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Appendix four reports a meaning for area development programs under a concept of total education for action, and shows the sixteen merged educational areas as developed over the period 1966-'68.
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AREA DEVELOPMENT: A NEW CAUSE FOR LAND-GRANT SCHOOLS?

I. INTRODUCTION

I have called area development a "cause," because the work has its champions and its critics. Possibly, for some, the word "direction" would be preferred. For purposes here, either term fits.

Now let me expose my hand before I play it. I propose to argue:
(1) that area development may get top billing in the near future from land-grant schools; (2) that area development work is in keeping with land-grant school philosophy; (3) that land-grant schools enjoy a comparative advantage, if they choose to work in area development, but (4) that problems of organizing for effective area development certainly exist and are not to be lightly regarded.

Yet, and in short, I propose to change the question mark in the title to an exclamation point.

II. A NEW CAUSE OR DIRECTION FOR TODAY?

Current causes universities have chosen to champion include: (1) urban development, (2) minority group problems, (3) under developed countries, and (4) domestic area development. Of the four, probably in the last two land-grant schools enjoy a comparative advantage. Of these two, if the U.S. economy becomes less buoyant, possibly only the last one, domestic area development, will receive public support at state and local levels.

If our "grass roots" schools of the people seek to serve future generations as past generations have been served, greater attention to area development may be required.

III. AREA DEVELOPMENT AND LAND-GRANT PHILOSOPHY, DO THEY GO TOGETHER?

Is area development in keeping with land-grant school tradition? I believe so.

Land-grant school philosophy calls for helping "the people" (which meant, 100 years ago, "the rural people") solve "critical problems" (which were, 100 years ago, "domestic food problems").

Over the past century the major problems attacked included problems of training, problems of production, and problems of learning new ways of doing old things. Principles contained in original land-grant school philosophy provided the rationale to support attack on these three problems.
Today, these same principles can justify a present day attack on problems of training, production and learning. The only adjustment needed in the philosophy being considered is to be explicit about basic principles which have by now become implicit in land-grant school action. Being explicit about basic principles makes re-examination of the role of land-grant schools much easier. Today's critical problems of training, production, and re-learning are really not vastly different from yesterday's.

IV. A COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE TO DO AREA DEVELOPMENT, DO LAND-GRANT SCHOOLS HAVE THIS?

A. What is it?

Area development can be defined as dealing with a bit of geography and its attached human and non-human attributes. Because the area approach focuses on people not pastures, area development seeks to help people in an area to a richer life. Land-grant schools, have been concerned for agricultural people because these people have been both numerous and needy. Within area development, concern now would be shown for people in their environment and over their life span, instead of in their agricultural economic sector and over their agricultural production activities.

Under area development the pie of human problems would be cut into geographic areas, not into economic sectors. By this suggested change, one would examine and work with all relevant aspects of area inter-action, not just economic activity or physical phenomena. Within an area approach the impact on popular behavior of ethnic sub-cultures and their traditions could be examined.

B. Can land-grant schools do it better?

Because of the kind of "going concern" that the land-grant system is, a rather simple shift in emphasis is all that is needed for pursuit of area development. Because this minor change is all that is needed, this would appear to give the land-grant school a comparative advantage over other universities when doing area development. Land-grant schools already are accustomed to involvement with the rank and file of our people and their problems. Land-grant schools currently have staff committed to the philosophy of helping these people help themselves. The nation's land-grant schools, because of their kinds of teaching, research and extension, already have extensive off-campus activities, and have strong support from people being served. All that is needed is inter-disciplinary area concern instead of intra-disciplinary commodity or economic sector concern.
V. FOCUSING ON AREA DEVELOPMENT, CAN IT BE HANDLED IN THE LAND-GRAANT STRUCTURES?

A. The land-grant organization problem

One needs to be aware of problems and difficulties of university re-direction. Staff and administrators face the same problems of any large organization when re-direction of activity is suggested. Because of the nature of present-day university organization, numerous problems present themselves when staff and administrators contemplate developing inter-disciplinary area studies and educational programs.

As one of my colleagues says, "People have problems and colleges have departments." In the environment of the present-day university, a group of scholars trained in subject-matter disciplines and responsible to given departments, find inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary research, teaching and extension strange, to say the least. Launching successful inter-disciplinary and inter-departmental studies for area development is not easy. However, these studies can be developed for they are being developed by several land-grant schools including South Dakota State University.

B. The area delimiting problem

Assuming a University can organize a portion of its teaching, research and extension programs for focus on area development problems, for practical and operational purposes, how is an area to be defined for study and for extension work?

In large part, the answer lies in the word, "homogeneity." Within the chosen area, certain similarities among the people are needed. Included among needed similarities is an area focus on a central city or trade center.

Because an area must be big enough to be "workable," that is to say, capable of achieving objectives set for it, a central city is needed to give economic focus. But how big an area around the city is needed? Further, what are area objectives?

Practically speaking, a "workable" area is usually bigger than one county, and smaller than a state. Area development is generally a group of counties seeking common objectives of development focused on a central city for economic activity.

C. The problem of development objectives

What, then are these "development objectives?"
Though I am an economist, note I have not said anywhere, so far, that area development is equated to area economic development. Neither have I said that the richer or fuller life to be sought for an area equates to economic or materialistic objectives. I think that shows remarkable restraint.

In our democratic society, a large dose of individualism is encouraged, and this individualism dictates a permissive kind of development. In our democracy, "grass roots" development is sought. Therefore, a large element of "permissive localism" would exist within the concept of what are and what are not area development objectives.

Area development programs certainly include varying amounts of cultural, social, religious, economic and educational development. Therefore, development for a given area may have certain unique qualities common to the culture and the people of the area. The development sought is really a process of living, a process of expansion of interests. Collective and individual achievements within the area which are in keeping with the popular will of the area is workable area development.

Certainly in today's world, a significant portion of the interests, concerns, and achievements within the area would be economic.

D. The functional economic area approach

The functional economic area approach may be desired. Such an area for economic development needs a cluster of economic activities and a mobile people within the area.

For 99 Iowa counties and three million Iowans, Karl Fox, Head, Department of Economics, Iowa State University, has determined about 12 functional economic areas each having a "central city" and a surrounding area running about 50 miles in each direction.

In these functional economic areas are contained home to work commuting patterns, as well as shopping patterns.

By studying these Iowa areas, each with a certain rural-urban component, each with a certain set of internal homogeneties and consistencies, one sees area socio-economic inter-action and hence one sees the inter-dependencies of rural-urban groups within each area plus the connective socio-economic tissue relating area to area.

E. How might a land-grant school organize for success in overcoming problems of focusing on area development?
To conquer problems mentioned, staff and administrators might begin by: (1) organizing groups of staff within the university to assess possibilities for doing effective area development work, (2) seeking stable and functioning areas so as to define terms like "workable areas and "acceptable" areas for a given state, and (3) seeking to define area objectives.

To date, no one has found this to come easily. Planning for area programs requires involvement of numerous staff members and off-campus leaders for both creative planning and for "legitimizing" focus on any set of area problems.

The ground gained to date by most land-grant schools seems to be secure. The foreseeable future course to follow appears clear.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me say I exposed my hand at the beginning. After that opening exposure, I hope I played my cards clearly.

The main points to be made on the subject of area development work by land-grant schools appear to be the following.

One, intra-state area development seems especially needed in the sparsely populated non-metropolitan areas of the West North Central United States. The land-grant schools by undertaking area development can perform an effective service for people of the state. Because of this, these land-grant schools will probably be giving area development work high priority ratings in the future.

Two, area development work is in keeping with land-grant school philosophy.

Three, land-grant schools probably have a comparative advantage when it comes to doing effective area development.

Four, special care needs to be exercised in planning, "legitimizing," organizing, and delivering. The first area development program needs to be a resounding success.
Howard, Winneshiek, Allamakee
Chickasaw, Fayette, Clayton
HOWARD COUNTY
IOWA

scale: ½" = 1 mi.

1. Turkey Valley Comm.
3. Riceville Comm.
WINNEBEG COUNTY
IOWA
scale: \(\frac{1}{4}" = 1 \text{ mi.}\)

- or - Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Turkey Valley Comm.
5. South Winneshiek Comm.
7. Decorah Comm.
Allamakee County
Iowa

Scale: 1" = 1 mi.

Or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

4. MFL Comm.
5. South Winneshiek Comm.

Waukon
CHICKASAW COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

☉ or ☉ Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
1. Turkey Valley Comm.
3. Charles City Comm.
4. Sumner Comm.
5. Fredericksburg Comm.
7. Tripoli Comm.
1. Turkey Valley Comm.
2. North Fayette County Comm.
4. Summer Comm.
5. Valley Comm.
7. Wapsie Valley Comm.
8. Oelwein Comm.
10. Fayette Comm.

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
CLAYTON COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{\text{mi}} = 1 \text{ mile} \)

or: Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

2. Garnavillo Comm.
4. MFL Comm.
5. Starmont Comm.
II ACC

Winnebago, Worth, Mitchell
Hancock, Cerro Gordo, Floyd
Wright, Franklin, Butler
or • Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Forest City Comm.
2. Woden-Crystal Lake Comm.
4. Thompson Comm.
5. Lake Mills Comm.
6. Rake Comm.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

5. Lake Mills Comm.
6. Forest City Comm.
MITCHELL COUNTY

scale 1 = 1 mi.

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

2. Osage Comm.
3. Riceville Comm.
5. Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock Comm.

[Map of Mitchell County with designated areas and cities labeled.]
HANCOCK COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} '' = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

\( \circ \) or \( \cdot \) Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

\( \boxed{\text{In an Independent or Consolidated High School District}} \)

1. Forest City-Leland Comm.
2. Woden-Crystal Lake Comm.
5. Ventura Comm.
7. Mesarvey Thornton Comm.
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Ventura Comm.
5. Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock Comm.
6. Forest City-Leland Comm.
7. Sheffield-Chapin Comm.
10. Mason City Ind.

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
FLOYD COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 m.

⊙ or ○ Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Charles City Comm.
2. Osage Comm.
5. Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock Comm.
WRIGHT COUNTY
IOWA
scale: 1" = 1 mi.

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Eagle Grove Comm.
2. Goldfield Comm.
5. Meservey Thornton Comm.
7. Dows Comm.
9. Webster City Comm.
10. Clarion Ind.
FRANKLIN COUNTY

IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

4. Dows Comm.
5. Alden Comm.
6. Iowa Falls Comm.
7. Sheffield-Chapin Comm.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Nashua Comm.
2. Plainfield Comm.
3. Clarksdale Comm.
5. Allison-Bristow Comm.
6. Aplington Comm.
7. Ackley Comm.
10. Greene Comm.
III ACC
Dickinson, Emmet, Kossuth
Clay, Palo Alto
DICKINSON COUNTY
IOWA
scale: 1" = 1 mi.

- Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
- In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Lake Park Comm.
2. Spirit Lake Comm.
4. Terril Comm.
5. Milford Comm.

[Map of Dickinson County showing districts]
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Armstrong Comm.
2. Lincoln Central Comm.
4. Terril Comm.
5. Graettinger Comm.
6. Ringsted Ind.

EMMET COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} \) " = 1 mi.
KOSSUTH COUNTY
(NORTH)
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} " = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

- Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
- In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Armstrong Comm.
2. Svea City Comm.
3. Ledyard Comm.
4. Buffalo Center Comm.
KOSSUTH COUNTY
(SOUTH)
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

7. Sentral Comm.
10. West Bend Comm.
11. Titonka Con.
12. Lakota Con.

Algona
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

- Sioux Rapids Comm.
- South Clay Comm.
- Ruthven Cons.
- Terril Comm.
- Milford Comm.
- Everly Comm.
- Hartley Comm.
- Spencer Comm.
- Royal Comm.
- Sutherland Comm.
- Sioux Valley Comm.
- Greenville-Rossie Con.
Palo Alto County
Iowa

Scale: \( \frac{1}{4} \) = 1 mi.

- Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
- In an Independent or Consolidated High School District.

1. West Bend Comm.
3. Ruthven Ccs.
4. Terril Comm.
5. Graettinger Comm.
7. Sentral Comm.
8. Cylinder Con.
9. Ayrshire Con.
IV AVS
Lyon, Osceola
Sioux, O'Brien
LYON COUNTY
IOWA
scale: \( \frac{1}{2''} = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. West Lyon Comm.
2. Central Lyon Comm.
3. Little Rock Comm.
5. George Comm.

[Map of Lyon County, Iowa, showing the locations of the communities mentioned, with symbols indicating whether they are in a high school district or not.]
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Harris Comm.
2. Ocheyedan Comm.
3. Little Rock Comm.
5. Melvin Comm.
7. Sibley Ind.
SIOUX COUNTY
IOWA

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

scale: 1/4" = 1 mi.

1. West Lyon Comm.
2. Maurice-Orange City Comm.
3. Floyd Valley Comm.
5. George Comm.
8. Sioux Center Comm.
9. West Sioux Comm.
O'BRIEN COUNTY
IOWA

scale: $\frac{1}{4}'' = 1$ mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Sutherland Comm.
2. Paullina Comm.
3. Floyd Valley Comm.
5. Melvin Comm.
7. Sanborn Comm.
10. Royal Comm.
V ACC

Buena Vista, Pocahontas, Humboldt
Wright, Sac, Calhoun
Webster, Hamilton, Carroll, Greene
BUENA VISTA COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \(\frac{\text{1"}}{\text{1 mi}}\)

or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District
1. Sioux Valley Comm.
2. Sioux Rapids Comm.
3. Albert City-Truesdale Comm.
5. Storm Lake Comm.
7. Aurelia Comm.
8. Alta Comm.
10. Marathon Con.
11. Rembrandt Con.
POCAHONTAS COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} " = 1 \) mi.

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Laurens Comm.
4. West Bend Comm.
5. Gilmore City-Bradgate
7. Fonda Comm.
8. Pocahontas Comm.
10. Palmer Con.

1. Laurens Comm.
4. West Bend Comm.
5. Gilmore City-Bradgate
7. Fonda Comm.
8. Pocahontas Comm.
10. Palmer Con.
HUMBOLDT COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{\text{1"}}{\text{1 mi.}} \)

1. Eagle Grove Comm.
2. Goldfield Comm.
4. LuVerne Comm.
5. Twin Rivers Comm.
6. West Bend Comm.
7. Rolfe Comm.
8. Gilmore City-Bradgate
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Eagle Grove Comm.
2. Goldfield Comm.
5. Meservey Thornton Comm.
9. Webster City Comm.
10. Clarion Ind.
SAC COUNTY
IOWA
scale: \(\frac{\text{1"}}{\text{1 mi.}}\)

1. Denison Comm.
4. Schaller Comm.
5. Storm Lake Comm.
7. Newell-Providence
8. Sac Comm.
10. Lake View-Auburn Comm.
11. Wall Lake Comm.

Sac City
CALHOUN COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

○ or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Lake City Comm.
2. Lohrville Comm.
3. Cedar Valley Comm.
4. Manson Comm.
5. Pomeroy Comm.
6. Rockwell City Comm.
7. Lytton Comm.
8. Fonda Comm.

DIAGRAM: Rockwell City
WEBSTER COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

- Dayton Comm.
- Prairie Comm.
- Cedar Valley Comm.
- Northwest Webster Comm.
- Gilmore City-Bredgate
- Humboldt Comm.

1. District as of August 30, 1963
2. Eagle Grove Comm.
3. Fort Dodge Comm.
5. Webster City Comm.
1. Webster City Comm.
4. Roland Comm.
5. Story City Comm.
7. Stratford Comm.
CARROLL COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

○ or ✗ Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

2. Coon Rapids Comm.
4. Ar-We-Za Comm.
5. Carroll Ind.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

2. Churdan Comm.
4. East Greene Comm.
5. Yale-Jamaica-Bagley Comm.
7. Coon Rapids Comm.
8. Scranton Con.
VI ACC

Hardin, Grundy, Tama
Marshall, Jasper, Poweshiek
or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Grundy Center Comm.
4. Eldora Comm.
5. Wellsburg Comm.
6. Aplington Comm.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. South Tama Comm.
2. Belle Plaine Comm.
3. Dysart Comm.
4. Traer-Clutier Comm.
5. Reinbeck Comm.
8. L D F Comm.
10. Grundy Center Comm.
Marshall County
Iowa

Scale: 1" = 1 mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Nesco Comm.
3. Clemons Comm.
4. Iowa Falls Comm.
7. Marshalltown Comm.
8. LDF Comm.
12. Green Mountain Ind.

Map of Marshall County, Iowa, showing school districts.
JASPER COUNTY
IOWA

scale 1/2 in. = 1 mi.

1. Mingo Comm.
2. Colfax Comm.
3. Southeast Polk Comm.
4. Prairie City Comm.
5. New Monroe Comm.
7. Lynnville-Sully Comm.

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

District as of August 30, 1963

Newton
POWESHIEK COUNTY
IOWA

scale: ½ " = 1 mi.

1. South Tama County Comm.
2. Belle Plaine Comm.
3. H L V Comm.
4. Deep River-Millersburg
5. Tri County Comm.

7. Montezuma Comm.
8. Lynnville-Sully Comm.
11. Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcolm
VII AVS
Bremer, Butler Black Hawk
Grundy, Buchanan, Tama
BREMER COUNTY
IOWA

t: 1 mi. = 1

or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

2. Plainfield Comm.
4. Tripoli Comm.
5. Fredericksburg Comm.
8. Janesville Con.
BUTLER COUNTY

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Nashua Comm.
2. Plainfield Comm.
3. Clarksville Comm.
5. Allison-Bristow Comm.
6. Aplington Comm.
7. Ackley Comm.
10. Greene Comm.
BLACK HAWK COUNTY

IOWA

scale: $\frac{1}{4"} = 1$ mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Reinbeck Comm.
2. Hudson Comm.
3. Waterloo Ind.
4. La Porte City Comm.
5. Dunkerton Comm.
GRUNDY COUNTY

IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Grundy Center Comm.
4. Eldora Comm.
5. Wellsburg Comm.
6. Aplington Comm.
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Oelwein Comm.
2. East Buchanan Comm.
5. Wapsie Valley Comm.
6. Independence Ind.
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. South Tama Comm.
2. Belle Plaine Comm.
3. Dysart Comm.
4. Traer-Clutier Comm.
5. Reinbeck Comm.
8. L D F Comm.
10. Grundy Center Comm.
11. Geneseo Con.
VIII

Delaware, Dubuque, Jackson
DELAWARE COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1 in. = 1 mi.

or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Edgewood (Colesburg) Comm.
2. Western Dubuque Comm.
5. Coggon Comm.
7. Starmont Comm.
or not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Dubuque Comm.
2. Western Dubuque Comm.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Bellevue Comm.
2. Western Dubuque Comm.
4. Andrew Comm.
5. Preston Comm.
6. Miles Comm.
7. Sabula Comm.
IX ACC

Clinton, Cedar, Scott
Muscatine, Louisa
CLINTON COUNTY
IOWA

scale: $\frac{1}{4}" = 1$ mi.

• Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Lost Nation Comm.
2. Delwood Comm.
4. Miles Comm.
5. Sabula Comm.
6. Clinton Comm.
7. Camanche Comm.
8. Central Clinton Comm.
10. Wheatland Comm.
CEDAR COUNTY
IOWA
scale: 1" = 1 mi.

- Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
- In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Wilton Comm.
2. Durant Comm.
5. Lincoln Comm.
6. Tipton Comm.
7. West Branch Comm.
8. West Liberty Comm.
SCOTT COUNTY
IOWA
scale: 1" = 1 mi.

or • Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. North Scott Comm.
2. Bettendorf Comm.
3. Davenport Comm.
5. Walcott Comm.
8. Wheatland Comm.
9. Le Claire Twp.
or: Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Columbus Comm.
2. Louisa-Muscateine Comm.
5. Walcott Comm.
8. West Liberty Comm.
9. Area No. 6 Comm.
LOUISA COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} \) in. = 1 mi.

or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Lone Tree Comm.
2. Columbus Comm.
4. Morning Sun Comm.
5. Mediapolis Comm.
X ACC

Benton, Linn, Jones
Cedar, Iowa, Johnson
Clinton, Keokuk, Washington
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Vinton Com.
2. Belle Plaine Com.
3. Urbana Con.
4. Shellsburg Con.
5. Newhall Con.
6. Norway Con.
7. Van Horne Con.
9. Garrison Con.
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Anamosa Comm.
5. Lincoln Comm.
6. Olin Con.
CEDAR COUNTY
IOWA
scale: \( \frac{1}{4} = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

- or - Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
- In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Wilton Comm.
2. Durant Comm.
5. Lincoln Comm.
6. Tipton Comm.
7. West Branch Comm.
8. West Liberty Comm.
IOWA COUNTY
IOWA

scale: $\frac{1}{4}" = 1$ mi.

- Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
- In an Independent or Consolidated High School District


Map showing districts and townships in Iowa County, Iowa.
1. Lone Tree Comm.
2. Iowa City Comm.
4. Clear Creek Comm.
5. College Comm.
7. West Branch Comm.
8. West Liberty Comm.

or - Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District
Clinton County, Iowa

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Lost Nation Comm.
2. Delwood Comm.
4. Miles Comm.
5. Sabula Comm.
6. Clinton Comm.
7. Comanche Comm.
8. Central Clinton Comm.
10. Wheatland Comm.

Scale: 1" = 1 mi.
or - Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Tri County Comm.
2. English Valleys Comm.
5. Pekin Comm.
WASHINGTON COUNTY
IOWA
scale: $\frac{1}{2''} = 1$ mi.

* or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

5. Highland Comm.
XI ACC

Boone, Story, Guthrie
Dallas, Polk, Jasper
Adair, Madison, Warren
Marion, Mahaska
BOONE COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} " = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

2. Stratford Comm.
3. Story City Comm.
5. United Comm.
7. Woodward Comm.
8. Ogden Comm.
10. East Greene Comm.
11. Madrid Ind.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

2. Bayard Comm.
5. Dexfield Comm.
9. Guthrie Center Comm.
10. Audubon Comm.
11. Exira Comm.
DALLAS COUNTY

scale: 1/4 in. = 1 mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Earlham Comm.
3. Van Meter Comm.
5. Waukee Comm.
6. Dallas Center Comm.
7. Woodward Comm.
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

5. Ankeny Comm.
8. West Des Moines Comm.
10. Johnston Con.
11. Saydel Con.
JASPER COUNTY
IOWA

-or- Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

scale 1/4 in. = 1 mi.

1. Mingo Comm.
2. Colfax Comm.
3. Southeast Polk Comm.
4. Prairie City Comm.
5. New Monroe Comm.
7. Lynnville-Sully Comm.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

- Orient Macksburg Comm.
- Winterset Comm.
- East Union Comm.
- Interstate 35 Comm.
- Martensdale-St. Mary's Comm.
- Van Meter Comm.
- Earlham Comm.
- Greenfield Comm.
WARREN COUNTY
IOWA

scale: $\frac{1}{4}'' = 1$ mi.

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Indianola Comm.
2. Pleasantville Comm.
4. Interstate 35 Comm.
7. Norwalk Con.
8. Carlisle Con.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Malcher-Dallas Comm.
2. Pleasantville Comm.
3. Southeast Polk Comm.
4. Prairie City Comm.
5. New Monroe Comm.
8. Twin Cedars Comm.
MAHASKA COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Oskaloosa Comm.
2. Eddyville Comm.
3. Twin Cedars Comm.
4. Pella Comm.
5. Lynnville-Sully Comm.
7. Tri County Comm.
8. Fremont Ind.
XII AVS
Plymouth, Cherokee, Woodbury
Ida, Monona, Crawford
PLYMOUTH COUNTY
(EAST)
IOWA
scale: \( \frac{1}{2} \) in. = 1 mi.

5. Lawton Comm.
7. Westfield Comm.
9. West Sioux Comm.
PLYMOUTH COUNTY
(WEST)
IOWA
scale: $\frac{1}{4}'' = 1$ mi.

or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. LeMars Comm.
2. Remsen-Union Comm.
CHEROKEE COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Sutherland Comm.
2. Paullina Comm.
5. Willow Comm.
7. Aurelia Comm.
8. Alta Comm.
11. Cherokee Ind.

Cherokee
WOODBURY COUNTY
(EAST)
IOWA
scale: \( \frac{1}{4} \text{in.} = 1 \text{mi.} \)

- Battle Creek Comm.
- Maple Valley Comm.
- Westwood Comm.
- Sergeant Bluff-Luton Comm.
- Bronson Comm.
- Sioux City Ind.
- Correctionville Ind.
- Cushing Con.
WOODBURY COUNTY

(WEST)

IOWA

scale: \(\frac{1}{4}\)" = 1 mi.

\(\bigcirc\) or \(\square\) Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

\(\square\) In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Lawton Comm.
2. Woodbury Central Comm.

Sioux City

10

8

7

8

9

1

2
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Ida Grove Comm.
4. Schaller Comm.
5. Holstein Comm.
7. Battle Creek Comm.
8. Maple Valley Comm.
Monona County

Or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. East Monona Comm.
2. Woodbine Comm.
3. Dunlap Comm.
5. Castana Comm.
7. Westwood Comm.
8. Whiting Comm.
10. West Harrison Comm.
or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Ar-We-Va Comm.
5. Dow City-Arion Comm.
7. Schleswig Comm.
8. Battle Creek Comm.

scale: 1" = 1 mi.
XIII ACC
Harrison, Shelby, Audubon
Guthrie, Pottawattamie, Cass
Mills, Fremont, Page
HARRISON COUNTY
IOWA
scale: \( \frac{1}{4}'' = 1 \) mi.

○ or ○ Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Dunlap Comm.
2. Woodbine Comm.
3. Tri Center Comm.
5. West Harrison Comm.
6. Missouri Valley Ind.
SHELBY COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} ^\prime = 1 \) mi.

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Elk Horn-Kimbollton Comm.
2. Irwin Comm.
5. Dow City-Arion Comm.
7. Shelby Comm.
9. Walnut Comm.
or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Manning Comm.
4. Exira Comm.
5. Anita Comm.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

2. Bayard Comm.
5. Dexfield Comm.
7. Manlo Comm.
9. Guthrie Center Comm.
10. Audubon Comm.
11. Exira Comm.
or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Walnut Comm.
3. Tri Center Comm.
5. Lewis Central Comm.
6. Treynor Comm.
POTTAWATTAMIE COUNTY
(EAST)
IOWA
scale: 1" = 1 mi.

10. Atlantic Comm.
11. Oakland Ind.
12. Council Bluffs Ind.
CASS COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} \text{ in.} = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Anita Comm.
2. C and M Comm.
4. Atlantic Comm.
5. Walnut Comm.

Diagram showing the distribution of high school districts across Cass County, Iowa, with specific communities marked for independent or consolidated districts.
1. Lewis Central Comm.
2. Glenwood Comm.
5. Shenandoah Comm.

scale: ¼" = 1 mi.
FREMONT COUNTY
IOWA
scale: $\frac{1}{4''} = 1$ mi.

and/or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

2. Farragut Comm.
5. Sidney Comm.
1. Villisca Comm.
2. Clarinda Comm.
5. New Market Comm.
6. Essex Ind.
XIV ACC
Adair, Adams, Union
Clarke, Montgomery, Taylor
Ringgold, Decatur
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Adair-Casey Comm.
5. Orient-Macksburg Comm.
6. Bridgewater-Fontanelle
ADAMS COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Villisca Comm.
2. Griswold Comm.
3. Corning Comm.
5. Orient-Macksburg Comm.
UNION COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

2. Creston Comm.
3. East Union Comm.
5. Lenox Comm.
CLARKE COUNTY
IOWA

scale: $\frac{1}{4}$" = 1 mi.

Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. East Union Comm.
2. Interstate 35 Comm.
5. Clarke Comm.
MONTGOMERY COUNTY
IOWA
scale: \( \frac{1}{4}'' = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

- or - Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
- In an Independent or Consolidated High School District
  1. Villisca Comm.
  2. Griswold Comm.
  5. Stanton Ind.
or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963
1. Villisca Comm.
2. New Market Comm.
3. Corning Comm.
4. Lenox Comm.
5. Clearfield Comm.
RINGGOLD COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{2} \) " = 1 mi.

2. East Union Comm.
3. Diagonal Comm.
4. Lenox Comm.
5. Clearfield Comm.
7. Mount Ayr Comm.
8. Lamonie Comm.
DECATOR CITY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} " = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Lamoni Comm.
2. Grand Valley Comm.
3. Central Decatur Comm.
XV ACC

Mahaska, Keokuk, Lucas
Monroe, Wapello, Jefferson
Wayne, Appanoose, Davis, Van Buren
MAHASKA COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District
1. Oskaloosa Comm.
2. Eddyville Comm.
3. Twin Cedars Comm.
4. Pella Comm.
5. Lynnville-Sully Comm.
7. Tri County Comm.
8. Fremont Ind.
KEOKUK COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Tri County Comm.
2. English Valleys Comm.
5. Pekin Comm.
LUCAS COUNTY
IOWA

scale: ¼ " = 1 mi.

or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Mormon Trail Comm.
2. Chariton Comm.
4. South East Warren
or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Russell Comm.
5. Eddyville Comm.
WAPELLO COUNTY
IOWA

scale: 1" = 1 mi.

or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

2. Ottumwa Comm.
5. Eddyville Comm.
6. Fairfield Comm.
JEFFERSON COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4}'' = 1 \text{ mi.} \)

\( \bullet \) or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

2. Pekin Comm.
3. Fairfield Comm.
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. ACL Comm.
2. Seymour Comm.
APPANOOSE COUNTY
IOWA

scale: \( \frac{1}{4} \) " = 1 mi.

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

1. Seymour Comm.
5. Centerville Ind.
or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Davis Comm.
6. Fox Valley Comm.
or. Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Davis Comm.
2. Fox Valley Comm.
5. Fairfield Comm.
XVI ACC

Henry, Des Moines, Lee
or Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963.
2. Yaco Comm.
5. Danville Comm.
DES MOINES COUNTY
IOWA

scale: $\frac{1}{4}" = 1$ mi.

or . Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

In an Independent or Consolidated High School District

2. Danville Comm.
5. Morning Sun Comm.
8. Yarmouth Con.
9. West Burlington Ind.

[Map showing territorial divisions and high school districts]
Not in a High School District as of August 30, 1963

1. Fort Madison Comm.
2. Central Lee Comm.