

**IOWA STATE BOARD  
OF EDUCATION**  
(Cite as 21 D.o.E. App. Dec. 72)

---

**In re Closing of Lockridge Elementary  
Building** :

Bruce Kittle, et al., :  
Appellants,

v. : DECISION

Fairfield Community School :  
District, :  
Appellee. :

[Admin. Doc. #4461]

---

The above-captioned matter was heard on June 19, 2002, before Susan E. Anderson, J.D., designated administrative law judge, presiding. Appellants were present, and were represented by Attorney Bruce Kittle, who is also an appellant. Appellee, Fairfield Community School District [hereinafter, "the District Board"], was present in the persons of Dr. John Kelley, superintendent; Doug Flourney, board president; and Glenn Tedrow, director of auxiliary services. The District was represented by Attorneys Danielle Jess and Ron Peeler of Ahlers, Cooney, Dorweiler, Haynie, Smith & Allbee of Des Moines, Iowa.

The appeal hearing was originally set for May 22, 2002. It was continued to the later date at Appellants' request. An evidentiary hearing was held pursuant to departmental rules found at 281 Iowa Administrative Code 6. Authority and jurisdiction for this appeal are found at Iowa Code section 290.1(2001). The administrative law judge finds that she and the State Board of Education have jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter of the appeal before them.

Appellants seek reversal of a March 18, 2002, decision of the Board of Directors [hereinafter, "the Board"] of the District to close its Lockridge Elementary attendance center located in Lockridge, Iowa.

**I.  
FINDINGS OF FACT**

Appellants and their children reside in the District. The children have been students in the District, attending the Lockridge Elementary attendance center. The Fairfield Community School District consists of three communities: Fairfield, Libertyville and Lockridge. Libertyville is some six miles southwest of Fairfield. Lockridge is some eleven miles east of Fairfield. The District consists of one high school (grades 9-12) in Fairfield, one middle school (grades 6-8) in Fairfield, and five elementary schools.

Three of the District's elementary buildings (Lincoln Elementary, Pence Elementary, and Washington Elementary) are located in the town of Fairfield. A fourth elementary building, Libertyville Elementary, is located in Libertyville. The fifth elementary building, Lockridge Elementary, is located in Lockridge. The enrollments for the five elementary schools for the 2001-2002 school year were:

Pence Elementary	278 students
Washington Elementary	255 students
Libertyville Elementary	125 students
Lincoln Elementary	122 students
Lockridge Elementary	94 students

At a work session of the District's Board of Directors on October 9, 2001, Superintendent Kelley brought to the Board's attention a previous board motion that had been passed on January 8, 1996. (Exh. 11.) The January 8, 1996, motion was part of a larger study of the elementary attendance centers throughout the District, which was initiated in April of 1995. (Exh. 1.)

The 1995 Study Committee, which had an independent chairperson as well as four separate working sub-committees, was primarily addressing the issue of whether to move from half-day kindergarten to full-day kindergarten throughout the elementary attendance centers within the District. As part of that study, consideration of closing the Lockridge Elementary School was discussed. On January 8, 1996, the Board passed a motion granting a "time window" of three to five years before it would reconsider the issue of closing Lockridge, offering an opportunity for growth through new development of the Lockridge community. The Board assisted with this opportunity for growth by moving the attendance center boundaries to allow for a larger percentage of the District's students to flow into the Lockridge Elementary School. Dr. Kelley testified that while enrollment had not decreased from 1996 through 1999 at Lockridge Elementary, the enrollment of the entire District had not declined to a point where the other elementary attendance centers could absorb the nearly 100 Lockridge students. The Board's four-part motion stated:

B. Motion by Mary Pettit, seconded by Craig Foss: I move a compromise to the Lockridge problem as follows:

1. That the Fairfield Community School District Board will grant a "time window" of 3 to 5 years offering an opportunity for growth through new development of the Lockridge community.

2. That children entering kindergarten from within the green boundary lines who have no siblings in elementary school will be enrolled at Lockridge beginning fall of 1996.
3. That the kindergarten opening enrollment must have a minimum of 10 students or it may be moved in its entirety to Fairfield at the discretion of the board.
4. That the Board will reevaluate the situation in three years, and, if total enrollment does not average 17-18 per class by fall of 1999, steps will be taken to close Lockridge.

(Exh. 10, p. 1.) Part 4 of the 1996 motion was what Dr. Kelley brought to the Board's attention at its work session in October of 2001.

By October 2001, enrollment figures for the 2001-2002 school year showed an average student enrollment per class at Lockridge Elementary of 15.5 students. This number was below the 17-to-18-student average that was outlined by the Board resolution in 1996. Additionally, enrollment across the rest of the Fairfield School District had also continued to decrease. Dr. Kelley, therefore, brought the 1996 resolution to the attention of the Board for consideration, since the enrollment of the District was now at a point where the students at Lockridge could be absorbed into other elementary schools.

At the October 9, 2001, Board work session, the Board began discussions on Lockridge Elementary School, the Fairfield/Lockridge boundary line and the Board motion on Lockridge passed on January 8, 1996. Superintendent Kelley discussed the 2001-2002 elementary enrollment figures and outlined future enrollment projections with the Board in connection with his budget preparation and planning presentation. Dr. Kelley explained that the District's elementary enrollment history from the 1995-1996 school year through the 2001-2002 school year had shown a steady decline in enrollment.

On November 12, 2001, the Board held its regular meeting. A main topic at this meeting was the effect of the 4.3% state aid reduction for the 2001-2002 school year. Dr. Kelley informed the Board that such a cut would amount to a \$271,000 reduction for the District. He also indicated to the Board that the District's budget was already tight and that future budget cuts were likely on their way in the form of a reduction in allowable growth for the 2002-2003 school year. In response to this information, the Board began discussing a variety of cost-saving options.

Dr. Kelley discussed the Lockridge building situation at the November 12, 2001, meeting as one of the cost-savings options. He provided the Board and public with a copy of the *Barker* guidelines, issued by the Department of Education in 1977, which outlined seven guidelines to follow when considering the closing of a building. Dr. Kelley testified

that he provided these guidelines to the Board so it would know and understand the process the District would need to follow in considering the closing of Lockridge Elementary School. Dr. Kelley made a recommendation that a study committee be formed on the Lockridge issue. The issue of the Lockridge Elementary Building was discussed again at the November 12, 2001, Board meeting after which a motion was made and eventually approved to create a Study Committee to "study the Lockridge issue." (Exh. 12, p. 4.) The Board announced at the meeting that any individual interested in serving on the Lockridge Study Committee should submit their names, addresses, and phone number to Dr. Kelley by December 3, 2001.

Lori Andermann testified at the appeal hearing that her request to be a member of the Study Committee was denied because she was not a resident of the Fairfield District. She testified that her family resides one-quarter mile outside of the District's boundary, but she has open enrolled three of her children into the District, all of which have attended Lockridge Elementary School. At the appeal hearing, she submitted a copy of the letter from Dr. Kelley informing her that as a non-resident, she would not be allowed to be a part of the Study Committee. (Exh. 74.)

After notice and some recruitment of individuals, a twenty-person study committee made up of parents and community members was appointed. Dr. Kelley; Glenn Tedrow (Director of Auxiliary Services); and Joe Carr (Lockridge Principal) were to serve as ex-officio members of the study committee. (Exh. 14, pp. 3-4). At the December 10, 2001, school board meeting, the Board appointed the members of the Lockridge Study Committee to study the building situation and prepare a written report of its findings due to the Board by March 11, 2002. The Board determined that the Lockridge Study Committee would be a fact-finding committee only and would not give a specific recommendation to the Board concerning the situation.

The Study Committee began meeting on January 7, 2002, and met through February 25, 2002, a total of five times. (Exh. 38, pp. 58, 61, 65, 68 and 70.) The Study Committee was not allowed to appoint or select its own chairperson. At its first meeting on January 7, 2002, Dr. Kelley served as chairperson. During that meeting, Committee member Wayne King made a suggestion regarding how the chairperson should be selected by the Committee itself. Dr. Kelley responded that he believed that it was the Board's understanding that he would act as the facilitator, but he would be glad to have volunteers when it came time to make the report to the Board. (Exh. 38, p. 60.) During Dr. Kelley's testimony he stated that it was his recollection that the Board had expressed its desires at its December 2001 meeting for him to facilitate the meetings.

At the regular Board meeting on January 14, 2002, Dr. Kelley gave a report to the Board on the progress of the Study Committee, and after a lengthy discussion, Dr. Kelley was appointed as the facilitator of the Committee. Appellants testified during the appeal hearing that Superintendent Kelley's appointment as facilitator of the Study Committee stifled any open and frank discussion of the Committee members. Two Study Committee members, Janice DeAth and Roberta Danielson, testified during the appeal hearing that they were not intimidated by Dr. Kelley and that much of the tension in the room centered around the fact that the Committee was dealing with an emotionally-charged issued.

At the February 11, 2002, Board meeting, members of the public spoke in opposition to the closing of the Lockridge Elementary School and a petition opposing the closing was presented to the Board. During the Committee meetings, individuals were not always in agreement as to background facts but there was considerable discussion and information shared at the meetings.

On approximately March 4, 2002, the Study Committee compiled a written report and provided it to the Board. (Exh. 38.) At the March 11, 2002, Board meeting, various members of the Study Committee made oral presentations (Exh. 37, pp. 2-3) to the Board providing a general summary of the contents of the Study Report. All items in the Report were listed under the relevant *Barker* guidelines. The Report outlined facts and data, including enrollment statistics; transportation costs; financial gains and losses; and program offerings and staff assignments, summarized below:

- 1) ***Enrollment statistics.*** Enrollment at the Lockridge Elementary Building, as well as the entire Fairfield District, was declining. Research depicted the District's elementary enrollment history from the 1995-1996 school year through the 2001-2002 school year. The report showed a class that began school in kindergarten with 158 students in 1995 had only 133 students by the time it began fifth grade in 2000. Similarly, there was a decline in the number of students actually beginning kindergarten. In 2001, there were only 123 students beginning kindergarten. This was a decline of 22.15% over a six-year period of time.

The study report contained a birth trend report for Jefferson County, which showed a correlating trend of decline between birth rates and kindergarten enrollment in the District. This document projected a continued decline into 2005. Since State Foundation Aid is dependent upon enrollment figures, the District could forecast no likelihood of any increase in state aid.

At the appeal hearing, Dr. Kelley testified that fewer students would mean a need for fewer teachers and fewer buildings. He further indicated that it was only because of the decreased enrollment within the entire District that the students at Lockridge could be absorbed into the District's other elementary schools without surpassing the District's class size goal of 19 students per class.

- 2) ***Transportation concerns.*** Parents had expressed concerns regarding the length of time their children would have to ride buses if the Lockridge Elementary School closed and those children were bused into Fairfield. The issue of bus time was researched by Glenn Tedrow, Director of Auxiliary Services, and presented to the Committee. Mr. Tedrow reported that state law requires elementary students to be transported by bus no longer than sixty (60) minutes. In an effort to meet this state guideline, Mr. Tedrow projected that the District would eliminate three regular bus routes and a shuttle if Lockridge Elementary Building were closed next school year. However, the report included a statement that if adjustments needed to be made, it might be necessary for the District to add back a regular route, which would cost \$13,324.
- 3) ***Financial gains and losses.*** The study showed that the District would lose \$613,160 as a result of the 4.3% budget cut, combined with the allowable growth cut from 4% to 1%. Additionally, Lockridge Elementary Building is the oldest building in the District, having been built in 1932, and had the highest operating cost per student at \$114.57. Utility costs for the Lockridge attendance center were extremely high and if the building were to remain open, the boiler and windows would have to be replaced. The District included these utility and replacement costs in its equation to help determine whether to keep Lockridge open as a viable option.
- 4) ***Program offerings and staff assignments.*** The study showed that the closing of the Lockridge Elementary Building would not change the number or type of programs being offered in the District. Schedules for the special teachers would change. Students presently attending Lockridge would be reassigned to one of the three Fairfield attendance centers, where they would have access to special education programming and the second-grade reading fluency program on the same basis as all other students.

Following the oral presentations by the Study Committee on March 11, 2002, members of the community asked to address the Board regarding the closing of the Lockridge Elementary Building. However, Board President Flourney announced to those in attendance at the March 11, 2002, meeting that all requests to address the Board would be tabled until the March 18, 2002, public hearing. This was contrary to the public's

understanding that they would be able to speak at the March 11, 2002, Board meeting as well as to the publicized notice in the *Fairfield Ledger*, dated March 8, 2002. (Exh. 71.)

The Board then approved taking the issue of closing the Lockridge Elementary Building to a public hearing, which was scheduled for March 18, 2002. (Exh. 37, p. 2.) Following the March 11, 2002, Board meeting and prior to the March 18, 2002, public hearing, a local newspaper reported that President Flourney had indicated that it was his opinion that the Lockridge Elementary Building should be closed. (Exh. 39, p. 2.) Based on the refusal to allow the public to address the Board at the March 11, 2002, meeting, the parents believed that the public was denied the opportunity to present to the Board critical information and its views regarding the closing of Lockridge Elementary Building prior to the Board's vote to take the matter to a public hearing.

At the appeal hearing, Mr. Mark Coble, parent and Appellant, testified that prior to the March 11, 2002, Board meeting, he had been working with other concerned community members and parents in an effort to convince the Board to keep the Lockridge Elementary Building open. In support of this effort, he wanted to distribute flyers to the parents of children at the three Fairfield elementary buildings after school on Friday, March 8, 2002. Pursuant to the District's policies, Mr. Coble was required to receive prior approval from the administration in order to distribute the flyers on school grounds. In speaking with the principals of the three elementary buildings, he was told that they were unable to provide that authorization and he would need to contact Dr. Kelley. On Wednesday, March 6, 2002, Mr. Coble presented the flyer to Dr. Kelley, who indicated that Mr. Coble would not be allowed to distribute the flyers on school grounds.

On the morning of Friday, March 8, 2002, Dr. Kelley called Mr. Coble and invited him to come into his office to discuss the matter further. Mr. Coble arrived at Superintendent Kelley's office around noon on March 8, 2002. Board President Flourney was also present for the discussion. During the meeting, Dr. Kelley informed Mr. Coble that he would be allowed to distribute the flyers if he chose to do so (although Mr. Coble believed that it was then too late to organize all of the people necessary to do so that afternoon).

On March 15, 2002, a group formed by concerned parents, called the Lockridge School Support Team, hand-delivered a document entitled, "Response Report to the Lockridge Study Committee's Report," to the Board members. (Exh. 42.) The Response Report discussed issues that were not, in its opinion, adequately addressed by the Lockridge Study Committee Report. This response report was provided to the Board in advance of the March 18, 2002, public hearing. The parents presented, from their point of view, what they felt were inaccuracies and gaps in information in the Committee's report.

The potential Lockridge closing also received considerable media attention in the *Fairfield Ledger*, the local newspaper, as well as in the *Ottumwa Courier*. Copies of all newspaper articles were included by the District as part of the record submitted for this appeal. The February 11, 2002, and March 11, 2002, Board minutes reflect that the Lockridge public hearing would be held on March 18, 2002. Additionally, newspaper articles and notices from the *Fairfield Ledger*, dated February 14, February 26, March 12 and March 13, stated that the public hearing would be held on March 18, 2002. The *Ottumwa Courier* published an article on March 16, which stated that the public hearing was scheduled for March 18, 2002.

On March 18, the public hearing and Board discussion on the Lockridge Elementary Building closing lasted almost four hours. More than 100 people were in attendance and approximately 20 individuals spoke to the Board. (Exh. 44.) Following the public hearing, it was moved, seconded and approved to close the public hearing and have Board discussion. After discussion, the Board then voted four to three to close the Lockridge Elementary Building, commencing in the fall of 2002. (Exh. 44.)

Board member Christy Watts testified that one of her concerns throughout the process was being forced to vote immediately following the receipt of new information at the public hearing, which she felt might warrant additional research and study. During her testimony at the appeal hearing, she stated that this is exactly what happened and that this was one of the reasons that she eventually voted "no" at the March 18, 2002, public hearing. She had asked many questions during the discussion period based on input from members of the community and had suggested financial alternatives. She did not, however, move to table the vote until a later date. When asked by District's counsel why she had not made a motion to table the vote to a later date, Ms. Watts indicated that all of her other motions had been defeated by a four-to-three vote and she didn't feel that this one would be any different.

## II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The issue in this case is whether the Board's decision on March 18, 2002, which closed the Lockridge attendance center, should be affirmed. Review of the Fairfield Board's decision in this case by the Iowa State Board of Education is *de novo*. *In re Debra Miller*, 13 D.o.E. App. Dec. 303(1996). The decision must be based upon the laws of the United States and Iowa, the regulations and policies of the Department of Education, and "shall be in the best interest of education." 281 Iowa Administrative Code 6.11(2). Essentially, the test is one of reasonableness. *In re Jesse Bachman*, 13 D.o.E. App. Dec. 363(1996).

The Fairfield Board of Directors has the authority to determine the number of attendance centers it shall have and where each child shall attend. The Iowa Code clearly states:

The board of directors shall determine the number of schools to be taught, divide the corporation into such wards or other divisions for school purposes as may be proper, determine the particular school which each child shall attend, and designate the period each school shall be held beyond the time required by law.

Iowa Code section 279.11(2001).

Whether the District Board exercised its authority in a reasonable manner is the question raised by this appeal. The reasonableness of the Board's action is measured by the seven-step procedure recommended for school closings by the State Board of Education. *In re Norman Barker*, 1 D.P.I. App. Dec. 145(1977). These seven steps constitute procedural due process for the public when "making decisions as important as the closing of an attendance center." 1 D.P.I. App. Dec. 145, 149. The *Barker* guidelines are as follows:

1. A timeline should be established in advance for the carrying out of procedures involved in making an important decision. All aspects of such a timeline would naturally focus upon the anticipated date that the Board of Directors would make its final decision in the matter.
2. All segments of the community in the school district should be informed that a particular important decision is under consideration by the Board of Directors.
3. The public should be involved in providing sufficient input into the study and planning involved in important decision making.
4. Sufficient research, study and planning should be carried out by the board and groups and individuals selected by the board. Such things as student enrollment statistics, transportation costs, financial gains and losses, program offerings, plant facilities, and staff assignment need to be considered carefully.
5. There should be an open and frank public discussion of the facts and issues involved.

6. A proper record should be made of all the steps taken in the making of the decision.

7. The final decision must be made in an open, public meeting and a record be made thereof.

*Barker* at 149, 150.

This seven-step process is needed “to acclimate the public and implement [a school closing] decision.” *Meredith v. Council Bluffs Comm. Sch. Dist.*, 5 D.o.E. App. Dec. 25, 30 (1986). The purpose of going through the process is to avoid springing such an action on an unwilling, resisting public. *Id.* By involving parents and citizens, a district board may not win approval of their plan, but it may avoid a schism in the community. The fact that, in this case, a majority of four members of the Board can control the outcome of every debate is not a matter that can be changed by the State Board.

The real issue for the State Board of Education to consider is not whether both sides actually agreed with each other’s position. The real issue is whether they were given the *opportunity* to listen to each other’s position. That is what the *Barker* guidelines stand for. The guidelines do not mandate that the District Board acquiesce to the wishes of those who are most vocal at the public hearings. *In re Susan Beary, et al.*, 15 D.o.E. App. Dec. 208, 217 (1999). As the State Board of Education said in another school closing appeal:

Appellant and her silent counterparts in the district believe the board owed them a greater “duty” to consider their views than it exhibited in this case. Translation: We (300+persons signed a petition opposing the change of attendance centers) are many. We told you we didn’t want you to do this and you did it anyway. Therefore, you failed to give adequate consideration to public opinion.

On the contrary, no one was denied an opportunity to present his or her views on the subject. There was an information meeting ... there were no less than four Board meetings at which Appellant and other residents spoke to the Board on this issue, and the meeting at which the decision was made lasted over three hours due to public comment. Appellant misconstrues the weight put on the right of public input. It does not imply that the Board must agree

...

*In re Ilene Cadarr*, 9 D.o.E. App. Dec. 11, 15(1991).

A school district board is comprised of "representatives" from the district it serves. At the time of its vote, the majority of those representatives on the Fairfield Board believed that closing the Lockridge Elementary Building was the best course for the District as a whole. Whether or not it is the District's best course is not the subject of the State Board of Education's review. The State Board's review focuses on the *process* employed by the District, rather than on the substance or merits of the decision. *Dunn v. Villisca Comm. Sch. Dist.*, 5 D.o.E. App. Dec. 31, 36(1982). *Beary* at 218.

The focus of this appeal, then, is an examination of the process followed by the District Board from October 2001, through its decision to close the Lockridge Elementary Building, which occurred on March 18, 2002. The District contends that the decision made on March 18, 2002, to close the Lockridge Elementary Building should be affirmed because it was the product of a process that followed the *Barker* guidelines.

In this case, Appellants acknowledge that the District has satisfied *Barker* guidelines 1, 2, 6 and 7. However, Appellants contend, based on the evidence set forth in this case and the record submitted, that *Barker* guidelines 3, 4, and 5 have not been met. They argue, therefore, that reversal of the Fairfield Community School Board's March 18, 2002, decision is appropriate.

The administrative law judge heard extensive testimony from parents, members of the public, Board members, district administrators, and citizen members of the Study Committee. The numerous and expansive exhibits offered at the time of the hearing, when combined with the testimony, established that the Fairfield Community School District followed the *Barker* guidelines. The District:

- 1) established a clear and concise timeline for the procedure, studying the Lockridge building closing, ultimately culminating in a Board decision in open session on March 18, 2002;
- 2) informed all segments in the community that an important building closing decision was under consideration by providing agendas, minutes and notices in the newspaper regarding board meetings and Study Committee meetings;
- 3) made efforts to ensure that all segments of the community were involved in the process by seeking volunteers for the Study Committee and by seeking public input in all study and planning steps involved in making the decision to close Lockridge;
- 4) carried out sufficient research, study and planning, through administrators and the Study Committee, which submitted a lengthy written report and made oral presentations to the Board on March 11, 2002. In addition,

the Board had the benefit of studying the Response Report before it made its decision.

- 5) provided open and frank public discussion of the process through newspaper articles, Study Committee meetings, comments at Board meetings and a public hearing held on March 18, 2002;
- 6) created a detailed record of the issue by maintaining regular Board minutes and minutes of the five Study Committee meetings; and
- 7) made a final decision on the matter at a duly noticed public meeting on March 18, 2002.

It is true that the Board's final action was taken on March 18, 2002, the same day as the public hearing. Appellants point out that the State Board of Public Instruction several years ago reversed a school closing decision made by a district which had voted on the same day of its only public comments. *In re Daniel Menke, et al.*, 4 D.P.I. App. Dec. 40(1985). That decision states:

In the absence of a showing of need for hasty decision-making, the District Board was ill-advised to hear its first public comments on the important issue of closing an attendance center at the same meeting at which it made the decision. Unless time weighs heavily as a factor, school boards should allow time to pass between initial formal public input and the final decision.

*Id.* at 46.

In the *Menke* case, the board first brought up the idea of closing a building only ten days before the public hearing and vote. The public hearing was the first opportunity for public input of any kind. In sharp contrast, however, the Fairfield Board took five months to study the issue and began seeking public input through its Study Committee beginning in December 2001. The *Menke* decision, therefore, is not controlling in the appeal currently before the State Board. The next year after the *Menke* decision, the State Board stated that the purpose of going through the *Barker* guidelines in a school closing, "is to avoid springing such an action on an unwilling, resisting public." *Meredith, supra* at 30. It simply cannot be said from the record in the appeal now before the State Board that the Fairfield Board "sprang" the Lockridge closing on the Fairfield public. The Board followed up on the 1996 compromise motion, starting in October 2001, over five months before the Board's final decision on March 20, 2002.

Unless time weighs heavily as a factor, school boards should allow a reasonable amount of time to pass between initial formal input and the final decision. *In re Susan Beary, et al.*, 15 D.o.E. App. Dec. 1, 15(1999). The State Board recently affirmed a board's decision to close a building after the Wapsie Valley District went through the *Barker* guidelines process in a seven-week period. *In re Teresa Duffy, et al.*, 19 D.o.E. App. Dec. 194(2001). We similarly conclude that the Fairfield District's financial situation warranted speedy action and that the five-month timeline it used was reasonable under the circumstances.

We believe that evidence shows that the District Board fulfilled all seven steps of the *Barker* guidelines. Because the process used was reasonable, the March 18, 2002, decision must be affirmed. In summary, Appellants have not shown any legal reason to reverse the District Board's March 18, 2002, decision. The District's decision to close Lockridge Elementary School should, therefore, be affirmed.

Any motions or objections not previously ruled on are hereby denied or overruled.

### III. DECISION

For the foregoing reasons, the decision of the Board of Directors of the Fairfield Community School District made on March 18, 2002, to close its Lockridge Elementary Building beginning in the 2002-2003 school year, is hereby recommended for affirmance. There are no costs to be assigned under Iowa Code chapter 290.

8-15-2002

DATE

Susan E. Anderson

SUSAN E. ANDERSON, J.D.  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

It is so ordered.

9-12-2002

DATE

Gene Vincent

GENE VINCENT, PRESIDENT  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION