Dawson County	1	6/15/06	Gothenburg Public Schools	3
Strang Public School	1	6/15/06	Bruning Public Schools	2
Strang Public School	1	6/15/06	Shickley Public Schools	3
Strang Public School	1	6/15/06	Fillmore Central Public Schools	3
Garden County Schools	1	6/15/06	Garden County Schools	3
Richland Public School	1	6/15/06	Burwell Public Schools	3
Burwell Elementary School	1	6/15/06	Burwell Public Schools	3
Dist. 070-Garfield County	1	6/15/06	Burwell Public Schools	3
Hyannis Elementary School	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Vinton School	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Dist. 005-Grant County	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Ashby Public School	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Cedar Hollow Public Schools	1	6/15/06	Northwest Public Schools	3
Wood River Elementary School	1	6/15/06	Wood River Rural Schools	3
Alda Public School	1	6/15/06	Wood River Rural Schools	3
Plainview Public	1	6/15/06	Wood River Rural Schools	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 501-Hall County	1	6/15/06	Northwest Public Schools	3
Page Public School	1	6/15/06	Orchard Public Schools	3
Page Public School	1	6/15/06	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Page Public School	1	6/15/06	Ewing Public Schools	2
Redbird Public School	1	6/15/06	Lynch Public Schools	3
Redbird Public School	1	6/15/06	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Redbird Public School	1	6/15/06	West Holt Rural High School	6
Redbird Public School	1	6/15/06	Verdigre Public Schools	3
Emmet Public School	1	6/15/06	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Emmet Public School	1	6/15/06	West Holt Public Schools	3
Atkinson Elementary School	1	6/15/06	West Holt Public Schools	3
West Holt Rural High School	6	1/1/06	West Holt Public Schools	3
Inman Public School	1	6/15/06	Chambers Public Schools	3
Inman Public School	1	6/15/06	Ewing Public Schools	2

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Inman Public School	1	6/15/06	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Inman Public School	1	6/15/06	Orchard Public Schools	3
Starview Public School	1	6/15/06	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Opportunity Public School	1	6/15/06	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Union Public School	1	6/15/06	West Holt Public Schools	3
Pleasant View Public School	1	6/15/06	West Holt Public Schools	3
Dist. 009-Holt County	1	6/15/06	O'Neill Public Schools	3
Ridgeway Public School	1	6/15/06	West Holt Public Schools	3
Clover Cove Public School	1	6/15/06	West Holt Public Schools	3
Farwell Public School	1	6/15/06	St. Paul Public Schools	3
Farwell Public School	1	6/15/06	Elba Public Schools	2
Farwell Public School	1	6/15/06	Centura Public Schools	3
St. Libory Elementary School	1	6/15/06	Northwest Public Schools	3
Elk Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Humboldt Table Rock Steinauer	3
Elk Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Johnson-Brock Public Schools	3
Elk Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Tecumseh Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Keystone Public School	1	6/15/06	Paxton Consolidated Schools	3
Keystone Public School	1	6/15/06	Ogallala Public Schools	3
Pleasant View Public School	1	6/15/06	Keya Paha County Schools	2
Mills Public School	1	6/15/06	Keya Paha County Schools	2
Spring View Public School	1	6/15/06	Keya Paha County Schools	2
Oak Valley Public School	1	6/15/06	Malcolm Public Schools	3
Middle Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Milford Public Schools	3
Haines Branch Public School	1	6/15/06	Lincoln Public Schools	3
Rokeby Public School	1	6/15/06	Crete Public Schools	3
Rokeby Public School	1	6/15/06	Lincoln Public Schools	4
Rokeby Public School	1	6/15/06	Norris School District 160	3
Cheney Public School	1	6/15/06	Norris School District 160	3
Cheney Public School	1	6/15/06	Lincoln Public Schools	4
Olive Branch Public School	1	6/15/06	Crete Public Schools	3
Olive Branch Public School	1	6/15/06	Wilber-Clatonia Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Hall Public School	1	6/15/06	North Platte Public Schools	3
Hall Public Schools	1	6/15/06	MC Pherson County Schools	3
Hall Public Schools	1	6/15/06	Stapleton Public Schools	3
Hall Public Schools	1	6/15/06	Hershey Public Schools	3
Hall Public Schools	1	6/15/06	Maxwell Public Schools	3
Platte Valley Public School	1	6/15/06	Hershey Public Schools	3
Platte Valley Public School	1	6/15/06	North Platte Public Schools	3
Lake Maloney Public School	1	6/15/06	Maywood Public Schools	3
Lake Maloney Public School	1	6/15/06	North Platte Public Schools	3
Rosedale Public School	1	6/15/06	North Platte Public Schools	3
Rosedale Public School	1	6/15/06	Hershey Public Schools	3
Rosedale Public School	1	6/15/06	Sutherland Public Schools	3
Rosedale Public School	1	6/15/06	MC Pherson County Schools	3
Sunny Meadow Public School	1	6/15/06	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
Sunny Meadow Public School	1	6/15/06	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Winter Public School	1	6/15/06	Pierice Public Schools	3
Winter Public School	1	6/15/06	Norfolk Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dederman Public School	1	6/15/06	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Warnerville Public School	1	6/15/06	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
Warnerville Public School	1	6/15/06	Madison Public Schools	3
Reiche Public School	1	6/15/06	Battle Creel Public Schools	3
Reiche Public School	1	6/15/06	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Reiche Public School	1	6/15/06	Madison Public Schools	3
Good Cheer Public School	1	6/15/06	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
Good Cheer Public School	1	6/15/06	Stanton Community Schools	3
Good Cheer Public School	1	6/15/06	Madison Public Schools	3
Good Cheer Public School	1	6/15/06	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Cloverleaf Public School	1	6/15/06	Elkhorn Valley Schools	3
Cloverleaf Public School	1	6/15/06	Newman Grove Public Schools	3
Cloverleaf Public School	1	6/15/06	Boone Central Schools	3
Kalamazoo Public School	1	6/15/06	Newman Grove Public Schools	3
Kalamazoo Public School	1	6/15/06	Humphrey Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Kalamazoo Public School	1	6/15/06	Madison Public Schools	3
Kalamazoo Public School	1	6/15/06	Battle Creek Public Schools	3
Tryon Public School	1	6/15/06	MC Pherson County Schools	3
Daly Public School	1	6/15/06	Arthur County Schools	2
Daly Public School	1	6/15/06	MC Pherson County Schools	3
Starr Public School	1	6/15/06	MC Pherson County Schools	3
Starr Public	1	6/15/06	MC Pherson County Schools	2
Chapman-Dist 9	1	6/15/06	Northwest Public Schools	3
Angora Public School	1	6/15/06	Bridgeport Public Schools	3
Angora Public School	1	6/15/06	Bayard Public Schools	3
Angora Public School	1	6/15/06	Alliance Public Schools	3
Broadwater Public School	1	6/15/06	Leyton Public Schools	3
Broadwater Public School	1	6/15/06	Bridgeport Public Schools	3
Shady Nook Public School	1	6/15/06	Twin River Public Schools	3
Shady Nook Public School	1	6/15/06	Fullerton Public Schools	3
Belgrade Public School	1	6/15/06	Fullerton Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Belgrade Public School	1	6/15/06	Cedar Rapids Public Schools	3
Locust Grove Public School	1	6/15/06	Auburn Public Schools	3
Nelson Public Schools	3	3/10/06	Lawrence/Nelson Public Schools	3
Lawrence Public Schools	3	3/10/06	Lawrence/Nelson Public Schools	3
Smallfoot Public School	1	6/15/06	Nebraska City Public Schools	3
Smallfoot Public School	1	6/15/06	Syracuse-Dunbar-Avoca Schools	3
Unadilla Public School	1	6/15/06	Syracuse-Dunbar-Avoca Schools	3
Funk Public School	1	6/15/06	Holdrege Public Schools	3
Funk Public School	1	6/15/06	Axtell Community Schools	3
Phelps District R4	1	6/15/06	Overton Public Schools	3
Phelps District R4	1	6/15/06	Loomis Public Schools	2
Phelps District R4	1	6/15/06	Holdrege Public Schools	3
Phelps District R4	1	6/15/06	Kearney Public Schools	3
Phelps District R4	1	6/15/06	Elm Creek Public Schools	3
Phelps District R7	1	6/15/06	Loomis Public Schools	2
Phelps District R7	1	6/15/06	Holdrege Public Schools	3
Hadar Public School	1	6/15/06	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Hadar Public School	1	6/15/06	Pierce Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Dist. 033-Platte County	1	6/15/06	Humphrey Public Schools	3
Dist. 033-Platte County	1	6/15/06	Lakeview Community Schools	3
Dist. 033-Platte County	1	6/15/06	Leigh Community Schools	3
Fitch Public School	1	6/15/06	Southwest Public Schools	3
Fitch Public School	1	6/15/06	MC Cook Public Schools	3
Fitch Public School	1	6/15/06	Culbertson Public Schools	3
Dist. 041-Red Willow County	1	6/15/06	MC Cook Public Schools	3
Maple Grove Public School	1	6/15/06	Falls City Public Schools	3
Newport Public School	1	6/15/06	Rock County Public Schools	3
Pony Lake Public School	1	6/15/06	Rock County Public Schools	3
Pleasant Hill Public School	1	6/15/06	Rock County Public Schools	3
Rose Public School	1	6/15/06	Rock County Public Schools	3
Basset Grade School	1	6/15/06	Keya Paha Count Schools	2
Basset Grade School	1	6/15/06	Rock County Public Schools	3
Valley View Public School	1	6/15/06	Crete Public Schools	3
Diamond Public School	1	6/15/06	Crete Public Schools	3
Diamond Public	1	6/15/06	Dorchester Public Schools	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Western Public School	1	6/15/06	Meridian Public Schools	3
Western Public School	1	6/15/06	Tri County Public Schools	3
Clear Creek Public School	1	6/15/06	Ashland-Greenwood Public Schools	3
Platteville Public School	1	6/15/06	Fremont Public Schools	3
Standard Public School	1	6/15/06	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Standard Public School	1	6/15/06	Mead Public Schools	3
Malmo Public School	1	6/15/06	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Ithaca Public School	1	6/15/06	Wahoo Public Schools	3
South Central Public School	1	6/15/06	Wahoo Public Schools	3
Touhy Public School	1	6/15/06	East Butler Public Schools	3
Touhy Public School	1	6/15/06	Prague Public Schools	2
Touhy Public School	1	6/15/06	Raymond Central Public Schools	3
North Star Public School	1	6/15/06	East Butler Public Schools	3
North Star Public School	1	6/15/06	Raymond Central Public Schools	3
Highland Public	1	6/15/06	Scottsbluff Public Schools	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Wheatland Public School	1	6/15/06	Morrill Public Schools	3
Haig Public School	1	6/15/06	Gering Public Schools	3
Haig Pubic School	1	6/15/06	Scottsbluff Public Schools	3
Cedar Canyon Public School	1	6/15/06	Gering Public Schools	3
Lake Minatare Public School	1	6/15/06	Scottsbluff Public Schools	3
Lake Alice Public School	1	6/15/06	Scottsbluff Public Schools	3
Gordon-Rushville K-8 Schools	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Prairie View Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Clinton Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Mirage Flats Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Mirage Flats Public School	1	6/15/06	Hay Springs Public Schools	3
Banner Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Fieldside Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Lakeside Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Lakesie Public School	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Lakeside Public	1	6/15/06	Garden County Schools	3

Dissolved District School	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Lakeside Public School	1	6/15/06	Alliance Public Schools	3
Ellsworth Public School	1	6/15/06	Garden County Schools	3
Ellsworth Public School	1	6/15/06	Hyannis Area Schools	3
Extension Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3
Sheridan County School District #131	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public	3
Boiling Springs Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public	3
Golden Rule Public School	1	6/15/06	Gordon-Rushville Public	3
Hazard Public School	1	6/15/06	Ravenna Public Schools	3
Hazard Public School	1	6/15/06	Pleasanton Public Schools	3
Hazard Public School	1	6/15/06	Litchfield Public Schools	3
Glen Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Bodarc Public	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Harrison Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Curly Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Pink Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District Schools	Class
Hillview Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Panhandle Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Chalk Butte Public School	1	6/15/06	Sioux County Public Schools	3
Duffy Public School	1	6/15/06	Leigh Community Schools	3
Duffy Public School	1	6/15/06	Norfolk Public Schools	3
Duffy Public School	1	6/15/06	Stanton Community Schools	3
Duffy Public School	1	6/15/06	Madison Public Schools	3
Thedford Elementary Schools	1	6/15/06	Thedford Public Schools	2
Valleyside Public School	1	6/15/06	North Loup Scotia Public Schools	3
Valleyside Public School	1	6/15/06	Ord Public Schools	3
Vinton Public School	1	6/15/06	Ord Public Schools	3
Fairplay Public School	1	6/15/06	Burwell Public Schools	3
Fairplay Public School	1	6/15/06	Ord Public Schools	3
Elyria Public School	1	6/15/06	Ord Public Schools	3

Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Elyria Public School	1	6/15/06	Burwell Public Schools	3
2007				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Butte Public Schools	2	6/1/07	West Boyd School District	3
Spencer-Naper Public Schools	3	6/1/07	West Boyd School District	3
West Boyd Unified System	3	6/1/07	West Boyd School District	3
Stratton Public Schools	2	5/25/07	Dundy CO Stratton Public Schools	3
Tecumseh Public Schools	3	5/31/07	Johnson CO Central Public Schools	3
Nemaha Valley Schools	3	5/31/07	Johnson CO Central Public Schools	3
2008				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Culbertson Public Schools	3	6/1/08	Hitchcock County School System	3
Trenton Public Schools	3	6/1/08	Hitchcock County School System	3
Hitchcock County Unified School System	3	6/1/08	Hitchcock County School System	3
2009				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
SE Nebraska Consolidated Schools	3	1/1/09	Humboldt Table Rock Steinauer	3
2010				
Dissolved District	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
Prague Public	2	6/1/10	East Butler Public Schools	3

Dissolved District Schools	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
2011				
Dissolved District Rising City Public Schools	Class 2	Dissolution Date 5/23/11	Receiving District Shelby Public Schools	Class 3
Clay Center Public Schools	3	7/31/11	Sandy Creek Public Schools	3
2012				
Dissolved District Howells Public Schools	Class 3	Dissolution Date 6/1/12	Receiving District Howells-Dodge Public Schools	Class 3
Dodge Public Schools	3	6/1/12	Howells-Dodge Public Schools	3
2013				
Dissolved District No dissolutions	Class	Dissolution Date	Receiving District	Class
2014				
Dissolved District Cedar Rapids Public School	Class 3	Dissolution Date 8/1/2014	Receiving District Riverside Public Schools	Class 3
Coleridge Community Schools	3	8/1/2014	Laurel-Concord-Coleridge Public Schools	3
Newcastle Public Schools	3	8/1/2014	Hartington-Newcastle Public Schools	3
Greeley-Wolbach Public Schools	3	8/1/2014	Central Valley Public Schools	3
Spalding Public Schools	3	8/1/2014	Riverside Public Schools	3
North Loup Scotia Public Schools	3	8/1/2014	Central Valley Public Schools	3

Appendix B

Survey Questions

**Survey of the History of Public School Reorganization in Nebraska
Over the Past 30 Years**

Survey Purpose: The purpose of this research study is to trace the past 30 years of reorganization of school districts in public schools in Nebraska.

Directions: Please mark one response for each question outlined below in Part 1 through Part 6.

*What year did your school district last reorganize? _____

*Has your school district gone through a unification? **Yes** _____ **No** _____

*If it did, what year did this occur? _____

*Has your school district become a member of a Learning Community?
Yes _____ **No** _____

*Place an X on the current classification of your school district.

A _____ B _____ C _____ D _____

Part 1: Enrollment

1. What level of importance did your school enrollment factor into your reorganization?

_____ **Very Important** _____ **Important** _____ **Somewhat Important**
_____ **Not Important** _____ **Don't Know**

2. Did your reorganization increase your enrollment?

_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**

3. Did your reorganization decrease your enrollment?

_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**

4. Did your reorganization allow your school site to continue to be open?

_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**

5. Did your reorganization force an attendance center to close?

_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**

6. Did the other school district have a larger enrollment than yours?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
7. Did the other school district have a smaller enrollment than yours?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
8. Did the other school district have an enrollment about the same as yours?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**

Part 2: Finances

9. Did school finances play a role in why you went through reorganization?
_____ **Very Important** _____ **Important** _____ **Somewhat Important**
_____ **Not Important** _____ **Don't Know**
10. Was your school district in bad shape financially at the time of the reorganization?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
11. Did you reorganize to stabilize your finances?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
12. By reorganizing, did your district's finances improve?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
13. By reorganizing, did your district's finances get worse?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
14. Did your overall valuation improve by the reorganization?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
15. Did your reorganization cause your overall valuation to get worst?
_____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**

16. Did your reorganization force you to a levy override?
 _____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
17. Did you receive incentive money to reorganize?
 _____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**
18. Did money as an incentive, factor into your decision to reorganize?
 _____ **YES** _____ **NO** _____ **Don't Know**

Part 3: Improving Student Opportunities

19. Did your reorganization increase academic opportunities for your students?
 _____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**
20. Did your reorganization decrease academic opportunities for your students?
 _____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**
21. Did your reorganization increase athletic opportunities for your students?
 _____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**
22. Did your reorganization decrease athletic opportunities for your students?
 _____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**
23. Did your reorganization increase activity opportunities for your students?
 _____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**
24. Did your reorganization decrease activity opportunities for your students?
 _____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

Part 4: Legislative Decisions

25. Was a decision made by the Legislature prominent in your reorganization?

_____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

26. Did a change in the TEEOSA (state funding formula) force your district into a reorganization?

_____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

Part 5: Staffing

27. Did the reorganization of your district have an impact upon staffing?

_____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

28. Did teachers in your school district lose their jobs because of the reorganization?

_____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

29. Did your school district gain staff by the reorganization?

_____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

Part 6: Community

30. Did the reorganization have a positive impact on your community?

_____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

31. Did the reorganization have a negative impact on your community?

_____ **To a Great Degree** _____ **To a Moderate Degree** _____ **To Some Degree**
 _____ **Not At All**

Part 7: Open Ended Question

32. If there is anything this survey didn't ask that we need to know about your reorganization, please comment below.

Thank you for sharing your insight about school district reorganization in Nebraska!

Appendix C

Letter to Survey Participants

December 2, 2014

Dear School Administrator,

I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. I am asking for your assistance in completing a survey for my dissertation. I am gathering evidence on the past 30 years of school reorganization in Nebraska. You have been selected to receive this letter as your school district has gone through some form of reorganization in the past 30 years. I have attached a survey of general questions related to the reorganization that your district has gone through.

Your responses on this survey are very important and will further the understanding of reorganization of schools in Nebraska. This survey should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. I ask that you complete the on-line survey as soon as possible. There are no known risks associated with participating in this survey. Benefits include the opportunity for you to reflect upon the impact that reorganization has had on your school district. The Individual school district names will not be used.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to ask questions and have them answered before or after filling out the survey. If you do have questions about the survey or the study, please contact me using the information that is below. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Jody Isernhagen. By returning the completed survey instrument, you will be considered as giving consent to participate in the study.

I want to thank you in advance for your participation. The information that will be obtained from this survey will help school administrators, school board members and legislators in Nebraska better understand school reorganization over the past 30 years in Nebraska.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at cworrell@esu7.org or 402-395-2134. Sometimes study participants have questions or concerns about their rights. In that case you should call the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at 402-472-6965.

Click here to indicate you are willing to participate in the survey _____. By clicking here you are giving your informed consent to participate in the survey.

Sincerely,

Cory Worrell
Superintendent
Boone Central Schools
605 S 6th St. PO Box 391
Albion, NE 68620

Dr. Jody Isernhagen
Associate Professor-University of
Nebraska-Lincoln
Educational Administration
132 Teachers College
Lincoln, NE 68588

Appendix D

Survey Reminder Letter

December 2, 2014

Dear School Administrator,

As a reminder, I am gathering evidence as a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. I am asking for your assistance in completing a survey for my dissertation. I am gathering evidence on the past 30 years of school reorganization in Nebraska. You have been selected to receive this letter as your school district has gone through some form of reorganization in the past 30 years. I have attached a survey of general questions related to the reorganization that your district has gone through.

Your responses on this survey are very important and will further the understanding of reorganization of schools in Nebraska. This survey should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. I ask that you complete the on-line survey as soon as possible. There are no known risks associated with participating in this survey. Benefits include the opportunity for you to reflect upon the impact that reorganization has had on your school district. The Individual school district names will not be used.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to ask questions and have them answered before or after filling out the survey. If you do have questions about the survey or the study, please contact me using the information that is below. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Jody Isernhagen. By returning the completed survey instrument, you will be considered as giving consent to participate in the study.

I want to thank you in advance for your participation. The information that will be obtained from this survey will help school administrators, school board members and legislators in Nebraska better understand school reorganization over the past 30 years in Nebraska.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at cworrell@esu7.org or 402-395-2134. Sometimes study participants have questions or concerns about their rights. In that case you should call the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at 402-472-6965.

Click here to indicate you are willing to participate in the survey [_____](#). By clicking here you are giving your informed consent to participate in the survey.

Sincerely,
Cory Worrell
Superintendent
Boone Central Schools
605 S 6th St. PO Box 391
Albion, NE 68620

Dr. Jody Isernhagen
Associate Professor-University of Nebraska-
Lincoln
Educational Administration
132 Teachers College
Lincoln, NE 68588

Appendix E

Interview Letter, IRB Approval and Interview Questions



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SCIENCES
Department of Educational Administration

November _____, 2014

Dear _____,

I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. You were selected to participate in this interview because of your involvement in education in Nebraska. Your position allows you to see school reorganization up close and gives you a unique perspective. Your responses to the questions will be transcribed and cited in my doctoral dissertation.

I would like to schedule a time for a face-to-face interview with you. The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to complete. There are no known risks associated with participating in this interview. Benefits include the opportunity for you to reflect on the impact reorganization has had upon districts in the state of Nebraska. The information that I collect from this interview will be shared in my dissertation to better understand reorganization the past 30 years.

You are considered an expert on school reorganization. Your name will not be used in this study. However, you have the right to choose to allow me to use your name in this study if you so desire. You have the right to ask questions and have them answered before taking part in the interview. If you do have questions please call or send me an e-mail using the personal information below. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Jody Isernhagen using the information below.

Please sign the attached agreement indicating whether you are willing to participate in the interviews and place it in the self addressed envelope provided. By completing this interview request, you will have identified whether or not you consent to participate.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without harming your relationship with the researchers or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, or your institution or in any other way receive a penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

I will contact you once you have given consent to participate in this study to confirm a time and date that is convenient for you to participate in an interview. A copy of the interview questions are provided with this letter. The information that will be obtained from the interviews will help school administrators, school board members and legislators in Nebraska better understand school reorganization over the past 30 years in Nebraska.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at cworrell@esu7.org or 402-395-2134. Sometimes study participants have questions or concerns about their rights. In that case you should call the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at 402-472-6965.

I am looking forward to visiting with you and exploring the past 30 years of reorganization in Nebraska.

Sincerely,

Cory Worrell
Superintendent
Boone Central Schools
605 S 6th St. PO Box 391
Albion, NE 68620
cworrell@esu7.org
402-395-2134

Dr. Jody Isernhagen
Associate Professor
Educational Administration
132 Teachers College Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588
jisernhagen3@unl.edu
402-472-1088

Interview Questions

1. What have been the key factors that have led to school reorganization in Nebraska since you have been in your current position?
2. In what ways do you believe Nebraska is unique as a state in regards to how reorganization is impacted by factors within the state?
3. What role do you believe the state legislature currently has in regards to school reorganization in Nebraska?
4. What key elements exist in the future that may lead to the need for reorganization?
5. What factors do you believe will influence school reorganization in Nebraska in the future?
6. How do you see school reorganization impacting Nebraska schools in the future?

Appendix F

Interview Consent Form

Cory Worrell
 Superintendent
 Boone Central Schools
 605 S 6th St. PO Box 391

Dr. Jody Isernhagen
 Associate Professor
 Educational Administration
 132 Teachers College

The History of Nebraska Public School Reorganization over the past 30 years and how this history might be used to predict Nebraska school reorganization in the future.

Participant Name: _____

Please respond to the following questions and return in the enclosed, postage-paid envelope as the attached Informed Consent Form for participation in this study.

_____ Yes, I would be willing to participate in the interview.

During the week of January 12th, 2015, the following times would be convenient for an interview:

(1st Choice) Date _____ Time _____

(2nd Choice) Date _____ Time _____

(Possible Date/Time that the week of _____)

Date _____ Time _____

Telephone Numbers: _____

Signature _____

Thank you for considering to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, please return this information and the attached signed Informed Consent form to Cory Worrell using the enclosed postage-paid envelope.