

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 682

EA 008 967

AUTHOR Elford, George
 TITLE Public and Private School Cooperation. Trends in Education Series.
 INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
 PUB DATE 76
 NOTE 35p.
 AVAILABLE FROM The University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210 (\$3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Catholic Schools; Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; Dual Enrollment; Educational Alternatives; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Projections; *Futures (of Society); *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Prediction; *Private Schools; *Public Schools; Special Education; Supreme Court Litigation

ABSTRACT

The relationship between public and nonpublic or private schools at the elementary and secondary levels is analyzed and ten predictions advanced. The public sector will increase in scope and size and operate as the established educational system. The private sector will decrease in size, be more distinctive and less influenced by prevailing public school standards, and be less church related. Cooperation between the two systems will stem largely from specific legislation that calls for formal cooperation. Dual enrollment and other forms of sharing will not increase. Project cooperation will continue in areas related to social concerns and educational technology. The most dramatic increases in public-private cooperation in education will take place in the area of special education. Experimental approaches that attempt to offer alternatives, such as the voucher system, have little prospect of widespread success. Finally, despite busing and court ordered desegregation, the differentiation in public education based on social class will continue as an important factor in maintaining influential support for public education. (Author/MLF)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED132682

Trends in Education

Public and Private School Cooperation

by

George Elford

1976



The University Council for
Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Public and Private School Cooperation

by

George Elford,
Director of the Northeast Regional Offices,
Educational Testing Service
Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts

In the spring of 1973 private school educators were beginning to lay plans for some commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the 1925 Oregon School case¹ in which the U. S. Supreme Court affirmed the rights of private education in America. At this same time, the U. S. Supreme Court was again deliberating on the legal position of the private school, especially the church-related school, in American education. In a series of decisions² on June 25, 1973, the Supreme Court with some finality closed the door on most forms of state aid to church-related private schools, which at the time represented over eighty-five percent of nonpublic schools. With these decisions, the Supreme Court put to rest the possibility of private schools sharing in a substantial way in public funds. Quite definitely, the Supreme Court has pronounced the public schools to be the established schools in U. S. education.

In these two actions which span fifty years, the Supreme Court has established the parameters for public and private education for the immediate future. Private schools have the right to exist and to prosper on their own; they have no right to claim public support. Within the framework of these decisions, there is now a firm basis for analyzing and offering some predictions concerning the future of the relationship between public and nonpublic schools.

This venture in educational futurism will focus on the relationship between public and nonpublic or private schools at the elementary and secondary levels. This relationship at times involves direct personal contact between public and private school officials; at times, it involves simply the impact one type of school has on the other, as they carry on their business in their own spheres of activity. The present discussion revolves around ten predictions relating to public and private schools.

The 1973 court decisions eliminated any threat to public school financing by way of large scale state spending on private education. As a result, public and private school educators are no longer involved to any substantial degree in the competition for public funds. Thus, the stage is set for more dialogue and constructive cooperation between the public and private sectors in American education. These predictions are presented with this end in view, i.e., to encourage discussion and cooperation. In Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress, F. C. Ikle³ discusses the uses of predictions. Some predictions are offered simply for "science-fiction type" entertainment; some are offered for general edification, e.g., cosmological predictions about the universe a billion years from now. The predictions offered here

are meant to be what Ikle calls "guiding predictions," i.e., those predictions "which help us to choose what course of action which makes the future more to our liking." To be an effective "guiding prediction," a predictive statement need not be proven true; it need only serve to stimulate discussion and action toward a better future. Thus, the ten predictions offered here in no way represent this author's scenario for the desired future. They are put forth as reasonable projections from the past and present of what might well happen if present forces and patterns go unexamined and unchanged.

The first two predictions deal with the two terms of the relationship, i.e., the future of the private schools and the future of the public schools. The remaining predictions deal with the relationship between the two sectors.

PREDICTION #1:

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS SECTOR WILL: A) DECREASE IN SIZE, B) BE CHARACTERIZED MORE AS "FREE" AND "INDEPENDENT" AND LESS AS "PAROCHIAL" OR "CHURCH RELATED."

In some ways this is a bold prediction. Not everyone predicts survival for the private sector in education. In his 1970 report, Alan Piper,⁴ the president of the Carnegie Foundation, speaking of all private service institutions, private museums, art galleries, etc., as well as private schools, made some dire predictions. According to Pifer,

Our historic partnership of public and private commonweal endeavor is in grave danger because of the state of apathy that is permitting the decline of private institutions. Unless this decline is arrested and reversed we and our children after us will almost certainly be living in a society where the idea of private initiative for the common good has become little but a quaint anachronism largely associated with the mores of an earlier age.

The demise of private institutions, according to Pifer, will not be an overnight prospect. It

is more likely to be a protracted and inconspicuous process lasting many years and encompassing several stages of progressive debility....There may be a first stage in which the institution, for financial reasons, becomes unable to manage the growth necessary to meet new challenges. This loss of a cutting edge may bring on a second stage in which the institution's own self-confidence in it begins to slip, a third in which the recruitment of capable staff becomes progressively more difficult, a fourth in which declining income begins to necessitate the curtailment of important activities and reduction of staff, and so on. Even when the institution is moribund, it may drag on for some time before it is finally forced to close down.

As Pifer pointed out, the prospects for the demise of the private sector are not immediate. Currently, some five million students are enrolled in nonpublic schools. While this represents only 10% of the nation's enrollment, in six states in the industrial northeast, according to 1971 figures, one-sixth of the children attend nonpublic schools. Studies for the President's Commission on School Finance,⁵ however, projected a drop of 2.27 million in Catholic school enrollments and a drop of .15 million in all other nonpublic school enrollments, decreasing the total nonpublic school enrollment from 5.28 million in 1970 to 2.86 million in 1980. Several factors account for this. Declining birth rates in the Catholic population alone could cause Catholic elementary school enrollments to drop 15 percent or .5 million by 1977.

In an inflationary economy where living costs and taxes take precedence over gifts and tuition for private schools, cost problems in the private sector appear inexorable. Earnest Bartell⁶ predicted a doubling of per pupil expense in Catholic schools in five years. Martin Mayer,⁷ in a survey of independent schools, reported that even Phillips Exeter Academy with its endowment of 70 million is now "budgeting for current deficits and looking down the pike at five year projections that are troubling--and ten year projections that are all but terrifying." Mayer added, "At scores of lesser private schools, residential and non-residential, the terrifying projections are only a year away or even closer. Of 539 schools reporting to the National Association of Independent Schools last year, 262 showed deficits." Shades of Pifer's stage four?

Table 1
Enrollment in Nonpublic Elementary
and Secondary Schools, Fall, 1960-71

Year	Total Enrollment in Non-Public Schools	Enrollment in Catholic Schools	Enrollment in Other Non-Public Schools	Non-Public as Percent of Total School Enrollment
(thousands)				
1960	5,969	5,254	715	14.0
1965	6,953	5,574	1,379	14.3
1970	5,655	4,367	1,288	10.9
1971	5,378	4,027	1,351	10.4

Sources: Total nonpublic enrollment from Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 234, "School Enrollment in the United States: 1971" (1972), p. 3, and preceding issues for 1960-64; National Catholic Educational Association, Research Department, A Statistical Report on Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools for the Years 1967-68 to 1969-70 (NCEA, 1970), p. 5, 8; NCEA, A Report on U. S. Catholic Schools, 1970-71, p. 10; NCEA, U. S. Catholic Schools, 1971-72.

According to a 1973 Brookings study,⁸ in Catholic schools the direct effects of tuition increases and the effects of school closings

accounted for approximately 40 percent of the elementary and over 60 percent of the secondary decline in enrollment. As shown in Table 1, nonpublic school enrollment declines from 1965 to 1971 were largely concentrated in Catholic schools, where enrollments have dropped from 5.5 million in 1965 to 3.8 million in 1973. The drop in Catholic school enrollments has been accompanied by school closings averaging some 450 per year from 1968 to 1972. During the same period, Lutheran and Mennonite schools have also experienced some enrollment declines. Population movements and shifts in preferences account for the rest of the enrollment decline. These same forces have likewise affected enrollment in Lutheran, Mennonite and other nonpublic schools. Changes in student and parent tastes are probably a major factor in the enrollment declines in military academies and single sex boarding schools.

Decline in the private sector, to date, has not included all categories of schools. According to the Brookings study, with the exception of the schools cited above other non-Catholic nonpublic school enrollment has shown a gradual increase in recent years in every region of the country. This same study suggested that much of this growth has come in two locations, in large cities and in the South:

While the exact data are lacking, it is possible that much of it has taken place in the nation's largest cities. In such places as New York City where many residents feel that the public schools have deteriorated, non-Catholic private school enrollment has also grown at a fairly rapid clip. Nonpublic school enrollment has also grown very rapidly in some parts of the South with the appearance of segregated 'white academies.' Although a sizeable fraction of the children attend white academies in some southern rural counties, the overall significance of these institutions should not be overestimated. In Mississippi the 15,000 to 20,000 students that are estimated to have left the public systems in the last three years to attend private academies represent only slightly more than 3 percent of the state's total school population.⁹

Some of this growth can be accounted for by newly formed Christian schools and freedom schools in all parts of the country. While 350 free or freedom schools with their enrollment of 12,500 students do not constitute a numerically significant segment of the private school sector, they do have a symbolic significance, with their emphasis on the development of alternatives to "coercive" or competitive approaches to learning.¹⁰ By way of contrast, the "Christian schools" usually stress discipline and very traditional approaches to schooling. Both offer programs that are perceived to differ from that of the local public school.

Thus, as the traditional parish schools decline somewhat in number, the independent schools, the free schools and the inter-denominational Christian schools are holding their own. In some ways, even parish schools themselves are becoming more independent of their local congregations with the establishment of separate lay boards and an increased dependence on tuition in place of church subsidy.

PREDICTION #2:

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SECTOR WILL: A) INCREASE IN SCOPE AND IN SIZE,
B) OPERATE CONFIDENTLY AS THE ESTABLISHED EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

According to the estimates prepared by the President's Commission on School Finance,¹¹ public schools will increase in total enrollment from 45.9 million in 1970 to 47.7 million in 1975, and then decline to 46.1 million in 1980. These figures include the transfer by 1980 of a million students from nonpublic schools. In the light of such projections, speculation about an imminent decline in American public education appears groundless. Even if the most threatening "possible" challenge - the introduction of the voucher plan - became a reality, according to Robert J. Havighurst, "no more than 30% of American parents would bypass the nearest school in sending their children to school, given some freedom of choice."¹² With 10% of U. S. students now in nonpublic schools, this "ultimate calamity" would produce only a 10% drop in public school enrollment.

In 1966, the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration established a committee to project the situation in education in 1985. In their 1970 final report, Stephen Knezevich reviewed and dismissed as unlikely two "possible" alternative futures. One dealt with a future in which there will be no formal educational institutions. Another suggested the demise of public schools. According to this scenario, the prolonged controversy in which public schools became embroiled during the 1960s and 1970s would weaken and splinter these schools, the consequent loss of public support would mean that these schools would cease to exist by 1985." Rejecting this prospect, Knezevich predicted that "the continuing debate is more likely to alter priorities and introduce new missions than it is to sunder educational institutions." Knezevich went on to predict that:

To satisfy a broader range of social and educational concerns within one social institution, public schools will be extended and expanded in all directions. Although the 'school-age' group will continue to be served, far more than one fourth of the population will demand educational opportunities in 1985. By the middle of the next decade nursery education will be accepted as the starting point in formal preparation. This implies that the public school kindergartens...will finally gain universal acceptance...Universal community college educational opportunities will be established in all states by no later than 1985...Community colleges in the United States will have repeated during the 1945-1985 period what the secondary schools experienced during 1890-1930.¹³

The future of public schools is secure and the expansion of public education at all levels, as predicted above, is inevitable because of "the ever increasing success by the men of public sphere," to use Daniel Moynihan words. According to Moynihan, the trend is

seemingly irresistible, not the least because the self interest of the new class is merged with a manifestly sincere view of the

public interest. This view, that the general good is served by advancing the interests of the public sphere, is apparently the dominant social view of the time, and is terribly difficult to argue against with any success.¹⁴

PREDICTION #3:

COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS WILL CONTINUE TO STEM LARGELY FROM SPECIFIC LEGISLATION WHICH CALLS FOR FORMAL COOPERATION AND FROM FRIENDLY PERSONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN LOCAL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL EDUCATORS.

The gravitational pull in the field of U.S. education clearly runs counter to cooperation between public and private schools. Describing conditions in urban areas in the early sixties, Greeley and Erickson commented:

In many urban centers, public and nonpublic schools that might profitably share their services and facilities continue to operate in insular detachment. In other cases, efforts to arrange concerted action run afoul of so much prejudice and bureaucratic inertia that pedestrian outcomes are viewed as a triumph of diplomacy.¹⁵

While admitting some particular problems (distance, complex schedules, etc.), they concluded:

It seems the only explanation for some barriers to cooperation is a deeply ingrained resistance to mutuality between public and nonpublic schools. A recent study suggests that public and nonpublic schools in sizeable American cities have tended for decades to proceed along parallel, seldom-connected tracks, studiously limiting contact.¹⁶

To overcome this "gravity" that seems to hold the two sectors apart, some special new elements or forces must come into play. Legislation which mandates formal contact and cooperation is one such force. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was one example of this kind of legislation. The law was itself the result of unprecedented cooperation at the national level between public and private school interests, seeking to end the longstanding impasse in the flow of federal funds into education.

With the passage of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the levels of cooperation between public and private schools seemed to increase. The two NEA surveys reported in Table 2 showed increases from 1966 to 1971 in cooperation in most districts. Oddly enough, in the largest districts, in which presumably more nonpublic schools were situated, a decrease in cooperation was reported. From 1966 to 1971, the percentage of these largest districts reporting no cooperation increased from 25 to 44 percent.

Table 2
Types of Resource Sharing Between
Public and Non-Public Schools, 1966-1971

Shared Resource	Systems enrolling 12,000 or more		Systems enrolling 100,000 or more	
	1966	1971	1966	1971
No cooperation	49.5%	35.8%	25.0%	44.0%
Public schools give or lend materials to nonpublic schools	21.0	38.3	37.5	28.0
Nonpublic-school pupils use some public-school facilities other than classrooms	17.5	15.2	29.2	16.0
Nonpublic-school pupils take some classes in public schools under public-school teachers	15.0	28.1	16.7	20.0
Public schools send some educational specialists to nonpublic schools	13.2	27.8	20.8	20.0
Public schools send teachers to nonpublic schools to teach some classes	2.7	7.7	12.0
Public-school pupils take some classes other than religious instruction at nonpublic schools	1.5	1.3	8.0
Nonpublic-school pupils take some classes in public schools but under nonpublic-school teachers	0.7	0.9	4.0
Nonpublic-school teachers participate in inservice training given by public schools	n.a.	28.3	n.a.	24.0
Other cooperative arrangement	10.5	4.1	16.7	4.0
Number of systems reporting	400	467	24	25

Sources: NEA RESEARCH BULLETIN, October, 1967, p. 91 and unpublished NEA OMNIBUS STUDY, 1970-71.

Table 2 indicates the types of cooperation reported by public school districts. The resource sharing involved nonpublic school students using public school materials, using public school facilities (other than classrooms), receiving help from public school specialists coming to the nonpublic schools, and taking certain classes at the nearby public school. Nonpublic school teachers participated in public school in-service training programs in over one-fourth of the districts surveyed. Though two of the largest school districts did report some public school students taking classes at nonpublic schools, cooperative practices involved chiefly the sharing of public school resources.

The earliest evaluations of Public Law 89-10 did not speak well for public and nonpublic school cooperation. The above findings showing a decrease in cooperation in large districts gives some hint of the problem. A U.S. Office of Education study of nonpublic school participation in ESEA Title I conducted by Boston College¹⁷ cited lack of communication and cooperation between public and nonpublic administrators among the reasons for the unequal participation of nonpublic school children in Title I programs. Erickson and Greely found the OEO projects served needy children far more flexibly and efficiently through private agencies under the Economic Opportunity Act than under ESEA. They pointed out that,

In keeping with a well-established pattern, federal aid flows rather easily through private pipelines when (as under EOA) the beneficiaries fall into 'preschool,' 'dropout,' or 'post-secondary' categories or if the services are viewed as 'welfare' rather than 'education'; but severe restrictions appear when (as under ESEA) the elementary and secondary levels of schooling are involved. Public schoolmen either are more sensitive than other citizens to church-state issues or have special reasons (such as fear or dislike of nonpublic education) for opposing the assistance.¹⁸

Despite these early problems with ESEA, as Table 3 shows, Title I did generate public and nonpublic school cooperation especially in schools serving the disadvantaged. Remedial reading assistance was reported by three-fourths of the Catholic and Lutheran schools responding to a 1973 NCEA survey. In fact, these same schools were aided more by Title I personnel in the areas of reading diagnostic services and technical assistance than by their own area or diocesan office personnel. This is not all that surprising in view of the fact that, in comparison with public school systems, nonpublic schools tend to have very small central office or system level staffs.

For all its limitations, ESEA, along with subsequent state legislation in the same vein, has served to launch new ventures in cooperation. Clearly, legislative stimulus is one way to overcome the gravitational pull.

Table 3
 Services Received by Non-Public Schools in Title I Programs
 in Nonpublic Schools serving the Disadvantaged (1972-73)

<u>Service</u>	(N=815)	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Not Sure</u>
Speech Therapy		40%	50%	10%
Teacher Workshops		32	49	19
Remedial Reading		74	20	6
Library Services		58	34	8
Instructional Materials		71	23	6
Counseling Services		43	67	10
Public School Teachers		32	60	8
Public School Remedial Specialists		44	48	8
Public School Guidance Counselors		22	69	9
Public School Curriculum Specialists		5	83	12

Source: NCEA-USOE Right to Read Survey, 1973

Erickson, Madaus, and Ryan in their study of cooperative programs between public and nonpublic schools pointed out another factor that overcomes this gravitational pull--a friendly interest.

More than any other single factor, the relationship between public and nonpublic school officials determines the fate of a cooperative program. When public and nonpublic school officials are friendly, almost any program can flourish; where the relationships are strained, no program, however brilliant can succeed: the case studies reveal no exceptions to this rule. Indeed, a prerequisite for a successful program seems to be a public school official who takes a personal interest in the program. In case after case, a public school official was identified by nonpublic schoolmen as being instrumental in the establishment of a cooperative venture.¹⁹

The absence of such friendly personal contacts in so many instances suggests a situation in which public and private school education never really meet one another with any frequency in professional, social, or community associations.

PREDICTION #4:

SHARED TIME (DUAL ENROLLMENT) PROGRAMS WILL NOT INCREASE, THEY WILL BE MAINTAINED AT THEIR PRESENT LEVEL.

Something of a standard definition for dual enrollment has evolved from an earlier (1963) U.S. Office of Education study. Dual enrollment is defined as "an arrangement whereby a child or youth regularly and currently attends a public school part-time and a nonpublic school part-time, pursuing part of his (or her) elementary or secondary studies under

the direction and control of the public school and the remaining part under the direction and control of the nonpublic school."²⁰ Four variations of dual enrollment have been identified in current practice.²¹

1. Limited Dual Enrollment

In limited dual enrollment, pupils are enrolled in one or two courses offered by the public school system. This scheme characteristically involved 90-300 minutes per week of public school instruction and is the oldest pattern of dual enrollment.

2. Partnership Dual Enrollment

This type of arrangement is called a partnership, a 50/50 or a half-day dual enrollment program. Typically, this arrangement involves public school children in 700-900 minutes of public school instruction per week.

3. Dual Enrollment for Religion Only

In this arrangement, pupils leave the public high school building to attend a class in religious education. The program differs from the typical "released time" programs in that students receive full public school credit for the religion courses.

4. Dual Enrollment in Reverse

This pattern of dual enrollment involves public school students taking courses in nonpublic schools.

As shown earlier in Table 2, limited dual enrollment is by far the most common form of dual enrollment. Table 4 reports the subject areas in which classes were taken by nonpublic school students in public school under the limited dual enrollment plan. According to these NEA surveys, the expanding area of cooperation was in driver education. The dual enrollment programs most often involve courses in industrial arts, vocational education, home economics, driver education, and instrumental music. All of these programs require expensive equipment and supplies, special facilities and are, as a rule, taught in small groups.

At times, these limited dual enrollment arrangements were worked out in order to keep the hard pressed nonpublic schools, most often Catholic schools, from closing their doors. Where state reimbursement applies to students in dual enrollment programs, the local public school district can by a dual enrollment program avoid absorbing the total cost of educating these nonpublic school students with very little additional public school expense. In one example cited by Erickson, Madaus and Ryan,²² a public school district conducted a \$62,000 dual enrollment program while receiving \$61,400 reimbursement from the state. The net additional expense of \$600 was a far cry from the \$300,000, the estimated cost of educating the 637 pupils from the financially pressed Catholic school. Where state reimbursements do not

Table 4
Classes Taken by Nonpublic School
Students in Public Schools by Subject Area

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1970-71</u>
Vocational Education	17.8%*	18.5%
Industrial Arts	28.9	20.4
Home Economics	24.5	18.7
Instrumental Music	38.4	23.2
Mathematics		6.8
Physics	6.2	11.7
Chemistry	8.8	5.3
Biology	1.4	4.4
Foreign Language	13.1	7.6
Physical Education	19.0	12.5
Driver Training	28.2	56.6
Other	34.4	23.5
Total Districts		
Reporting Shared Time	849	1451
Total Districts Surveyed	NA	11,718

*Indicates % of districts reporting nonpublic school students taking classes in the subject area.

Source: NEA Research Department

apply or are less adequate, the costs of dual enrollment to the local district can become significant. Additional complications arise from the overlap between public and private school attendance areas. Districts are often confronted with the financial complexities involved in serving non-residents.

The early NEA and USOE studies on dual enrollment proved to be inspirational as well as informative. While dual enrollment arrangements have been in effect for years, they became increasingly popular in the late 1950's when educational, political, and religious leaders began a more extensive public discussion of dual enrollment. More recently, in a 1969 Rhode Island study focusing on alternatives for the future in nonpublic education, Henry Brickell²³ proposed to the Rhode Island General Assembly a variation on dual enrollment, the creation of semi-public schools, in which segments of the heretofore nonpublic school would be assigned to the public sector. However, Brickell's survey of Catholic lay opinion indicated that 60% of the Catholic parents opposed and only 20% favored the idea of dual enrollment. Similar surveys in other parts of the country showed the same results.

In any form, shared time or dual enrollment programs offer both "good news" and "bad news." In such programs, the nonpublic school student has a broader, more comprehensive program and the opportunity of spending part of the day in a pluralistic setting. This same student also faces the problems of travel, a fractionalized curriculum,

the possibility of divided loyalties, and difficulties with extra-curricular activities. Relationships between public and nonpublic schools tend to improve; Catholic or other nonpublic school parents, without relinquishing their freedom of choice, begin to benefit directly from taxes and become more understanding about public school financial needs. Public education thus broadens its base of support.

Public school evaluations of shared time programs have tended to be quite favorable. As Erickson had noted, shared time arrangements tend gradually, as more courses are taken in public schools, to reduce the nonpublic school to a "part-time, supplementary agency." As Erickson observed in his 1970 Illinois study,

Public school evaluations of shared time typically say little about the major worries of participating nonpublic schoolmen, who in turn often seem reluctant to discuss their problems, perhaps because doing so may sometimes appear to reflect upon the attractiveness of nonpublic schools to parents and students. The Chicago Board of Education's report of last year rather cryptically observes that 30 percent of youngsters in the city's shared time program (involving three nonpublic schools) at its inception eventually abandoned the program and became full-time public school students. When the same program was evaluated by Catholic officials, the difficulties were made more explicit. Whereas four nearby Catholic schools, which did not participate in shared time, experienced enrollment declines of 9 to 10 percent during the first year of the program, the high school that did participate suffered a 23 percent loss during the same period.²⁴

Local school conditions and the kinds of reasons impelling the non-public leaders to cooperate in dual enrollment programs play an important part in determining the ultimate impact of these programs. Shared time arrangements between two thriving schools, confined to areas of instruction in which nonpublic schools have limited interest and competence, can be a permanent model for public and nonpublic school cooperation. As Erickson has pointed out, "When shared time extends beyond this point, usually because hardpressed nonpublic schools cannot otherwise survive, it functions as a phase-out technique."²⁵

While predicting neither an increase nor a decrease in dual enrollment programs, it is difficult to assess the future impact in certain changes. For example, some states have considered an arrangement which would allow students to spend a semester or a school year in some educational activity outside of the public schools and receive credit for this experience. Such changes may well open new possibilities for public and nonpublic school cooperation in some variation on the shared time theme.

PREDICTION #5:

PRESENT FORMS OF SHARING OTHER THAN DUAL ENROLLMENT WILL ALSO REMAIN AT PRESENT LEVELS.

Table 4 above reported slight increases in the number of school districts involved with other kinds of resource sharing such as lending materials, sharing public school facilities and public school specialists working in nonpublic schools. The level of sharing here, as mentioned in Prediction #3, is related to particular legislation and to personal relationships. In addition to ESEA, some fourteen states now provide nonpublic schools with auxiliary instructional services (psychologists, reading specialists, testing, state approved materials, etc.), which entails some cooperation between public and nonpublic school personnel. The 1970-71 U. S. Office of Education survey of nonpublic schools presented an overview of the kinds of public assistance to nonpublic schools. While all of the programs reported here in Table 5 do not require local cooperation, most do entail some contact. As shown in Table 5, the parochial schools, Catholic and Lutheran, were most extensively involved with governmental aid.

For the near future, there is no reason to suggest that these types of sharing will increase or decrease. Efforts by parochial school proponents to add to these programs will probably be offset by efforts by other parties to terminate these programs. For example, at present the California Teachers Association (CTA) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Southern California are currently suing the State Board of Education in an effort to overturn a law providing textbooks for children in nonpublic elementary schools*.

*Postscript: The U. S. Supreme Court's ruling (May, 1975) in *Meek v. Pittinger* which disallowed state programs involving the lending of instructional materials and equipment and auxiliary services on private school premises, necessitates some modifications in this prediction.

PREDICTION #6:

THE MOST DRAMATIC INCREASES IN PUBLIC-PRIVATE COOPERATION IN EDUCATION WILL TAKE PLACE IN THE AREA OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.

Since 1970, a number of states have passed legislation lowering the minimum age for handicapped children and requiring services to be provided to handicapped children now excluded from the public schools for want of adequate facilities. As reported in the NCEA Special Education Bulletin, "the movement in the nation's courts to open the doors of public education to all handicapped children is expected to reach new heights shortly."²⁶ With more litigation in preparation, as of 1972, 21 court cases involving the right to education or treatment had been initiated or completed in Alabama, California, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia and Wisconsin. According to a 1972 survey,²⁷ forty states have legal provisions allowing for the use of public monies to provide handicapped children with an education in private schools. All of these states permit this funding only when appropriate special education services are unavailable in the child's district of residence or in a readily accessible public program. In more cases, a child must meet state requirements of eligibility in order to obtain these services. Thus, if a state excluded trainable mentally handicapped children from its public school program, a trainable child would not be eligible for state financial assistance to attend a private program.

TABLE 5: Number of Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Schools REceiving Contributions from Public Agencies, by the Type of Contribution and by Religious Affiliation of School: United States, 1970-71

Religious Affiliation	No. of Schools	None	Instruct. Staff	School Lunch	Health Serv.	Transpor. Serv.	Instruct. Material	Text-books	Facilities	Other
Protestant	16,429	17.6%	18.7%	31.8%	50.4%	35.8%	48.1%	17.0%	10.0%	22.5%
Catholic	2,133	54.2	7.0	15.0	9.7	11.4	20.3	7.6	3.2	14.3
Other	14,255	12.0	20.5	34.3	56.6	39.6	52.4	18.4	11.0	23.7
Methodist	1,353	12.9	7.3	44.3	56.7	37.6	35.8	6.6	3.6	33.1
Other	10,770	5.0	25.4	36.1	62.6	45.3	61.6	21.6	13.7	24.1

USOE 1970-71 Survey of Nonpublic Schools (unpublished)



At present, the amount of assistance available varies widely. For example, Mississippi will pay up to \$250 annually; in Tennessee all of the costs of a private education will be paid by the school district. More commonly the state will pay only the actual per pupil expenditure of public school programs for the handicapped during the preceding school year. In certain disability areas, such as the deaf-blind, more flexibility is allowed and generally the actual program costs may be paid.

With the monies comes state supervision. For example, Virginia legislation established a strict licensing procedure for private schools in determining their eligibility to receive state funds. Pennsylvania's regulations regarding the use of private schools require that the school district of residence receive an annual assessment of each child made by the private school's educational team which must include, when appropriate, a certified public school psychologist's recommendation as to whether a continued placement in that setting will benefit the child. Alternative placements must be considered in the assessment. The child's home school district is responsible for providing an appropriate education to an exceptional child in the public schools as soon as the child can function in that environment.

To pursue one example in detail, the Virginia law, cited above, "recognizes the fact that education and training of handicapped children can take place in a variety of settings and indicates that these opportunities may be provided through private schools, regional cooperative programs and/or services, or tuition assistance when no public school programs are available."²⁸ In February 1973, the Fairfax County School Board²⁹ voted one-half million dollars to give parents of the county's special education students up to 75 per cent of the funds needed to send these children to private schools. The average cost of educating these children, most of whom are severely retarded or emotionally disturbed and cannot receive education in county public schools, is \$4,355 per resident in a private school and \$1,860 for a nonresident.

To implement these new arrangements in Fairfax county, rules and procedures are presently being defined by a task force of public and private school representatives. In one working arrangement now underway, the public schools provide a teacher in a private school called "The School for Contemporary Education" (SCE). The principal terms of the contract for the public school's support of Kenny Smith read as follows:

Fairfax County Public Schools will:

- 1) Select and pay for a teacher for Kenny Smith, who will be placed in a class with other children at the Contemporary School for Education.
- 2) The Fairfax County Public Schools teacher will work in a team with other SCE staff members, including the teachers of the group in which Kenny is placed.
- 3) Provide cost of transportation for Kenny if the parents do not agree to pay this cost (\$420.00).

The School for Contemporary Education will:

- 1) Provide in-service experience for the Fairfax County Public School teacher and administrative support of her.
- 2) Make available all special services normally provided in the school for children with Kenny's handicap, including transportation.
- 3) Provide the supplies and equipment necessary for Kenny on the same basis as for other pupils in the school.

Such arrangements might well become commonplace. According to the 1972 estimates, only 40% of the 4.25 million school aged handicapped children were being served by the public schools. This pressing need along with the presumed absence of church-state complications and the particular programmatic demands of special education for the handicapped add to the feasibility of close public-private cooperation in this area.

PREDICTION #7:

PROJECT COOPERATION WILL CONTINUE IN AREAS RELATED TO SOCIAL CONCERNS AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY.

From 1970 to 1974, the Ford Foundation funded a National Catholic Educational Association project to establish pilot efforts at cooperative planning called Joint Planning Councils first in three cities: New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Francisco and then later in five additional cities. The purpose of each planning council was to encourage cooperative planning and cooperative ventures between public schools and Catholic school systems. While the joint planning project has enjoyed some success, it has also served to highlight the crucial role played by personnel as well as the gravitational pull toward non-cooperation between public and nonpublic school relationship groups discussed earlier.

A substantial amount of the planning councils' efforts have dealt with facilities and programs in radio and TV. This is quite understandable. As William J. Sanders has observed, "The joint use by public and nonpublic schools of data processing for pupil accounting, of television, of computer-assisted instruction, in short, jointure in educational technology"³⁰ is a promising avenue for cooperation. As Sanders put it, "technology has a way of ironing out differences; it exerts a centripetal force."

Cooperative projects which center around a constructive social concern will likewise continue to have appeal. Hartford's Project Concern is a good example. In 1973 the project, then in its seventh year, served some 1,400 randomly selected children in 10 Hartford schools where approximately 85% of the pupils are Puerto Rican or Black. The project provides not only busing to suburban schools but also special teachers and aides to work in these suburban schools, which include nine parochial schools. To date, the costs of this project have been met chiefly from state and federal aid that Hartford receives for disadvantaged children.

Another example from the Hartford area is project SPHERE, in which a group of Connecticut independent schools have provided successful summer remedial and enrichment programs for low-income students from the Hartford public schools. Begun in 1964 with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, SPHERE, Inc. was legally incorporated as the first supplementary education system devoted to building a viable partnership across public-private lines. In a program designed with and for the Hartford Public Schools, these independent schools offered programs for grades 4-12, some boarding, some day, serving boys and girls from the public schools with an intensive summer session, followed by year-round tutoring and follow-through, with heavy involvement with the parents and the sending schools. Foundations and ESEA monies have provided the funding to date for the project. As the executive director noted, "If this partnership is to continue to serve and be an example, it will be necessary to develop an adequate and regular funding source. Our efforts will be directed toward passage of State legislation to underwrite on a regular basis this kind of cooperative venture. We hope that this will result in recognition of the concept and tend to legitimize a new and growing educational endeavor."³¹

In predicting the future of these cooperative efforts, it seems safe to assume that while federal and foundation monies can launch such projects, no such ventures can survive permanently without state or local support.

PREDICTION #8:

PRIVATE SCHOOLS, MORE CONSCIOUS OF THEIR OWN IDENTITY, WILL SEEK TO BECOME MORE DISTINCTIVE IN CHARACTER AND LESS INFLUENCED BY PREVAILING PUBLIC SCHOOL STANDARDS.

By law, private schools are supposed to be influenced by the prevailing public school standards. In order to reinforce school attendance requirements which seek to guarantee to each child an education sufficient for his own welfare and for the needs of a competent citizenry, forty-one state legislatures have enacted some type of compulsory standard for nonpublic school instruction. Six states explicitly require certification of nonpublic school teachers. Ten states specifically define required courses and twenty-one demand some equivalence between nonpublic and public school instruction. According to John Elson,

The most common troublesome instructional standard requires nonpublic schools to have courses of instruction equivalent to those in public schools. Typical expressions of this standard provide that nonpublic school instruction shall 'be equivalent to that provided in the public schools,' 'teach subjects comparable to those taught in the public schools,' and equal 'in thoroughness and efficiency and in the progress made therein as in the public school.'³²

In his discussion of possible pitfalls in state regulation of nonpublic schools, Elson offers several valuable suggestions to avoid undesirable regulation. For example, Elson suggests that,

The most effective procedure for this purpose is to draft tentative rules and then submit them to the interested parties for written comments. A department of education can also sponsor periodic statewide nonpublic school conventions or hold smaller, more specialized conferences. Space in its bulletin or journal can be devoted to views of nonpublic school officials.³³

While state regulation has had some impact, by and large the great resemblance that most nonpublic schools bear to their public school counterparts has little to do with state regulations. While the high-tuition religiously unaffiliated schools have demonstrated more independence and self-direction than the parochial schools, in most schools, public and private alike, it has been business as usual. In his Illinois study report, Erickson asserted that:

Scandalously little attention is given in most public or nonpublic schools to the possibility that the basic modus operandi is defunct, that a fundamentally different approach to teaching and learning is essential to significant progress: smaller schools, a great sense of community, more student-initiated learning, more extensive connections between the classroom and the world outside, less emphasis upon the teacher as the knowledge-storehouse gatekeeper, more use of people in the community who speak the students' language and embody unique insights and skills, more use of students to instruct and assist each other.³⁴

According to Erickson, even recent large scale efforts to improve Catholic schools have not led to distinctive or imaginative approaches:

Rather, exorbitantly expensive efforts have been exerted along the same discredited lines that have been so common in public schools. Vast sums have been spent to reduce class size, though no clear evidence shows that factor to be important to learning. The tired premise prevails, apparently, that the way to improve school outputs is to maximize school inputs—more teachers, higher salaries, more equipment, more books.³⁵

Thus, according to Erickson, public school standards have been internalized by private school educators, law or no law. Looking to the future, Erickson does call for some change in the "state regulation" of nonpublic schools, centering on two imperatives:

(The) first and most basic imperative, state regulations of nonpublic schools must encourage the pursuit of pluralistic goals. According to the Supreme Court, 'The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize

its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only.' But standardization may as readily be achieved by requiring nonpublic schools to serve the same ends as public schools. I think it a priceless principle that radically different educational purposes are not only tolerable but desirable in our democracy. The second imperative is that state regulation on nonpublic schools must encourage diverse approaches to the achievement of goals. The reason is simple: as a field of study, education is in its infancy. Most current instructional procedures have about as much scientific evidence to support them as the home remedies and patent medicines of a past century. It is a time for exploration, not codification.³⁶

Erickson was referring to such matters as the application to nonpublic schools of the unresearched and often questionable requirements for public school teacher and administrator certification.

Erickson can take heart that there are signs that the nonpublic schools are becoming more conscious of themselves as some alternatives or distinctive schools. The emergence of the alternative school movement itself has provided some stimulus. A new force in developing and articulating this distinctiveness might well develop from the newly formed Council for American Private Education (CAPE), a federation of national organizations of nonpublic schools. Dr. Otto Kraushaar explained the Council's purpose as follows:

The various school groups represent a variety of purposes, philosophies, styles, and beliefs which preclude general agreement on many questions. They seek the comfort of mutual reinforcement not in order to overcome these differences—that would destroy their raison d'etre—but to form a united front on the basis of what they have in common. The common denominator is the concept of independence, the right to be different, the mutual acceptance and mutual protection of diversity in education. . . . The principle which unites them is indivisible: all are in jeopardy if the survival of diverse groups of schools is imperiled.³⁷

The council quite predictably could serve as a stimulus and clearing-house of ideas and procedures related to the efforts of nonpublic schools to realize their own uniqueness.

In his study of nonpublic schools, Kraushaar³⁸ found in the matter of the distinctiveness of church-related schools a "singular lack of imagination and enlivening thought in the conceptualizing and articulating" of the school's religiously rooted goals. Kraushaar noted that "in many schools, religion appears to be not so much the invigorating nucleus of a humane education as a protective facade which facilitates the perpetuation of ethnic subculture traditions." However, he did add that "the evidence is substantial that despite the inability of most religious educators to articulate their guiding principles in anything but pedestrian ways, the religious setting does make an important difference."

Removed once and for all by the Supreme Court from the temptation to ape public school ways in order to win public subsidy in the form of the purchase of secular services, church related schools—especially Catholic schools—are taking a hard look at their distinctiveness as religious schools. Ironically, Catholic educators have for decades been calling for a clear definition of what a Catholic school is meant to be. After reviewing more than four decades of Catholic education periodicals, G. S. Sloyan,³⁹ in his doctoral study pointed out that "too often such papers and essays are inspirational rather than instructive, and just at the point where the speaker or writer has said, 'We must Catholicize every part of the school day, every course of study, every textbook,' he lapses into generalities that cast no further light." In Theories of Education, John Childs⁴⁰ noted that the Catholic school "supernaturalist theory" was very insistent on distinctive first principles but consistently refrained from application of these first principles.

One approach recently taken by the National Catholic Educational Association in bridging this gap between principle and practice is to have educators begin by simply defining a school's philosophy in terms of what actually goes on in the school and the reasons and purposes for this actual pattern of school practice. Underlying the desing of this approach is the theory or assumption that a school's philosophy is a matter of action more than words. As Chester I. Barnard has pointed out, "The purpose of any organization is defined more nearly by the aggregate of actions taken than by any formulation in words."⁴¹ This aggregate of actions taken (what actually goes on in the school) is chiefly a matter of what the teachers do together with the students in the classrooms, halls, cafeteria, church, playground, etc. Reflecting Barnard's views, the NCEA approach contends that nine-tenths of the responsibility for shaping the actual purpose or philosophy of a school in fact rests with the teachers. The school's philosophy is largely a matter of what they really believe and actually do.

Several surveys by the NCEA⁴² based on this approach have revealed a spectrum of Catholic school operating philosophies ranging from the common stereotype of a Catholic school, which Supreme Court justices and others have associated with indoctrination, to a quite liberal and open school. In 1973, most Catholic schools seemed to be somewhere between these two models or philosophies, favoring the latter more than the former.

In proposing a theoretical model or the philosophy toward which their schools should strive, both Catholics and Lutherans have focused on the school as a free choice learning community. The 1973 Lutheran Education Yearbook⁴³ proposes that the school be the prototype supportive Christian community in the local parish. The 1972 Catholic Bishops'⁴⁴ statement on education affirmed that "community is at the heart of Christian education, not simply as a concept to be taught but as a reality to be lived." The freedom that nonpublic schools have to develop this sense of community stands somewhat in contrast to the dilemma facing public school students and teachers at the bottom of the state's educational bureaucracy. As seen by Richard Graham

Many schools by their process of education teach powerlessness, teach the individual that he does not have, and is not likely to

have, significant control over his own destiny. In them, there is little sense of community established by the wishes of a group of individuals, by the consent of the governed. Rather, student and teacher alike are members of the school society because they are assigned to it. There is no sense of voluntary association; little sense, on the part of either student or teacher, of the exercise of power in his own behalf. Schooling has become a form of compulsory national service, enculturation in the national interest.⁴⁵

PREDICTION #9:

THE 'GENIUS OF PRIVATE EDUCATION' WILL BE TESTED IN OCCASIONAL, LIMITED AND CAREFULLY CONTROLLED PUBLIC SCHOOL EXPERIMENTS: THESE EXPERIMENTAL APPROACHES HAVE LITTLE PROSPECT OF WIDESPREAD SUCCESS.

The "genius of private education" is that it provides parents with an alternative and a choice—if they have the money. As Mario Fantini⁴⁶ discovered, the typical American parents have little real freedom of choice about where their children go to school and how they are taught. Recently, some public school educators have become increasingly sensitive to this vein of criticism—i.e., that parents have no real choice other than the monolithic public school. Jencks and his colleagues built their case for the voucher experiment of the need for competition and choice in education. Jencks⁴⁷ argued that if parents would have more choice about education, schools would be more responsive to the needs of the child.

However, Jencks and others to the contrary notwithstanding, any voucher plan experiment involving both public schools and nonpublic schools in any substantial numbers has been and most probably will continue to be quickly warded off as a potential threat to public education as presently defined. The ease with which this was accomplished only confirms Prediction #2 concerning the security of the public schools as the established institution. As Judith Areen, who earlier had collaborated with Jencks in the voucher plan proposal, has recently pointed out,

Traditionally most alternative school supporters have looked outside public school systems for change. Consequently their biggest problem usually is obtaining enough money to operate. But to the extent that parents' objections to public schools are the result of the structure of public school systems, it may turn out to be more feasible to make public schools 'private' than to make private schools 'public.'⁴⁸

In 1973, Mario Fantini published a plan for the reform of American education in a work entitled Public Schools of Choice.⁴⁹ Fantini reviewed the efforts to date at setting up, chiefly within the public

schools, alternative forms of schooling which include individual classroom alternatives, schools within schools, separate alternatives schools, and school without walls. What begins as a confidently formulated plan becomes, in the end, an urgent but less confident appeal. Fantini devotes a chapter to the exciting alternative schools in Berkeley and a post-script, in dialogue with Herbert Kohl, on what really happened in Berkeley. According to Kohl, administrators' interest in "alternative" schooling was coextensive with 3.5 million dollars in USOE monies. (For the most part, alternative schools within the public system have been financed by the federal government or foundation funds.) One of the founders of the National Consortium for Options in Public Education, Robert Barr, has expressed some concern about the future prospects for the public schools of choice. According to Barr

Most public school reformers worry that the idea of options will become a fad and lost the promise this development holds for far-reaching reform. At present, public school options are still small indeed. With the exception of a half dozen school districts that have developed clusters of diverse options, few public schools have more than one, and too often it involves only a few students. Such schools are often under attack from their colleagues in conventional programs, from conservative school boards, and from insecure administrators. At best they can only be called a beginning.⁵⁰

There is little to suggest this small beginning will lead to much of anything. In discussing his plan for reform, Fantini asserts that

Basically, the 'enemies' of reform are not school administrators, teachers, parents, or any one group, but the outdated institutional arrangements that literally force these groups to engage in negative political conflict . . . School administrators and professional educators respond the way they do in large measure because the institutional structure compels them to behave in this way. The institution orients them toward thinking about reform in certain ways. They are products of the environment in which they work.⁵¹

PREDICTION #10:

THE DIFFERENTIATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION BASED ON SOCIAL CLASS IS ONLY TEMPORARILY THREATENED BY BUSSING AND COURT ORDERED DESEGREGATION; IT WILL CONTINUE AS AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN MAINTAINING INFLUENTIAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION.

What is suggested here is that some of the success of public education in the U. S. results from its conformity to the demands of the "private market." Public schools do offer alternatives; the influential, well-to-do citizens can send their children to the better public schools. As the Serrano v. Priest, Rodriguez v. San Antonio, and Hobson v. Hansen cases have shown, public schools

can and often do differentiate the level of their services to clients according to the income level and social class of the client group. The noted scholar of public school finances has commented on this differentiation; Charles Benson points out that:

After all, the handsome couples in the suburbs who deplore de facto segregation in the large cities and who even are so daring as to form local committees on fair practice in housing are the ones who have a major stake in preserving the lifetime advantages that their privileged, though tax-supported, school offers their children. The vocal elements of the community, that is, find it hard to raise their voices on the one issue over which, in the present scheme of things, they can lose most of all.⁵²

Using the concept of consumer differentiation, Monsen and Downs have explained how some of the success and acceptance enjoyed by public education is based on its conformity to the demands of the "private market." Monsen and Downs, in their analysis of the attractiveness of public goods, pointed out that, in addition to utility, consumer differentiation or the communication of status information is a basic function of consumer goods especially among whose income is well above the subsistence level. They argue that in the provision of most public goods, (e.g. welfare, the county home, the state hospital, social security) there is little opportunity for consumer differentiation. However, this is not so with the public schools.

Public education is an example of the arrangement of government goods that supports consumer differentiation in the United States. Public school systems in most metropolitan areas outside the large central cities are operated by relatively small school districts—especially in primarily middle-income and upper-income areas—regard their school systems as important status differentiators in relation to school systems in lower-status areas—particularly those within the central city. These higher-status residents lavish relatively large expenditures on their schools . . . Certainly one motive for such spending is that most parents believe higher expenditures for better teachers, buildings, and facilities in fact improve educational attainment. But another motive stems from the fact that the reputed 'quality' of local schools is a key ingredient in establishing the status of any residential area. This occurs precisely because private spending goes for a government good capable of being provided on a differentiated basis (neighborhood by neighborhood, or district by district).⁵³

These authors predict that, if this differentiation were eliminated, total spending on schools would decrease.

The court-ordered bussing has represented, in effect, a step away from consumer differentiation in public education. At the same time, an increase in demand for private school education has taken place in urban areas and in the South. As Monsen and Downs warned, it would be naive for advocates of increased equality to suppose they can suppress

the desire for consumer differentiation, even in government goods. Donald Erickson, in his 1972 Louisiana study, reported some of the problems found by consumers in desegregated schools:

Numerous serious difficulties have attended racial desegregation in the state's public schools In some cases, desegregation is badly managed. Anarchy breaks out, children are threatened, instruction is disrupted, and there are few discernible prospects for improvement. In other instances, a social class phenomenon seems primary; middle-class whites react against the advent of black children from deprived backgrounds who may have difficulty coping with conventional classrooms. In other cases, whites seem to be deserting the public schools because the courts allegedly have usurped the governance rights of parents. When the welfare of the child seems seriously threatened in a racially integrated school, the parent faces a moral dilemma. If he transfers his child to a largely segregated nonpublic school, he may hamper society's struggle toward racial justice. But there must be some point at which conditions are sufficiently damaging to the child to constitute moral justification, or even a moral demand, for the transfer.⁵⁴

Because of the close relationship between race and social class, especially in the South, efforts at racial integration diminish differentiation by social class. However, long term prospects indicate that in some way social class or consumer differentiation will be worked out in public education for the reasons indicated above by Monsen and Downs. Especially after the Supreme Court's rejection of the Rodriguez appeal, the handsome couples in the suburbs cited above by Benson will continue through the legislatures to find a way to maintain their advantage. In selling the idea of public education, the laws of the private market will inexorably be given their due.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The predictions offered here, as mentioned earlier, are meant to serve as "guiding predictions" which find their fulfillment not when they are proven to be true but when they are proven to be useful in stimulating discussion and action. Do American educators really want a future in which public and private sector cooperation is intensified? If one assumes, for the moment, that they opt for some growth in cooperation, attention needs to be given to the barriers preventing cooperation and possible steps toward improving cooperation. Both the barriers and the steps over these barriers were outlined by Robin H. Farquhar in a presentation at the 1968 National School Boards Association Convention.⁵⁵ The intervening years have served only to substantiate Farquhar's remarks. Farquhar identified the following barriers:

1) The legal or constitutional barriers. These have recently become more difficult with the prevailing and quite nebulous Supreme Court doctrine of "excessive entanglement." Earlier concepts such as the "child benefit" theory did provide a very clear basis for administrative judgment. With the "excessive entanglement" doctrine, any form of cooperation (read "entanglement") can be deemed excessive. The state is set for confusion and arbitrary decisions.

2) Misinterpretations of legal barriers. In general public school officials have a penchant for exaggerating barriers and nonpublic officials a penchant for ignoring barriers. Farquhar suggested that at times these exaggerations of legal barriers are really just a cover-up for psychologically based opposition.

3) Varied administrative structures. Schedules and customary procedures at times complicate communication and cooperation. Contacts between administrators of the two systems involve individuals who are operating at different levels of responsibility with different channels of communications and different official relationships with their subordinates. For example, nonpublic schools are extremely decentralized in their authority structure in contrast to the more bureaucratized public school organization.

4) Financial competition. Admittedly this was more of a barrier before the recent Supreme Court closure on the question of direct and substantial aid to nonpublic schools. As Farquhar has pointed out, this objection even then was more one of feeling than of fact. Farquhar's own study in 1968⁵⁶ asked public school administrators to rate the impact of nonpublic schools on public schools in terms of 23 postulated effects via a rating scale from 1-5, i.e. from "no effect" to "very strong." The total mean score was 1.7. No effect registered even a mean score of 3. While the financial competition generated by the nonpublic schools' campaigns for state aid was one of the more noticeable "effects," the greatest impact was assigned to the "relief effect item read as follows: "The net effect of the existence of nonpublic schools on the local financing of the public schools is to increase the amount of money per pupil available for public school use." This relief effect has been corroborated by school finance. As summarized by Erickson and Greeley, this research has shown generally positive relationships between proportion of students in nonpublic schools and per pupil outlays in public education. According to their report

While nonpublic school patrons probably do tend to limit revenue levels for public education, indications are that this proclivity is more than offset by the financial burden the nonpublic schools assume in educating their students at private expense.⁵⁷

Withal, the atmosphere of competition continues. Recently the powerful teacher organizations, NEA and AFT, have joined a new nationwide coalition to oppose efforts of private and parochial school interests to secure public funds for nonpublic schools, The National Coalition for Public Education and Religious Liberty, made up of thirty educational, religious, and civil liberties groups, is an outgrowth of the earlier formation of state and local PEARL units.

5) Philosophical and historical barriers. Differences in educational, religious, social and even moral values come to bear on public and private cooperation. In his report cited earlier, Pifer pointed out a sort of philosophical barrier: "There remain in the nation many people, especially in the nation's 'heartland,' who continue to have a kind of populist distrust of private institutions, associating them with great wealth, privilege, and a social caste system."⁵⁸ Public officials, in his view, lack commitment to a combined public/private system. According to Pifer, "The predominant attitude of officialdom, however, is at best one of indifference to the entire issue and at worst one of skepticism bordering on hostility."

These attitudes cannot be charged simply to the self-interest of the representatives of public education. There is a long history behind these points of view, which has shaped even the semantics of the question. As Otto Kraushaar noted,⁵⁹ private school people often prefer to have their institutions called "independent" schools to avoid the "elitist," "undemocratic," even "un-American" connotations that have been acquired by the term "private" in education. Such connotations are not difficult to explain. They grew out of a history of American education which was written by public school advocates. For example, one history of education text used widely in required courses in educational administration dismissed the nonpublic schools with this statement, "During the nineteenth century, when public schools were in many ways imperfect and old social and religious prejudices still prevailed, private elementary and secondary schools flourished."⁶⁰ According to Bernard Bailyn, the early 20th century advocates of public education drew up "what became the patriotic literature of a powerful academic ecclesia compiled to give the neophyte an everlasting faith in his profession" as a public school educator. According to Bailyn, these public school advocates had serious limitations in their historical approach which resulted in "distortions and short-circuiting of thought Persisting in their search for familiarity in an unfamiliar past, they had no choice but to accept crude facsimiles, deceptive cognates. 'Public' was perhaps the most important." Bailyn observed how they failed to realize that "The modern conception of public education, the very idea of a clean line of separation between 'private' and 'public,' was unknown before the end of the eighteenth century."⁶¹ Thus, they re-wrote the past in the light of their own present concern for the advancement of public education."

Also, underlying this historical distrust of the private sector in American education was the century old unspoken assumption or hope that large scale government intervention would be the answer to the educational problem of growing America. It would inevitably put things right. This hope rested in part on an idealized notion of perfect government and the belief that a true and nearly perfect democracy provided the setting for the rise of the American public school. However, as E. G. West has remarked,

We are now certainly more conscious that the general proposition that government could possibly put things right does not mean that real world governments will always do so. Economics textbooks now explain to their readers not only

that markets are 'imperfect' but that so also are governments. To identify the practical workings of the government sector with its ideal workings is at least as big an error as always to identify the practical workings of the market with its ideal workings. The market critic's alternative system cannot avoid markets. If it destroys private markets in education, it creates political ones.⁶²

Perhaps as a result of the sequence of issues and events of Watergate, Americans may have gained some more insight about the political market, where, once and for all, the future of American education is squarely located.

These barriers to cooperation between public and nonpublic schools, as Farquhar has observed, result to a large extent from misunderstanding and mutual unfamiliarity, which can be at least partially remedied by communication and cooperation. Farquhar has suggested the following steps. 1) research on problems and prospects for cooperation, 2) the development and dissemination of model projects in cooperation, such as Project SPHERE and the Ford Foundation's Joint Planning Council Project described earlier. 3) new and more imaginative ways of sharing, such as student exchanges, inter-system sharing of teachers in highly specialized subject matter areas, etc., 4) developing pre-service and in-service training programs especially for administrators, involving specific courses, seminars, and workshops, 5) cross system research, of which there has been surprisingly little. As a vehicle for these actions, Farquhar proposed the formation of regional consortiums of institutions which would include public and non-sectarian private universities, sectarian universities, public school systems, nonpublic school and school systems and a conveniently located central office which would serve as an information clearinghouse and a coordination center.

Unfortunately, the 1968 agenda proposed by Farquhar has largely gone untouched in the intervening years. However, the U. S. Office of Education has recently sponsored joint conferences between public and nonpublic school administrators and has named a special liaison official to work with the nonpublic schools with a view of improving public and private cooperation in education. A number of state departments of education have likewise added a staff member with special responsibilities for the nonpublic schools. These are hopeful signs for the future. In this matter of the future of public-nonpublic school cooperation, hopeful signs are not that easy to find.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 US 510.
- ²Pearl v. Nyquist, Sloan v. Lemon and Levitt v. Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty.
- ³Fred Charles Ikle, "Can Social Predictions Be Evaluated?," Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress, ed. Daniel Bell Boston: Beacon Press, 1967, p. 105.
- ⁴Alan Pifer, "The Jeopardy of Private Institutions," Annual Report: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1970, p. 9.
- ⁵The President's Commission on School Finance, Schools, People, and Money, Final Report, Washington, D. C., March 3, 1972, p. 12.
- ⁶Ernest J. Bartell, "Costs and Revenues of Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Education: The Past, Present, and Future of Roman Catholic Schools," in Fahey, Economic Problems of Nonpublic Schools, p. 218, 563,565.
- ⁷Martin Mayer, "The Prep Schools Enroll for a Cram Course in Budgeting," The Independent School Bulletin, (February, 1973), p. 9.
- ⁸Robert D. Resichauer and Robert W. Hartman with the assistance of Daniel J. Sullivan, Reforming School Finance, Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1973, p. 99-100.
- ⁹Ibid., p. 100
- ¹⁰Bruce S. Cooper, Free and Freedom Schools: A National Survey of Alternative Programs, A Report to the President's Commission on School Finance, November, 1971, p. 2.
- ¹¹Schools, People, and Money, op. cit., p. 12.
- ¹²Robert J. Havighurst, "The Unknown Good: Education Vouchers," Education Vouchers: From Theory to Alum Rock, ed. James A. Mecklenburger and Richard W. Hostrop. Homewood, Illinois: ETC Publications, 1972, p. 50.
- ¹³Stephen J. Knezevich, "Perspectives on the Educational Program in 1985," Educational Futurism 1985, Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971, p. 33.
- ¹⁴Daniel P. Moynihan, "Equalizing Education: In Whose Benefit?," The Public Interest, No. 29 (Fall, 1972), p. 55.
- ¹⁵Donald A. Erickson and Andrew M. Greeley, "Nonpublic Schools and Metropolitanism," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education (The Sixty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education), ed. Robert J. Havighurst, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968, p. 307.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Vincent C. Nuccio and John J. Walsh, A National Level Evaluation Study of the Impact of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the Participation of Nonpublic School Children, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts: Boston College, 1967, p. 263.

¹⁸Erickson and Greeley, op. cit., p. 309.

¹⁹Donald Erickson, George Madaus, and Joseph P. Ryan, Summary of Local Cooperative Programs Between the Public and Nonpublic Schools, prepared for The President's Commission on School Finance, 1972.

²⁰James E. Gibbs, Carl J. Solzowski, A. W. Steinhibler, and William C. Straser, Dual Enrollment in Public and Nonpublic Schools, U. S. Office of Education Publications, OE-24014, Cir. No. 772, Washington: U. M. Government Printing Office, 1965.

²¹Erickson, Madaus, and Ryan, op. cit.

²²Ibid.

²³Henry M. Brickell, Nonpublic Education in Rhode Island: Alternatives for the Future, A Study for the Rhode Island Special Commission to Study the Entire Field of Education, July, 1969, p. 125.

²⁴Donald A. Erickson, Crisis in Illinois Nonpublic Schools, Final Research Report to the Elementary and Secondary Nonpublic Schools Study Commission, State of Illinois, December 29, 1970. p. 2-4-5.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶National Catholic Educational Association, Special Education Bulletin, Vol. 11, No. 2 (January, 1973), p. 37.

²⁷Alan Abeson, "A Continuing Summary of Pending and Completed Litigation Regarding the Education of Handicapped Children," Council for Exceptional Children, Jefferson Plaza, Suite 900, 1411 S. Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia, 22202.

²⁸The Code of Virginia, Section 22-9.1:01.

²⁹Ron Shaffer, "Board Votes More Special Education Aid," The Washington Post, February, 1973, p. C2.

³⁰William J. Sanders, "Regulation of Nonpublic Schools as Seen by a State Commissioner," Public Controls for Nonpublic Schools, ed. Donald A. Erickson, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969, p. 184.

³¹Reverend David P. Kern, "S.P.H.E.R.E., Inc." The Independent School Bulletin (February, 1972), p. 42.

- ³²John Elson, "State Regulation of Nonpublic Schools: The Legal Framework," Public Controls, *op. cit.*, p. 122f.
- ³³Ibid.
- ³⁴Erickson, Illinois Nonpublic Schools, *op. cit.*, p. 3-3,3-4.
- ³⁵Ibid.
- ³⁶Donald A. Erickson, "Freedom's Two Educational Imperatives: A Proposal," Public Controls, *op. cit.*, p. 160-65.
- ³⁷Otto F. Kraushaar, American Nonpublic Schools: Patterns of Diversity, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1972, p. 359.
- ³⁸Ibid., p. 179.
- ³⁹Gerald S. Sloyan, "The Recognition of Certain Christian Concepts in the Social Studies in Catholic Elementary Education," Catholic University Press, 1948.
- ⁴⁰John P. Wynne, Theories of Education, New York: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 362f.
- ⁴¹Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966, p. 231.
- ⁴²George Elford, "The Catholic School in Theory and Practice," Washington, D. C., NCEA Paper, Series 11, No. 5, 1973.
- ⁴³James Cassens, The Catalytic Community, River Forest, Illinois: Lutheran Education Association, 1973.
- ⁴⁴"To Teach as Jesus Did," Pastoral Letter of U. S. Bishops, Washington, D. C., National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1972.
- ⁴⁵Richard A. Graham, "The School as a Learning Community," Theory Into Practice, Vol. XI, No. 1 (February, 1972), p. 7.
- ⁴⁶Mario Fantini, Public Schools of Choice, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.
- ⁴⁷Judith Areen and Christopher Jencks, "Education Vouchers: A Proposal for Diversity and Choice," Educational Vouchers: Concepts and Controversies, ed. George R. La Noue, Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press, 1972, p. 52.
- ⁴⁸Judith C. Areen, "Alternative Schools: Better Guardians than Family or State?" School Review (February, 1973), p. 178.
- ⁴⁹Fantini, *op. cit.*

⁵⁰Robert D. Barr, "Whatever Happened to the Free School Movement?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 7 (March, 1973), p. 457.

⁵¹Fantini, op. cit., p. 254.

⁵²Charles S. Benson, The Cheerful Prospect, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965, p. 20.

⁵³Anthony Downs and R. Joseph Monsen, "Public Goods and Private Status," The Public Interest, No. 23 (Spring, 1971), p. 70.

⁵⁴Donald A. Erickson and John D. Donovan, The Three R's of Non-Public Education in Louisiana: Race, Religion, and Region, A Report to the President's Commission on School Finance, HEW, Chicago, Illinois, January, 1972, p. 3-4.

⁵⁵Robin H. Farquhar, Toward Improved Communication and Cooperation Between Public and Nonpublic Schools, HEW, ERIC Report No. Ed 025 836, p. 8-12.

⁵⁶Robin H. Farquhar, "The Public School Administrator Views the Catholic School—or Does He?" Educational Administration Quarterly (Fall, 1968), p. 2-15.

⁵⁷Erickson and Greeley, op. cit., p. 303.

⁵⁸Pifer, op. cit., p. 12-13.

⁵⁹Kraushaar, op. cit., p. 53-54.

⁶⁰James Mulhern, A History of Education: A Social Interpretation, Second Edition, New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1946, p. 622.

⁶¹Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, p. 10-11.

⁶²E. G. West, Education and the State, London: The Institute of Economic Affairs, 1970. p. xxii.



TRENDS IN EDUCATION SERIES

Editors for the Series: Nicholas Nash and Richard S. Podemski

Papers in this series include:

Other papers in this series include:

BEFORE CONANT, BEYOND JENCKS

Harry L. Summerfield reviews educational policy in the United States since World War II and anticipates events of the 1980's.

Code T-1

CHANGING ROLES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

Maynard Reynolds reviews the history of special education, discusses current trends and forces, and outlines problems, predictions, and their implications for the future.

Code T-3

WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP: A TREND DISCUSSION

Paula Silver analyzes trends in employing women for leadership positions in education, identifies recent developments which might have impact on altering those trends, and suggests some courses of action for those who favor more active participation of women in educational leadership in the future.

Code T-4

THE "SPECIAL" CHILD GOES TO COURT

David L. Kirp examines the effect of recent court rulings and the future role of litigation upon the delivery of educational services for handicapped children.

Code T-5

TRENDS IN RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Philip Roos re-examines past trends and projects future developments in residential care for handicapped individuals.

Code T-6

The University Council for Educational Administration is a non-profit consortium of major universities. Its basic mission is to improve the professional preparation of administrative personnel in education through a variety of activities. Located on the campus of The Ohio State University, UCEA is directed by Jack A. Culbertson.