

5-1-1969

An Analysis of the Impact of the Loans and Services Offered Under Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, on the Availability of Library Resource Material to the Pupils and Teachers of the Non-Public Schools of Nebraska, 1965-1968

Richard B. Ulmer, Sr.
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Ulmer, Sr., Richard B., "An Analysis of the Impact of the Loans and Services Offered Under Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, on the Availability of Library Resource Material to the Pupils and Teachers of the Non-Public Schools of Nebraska, 1965-1968" (1969). *Student Work*. 2563.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2563>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



An Analysis of the Impact of the Loans and Services Offered
under Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
of 1965, Public Law 89-10, on the Availability of Library
Resource Material to the Pupils and Teachers of the Non-public
Schools of Nebraska, 1965-1968

A Field Study Project
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate College
The University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

by
Richard B. Ulmer, Sr.

May 1969

UMI Number: EP74106

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74106

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of The Graduate College of
the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education.

Graduate Committee

Kenneth Bushholder Educational Administration
Name Department

Paul B Askerson Sec Ed.

Raymond A Zink Sec Ed

Darrell Kelams Ed. Ad.
Chairman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While the writer takes complete responsibility for the conclusions and recommendations found in the final chapter of this study, he wishes to acknowledge the invaluable assistance rendered to him by the following people:

Dr. Dean Lusinski, Director of NANS during the period studied, for providing ready access to the statistical data stored in his office as well as for his many explanatory comments regarding the procedures followed in administering the Title II program to the non-public schools of Nebraska,

Mrs. Elsa Jackman, NANS library consultant, for alerting a novice to items only a professional librarian would notice,

The members of his university advisory committee for constructively criticizing the scope and format of the study,

Many non-public school administrators and librarians for taking the time to answer and return his questionnaire,

Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. for spending his Christmas vacation at the adding machine helping his father tabulate raw statistics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM, DEFINITION OF TERMS USED, AND	
SOURCES OF INFORMATION	1
The Problem	1
Delineation of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Importance of the Study	4
Organization of the Study	5
Definition of Terms	5
Non-Public Schools	5
Nebraska Agent for Non-Public Schools	5
Library Resources	8
Participating School	8
Secondary School	9
Sources of Information	9
Annual Survey Reports	9
The Questionnaire	9
Informal Interviews	10
II. THE PROBLEM IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	11
The Rationale For The Use of Title II Funds	
By Non-Public School Pupils and Teachers	11
Current Issues in State Aid For Non-Public	
School Students in Nebraska	16
III. PRESENTATION OF SELECTED STATISTICAL DATA AND	
QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES	20

CHAPTER	PAGE
Selected Statistical Data From Annual Survey	
Forms	20
Responses to Questionnaire	34
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
Summary	41
Conclusions	42
Recommendations	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIX A	48
APPENDIX B	56

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Degree of Participation of Nebraska Non-Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in the Title II Loan Program, 1965-66 through 1968-69	22
II. Degree of Participation of Nebraska Non-Public Elementary and Secondary School Pupils in the Title II Loan Program, 1965-66 through 1968-69	24
III. Annual Investment of Title II Funds and the Number of Books loaned to the Non-public Elementary and Secondary Schools of Nebraska, 1965-66 through 1968-69	25
IV. Expenditure of Private Funds for Library Resource Materials by the Non-public Elementary and Secondary Schools of Nebraska participating in the Title II Loan Program, 1965-66 through 1968-69	28
V. A Comparison of the Percentages of Selected Categories of Library Books in Centralized Library Collections of Nebraska Non-public Schools Which Participated in the Title II Loan Program, 1965-66 through 1968-69	32

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, DEFINITION OF TERMS USED, AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION

I. THE PROBLEM

Delineation of the Problem. In a symbolic gesture President Lyndon Baines Johnson elected to sign the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, 89 Congress, H.R. 2362) in the little Texas schoolhouse where he had received his first years of formal education. On this occasion he indicated the importance which he attached to this piece of legislation by saying, "As President, I believe deeply that no law I have ever signed or will ever sign means more to the future of our country."¹ History will eventually rule on the validity of this unprecedented assertion, but friend and foe are in agreement that this bill constituted the most ambitious federally-financed program enacted to improve the educational opportunities of children in the United States.

The Act was not a general aid-to-education measure designed to reduce any school's current operating expenses. Simply stated, it was designed to improve the education of American children by encouraging innovation in methods of teaching and the use of modern techniques and to make available to children and teachers instructional materials of high quality. President Johnson succinctly sketched the purpose of the Act when addressing the nation on January 4, 1965.

¹News item in the New York Times, April 12, 1965.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse and buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's: teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.²

A more complete exposition of the historical significance of this bill will appear in the following chapter. It is important to note at this point, however, that the child benefit theory, as first asserted by the Supreme Court of Louisiana in 1930 and later upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States,³ was carefully considered when this piece of legislation was formulated. In essence, the child benefit theory suggests that certain kinds of public aid to children attending non-public schools are permissible because the aid is given to benefit children directly and not the schools which they may attend.

The act was divided into five sections, or titles, each dealing with a specific area of concern.⁴ These titles may be generally described as follows:

Title I. Almost 75 per cent of the total amount of money originally allocated was designated for Title I

²Lyndon B. Johnson, "State of the Union Message," January 4, 1965.

³281 U. S. 370 (1930).

⁴National Audio-Visual Association, Nothing Matters More (A Summary of the Titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Fairfax: Virginia: National Audio-Visual Association, 1966). This booklet provided the writer with the most imaginative presentation of ESEA innovative programs.

programs. Educationally deprived children, children whose educational achievement was below, or without special aid was likely to fall below, that normally expected of children of their age and grade as well as children whose physical, emotional, or mental state indicated that they needed special assistance, were the beneficiaries of this title.

Title II. This section provided money to local school districts to purchase library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials. Items such as maps, globes, sound recordings, slides, transparencies, films, filmstrips, musical scores, and other items of a similar nature were included. Equipment was not included.

Title III. Title III was set up as a five-year program. The emphasis in this section was on innovation. Monies were allocated to local educational agencies to plan, develop, and maintain pilot projects and exemplary programs.

Title IV. This title was an amendment to the Cooperative Research Act of 1954. It provided for grants to universities, public and private agencies, and individuals for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education and for the dissemination of information gained through such projects.

Title V. Under this title a state educational agency

responsible for the public education of elementary and secondary school children could receive grants to build up its leadership functions. Provisions for spending this money were left very flexible.

Statement of the Problem. This study was specifically designed to answer the question: What effect have Title II loans and services had on the availability of library resource materials to the child attending a non-public school in Nebraska.⁵ The period covered was September, 1965 through December, 1968.

Importance of the Study. A study of this nature was of importance in three respects. In the first place, the legislators who initially allocated the funds should be interested in knowing whether Title II accomplished the purposes for which it was designed. This evaluation should come from a person removed from the administration of the program. Reassessments and changes of direction could be suggested by such an evaluation.

Secondly, it is of value to those responsible for administering any program to have an "outsider" evaluate progress from a relatively objective viewpoint.

In a third respect, this study was of importance as a case study, albeit a small one, in the broad area of public assistance to children enrolled in non-public schools. At the

⁵The word loans is significant in this context. Materials were given to public schools and loaned to pupils and teachers in non-public schools, as stipulated in Title II.

time of writing this topic was of major concern to educators and legislators both on the state and national levels.

Organization of the Study. Subsequent sections of this chapter deal with a definition of terms used and the sources from which statistical information was acquired. Chapter II attempts to put the problem in historical perspective. Chapter III contains two sections: one dealing with the data found in the files of the Nebraska Agent for Non-Public Schools and the other with the questionnaire designed and employed by the writer. Chapter IV contains a summary of the study together with the conclusions and recommendations which seem justified on the basis of the study.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Non-Public Schools. As used in the study, this term designated a privately administered and financed full-time, elementary or secondary school which operated with the approval of the Nebraska State Department of Education. This definition encompasses church-related as well as non-denominational private schools. No attempt was made to categorize schools according to denominational affiliation, but it is significant at this point to note that approximately 99 per cent of the non-public schools in Nebraska were church-related at the time the study was made.

Nebraska Agent for Non-Public Schools. (NANS) Title II was designed to be administered on the state level. Subsection (a) of Section 203 of the Act required that any state which desired to receive grants under this title was required to

submit a plan to the United States Commissioner of Education which (1) designated a state agency to administer the same, (2) set forth a program under which funds would be expended for library resources and administration of the state plan, (3) set forth criteria to be used in allocating the materials in an equitable manner, (4) set forth criteria to be used in selecting the materials, (5) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that federal funds were supplemental to local, state, and private resources, (6) set forth fiscal control and accounting procedures, and (7) provided for making certain reports.

At the direction of Floyd A. Miller, Commissioner of Education for the State of Nebraska, a plan was designed which met the above criteria. This plan was subsequently approved by the Nebraska Board of Education on January 11, 1966. The plan was submitted to the Attorney General of the State of Nebraska for his signature before being sent to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, D.C. The accompanying letter indicated that there were some misgivings with regard to the involvement of private school students and teachers.⁶

The Attorney General responded to Mr. Miller on January 24, 1966. While approving of the plan submitted in a

⁶The writer made extensive use of a mimeographed copy of the plan submitted by the Commissioner to which was appended mimeographed copies of the correspondence between the Commissioner and the Attorney General. This material was given the title "A State Plan, for making available school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, under Sections 201-207 inclusive of Title II and Sections 601-605 inclusive of Title IV, Public Law 89-10 April 11, 1965."

general way, the Attorney General expressed the opinion that it would violate the laws of Nebraska in one specific aspect, the powers given to local public school districts to purchase materials which would be used in other than public schools. The key section of this opinion for the purpose of this study was as follows:

Upon examining the Revised Statutes of Nebraska we find no authority whereby school boards and boards of education are authorized to enter into contracts for the purpose of purchasing library resources, textbooks or other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in non-public elementary or secondary schools.⁷

Commissioner Miller then inquired in a letter dated January 31, 1966, as to whether the Attorney General could identify any existing state agency which could serve as the administrator for Title II funds allocated to private school students. The response dated February 8, 1966, was negative.⁸

The June 30, 1966, deadline was rapidly approaching and concern was indicated on the part of both public and non-public school administrators, the latter for obvious reasons and the former because of the policy of the United States Office of Education that no Title II funds would be allocated to a state until provision had been made for all elementary and secondary school students, public and non-public, to benefit therefrom.

⁷Ibid., Appendix A, p. 4.

⁸Only two states, Nebraska and Oklahoma found themselves faced with this problem. The other forty-eight all administered Title II funds through existing state agencies to both public and non-public school students.

When apprised of the Nebraska dilemma, the United States Office of Education offered two alternatives: find an existing private agency willing to take the responsibility or form a new corporation whose sole purpose would be to administer Title II funds to non-public school children. Since no existing agency was willing to take this responsibility, superintendents of the various non-public school groups represented in the state agreed to form the corporation which became known as the Nebraska Agent for Non-Public Schools. Meetings were held from early February until the incorporation papers were filed on April 15, 1966. The five incorporators were representatives of non-public schools. The first board of directors was composed of both public and non-public school representatives.

The NANS offices were initially located in Lincoln, Nebraska, but were relocated in Omaha, Nebraska in January of 1967. Dr. Dean Lusinski was engaged as the director and served in this capacity during the entire period under study. It was in this office, with the cooperation of Dr. Lusinski, that the raw statistics for the major part of the study were gathered.

Library Resources. As used in this study, the term library resources refers to books (excluding textbooks) and printed matter as well as to filmstrips, recordings, and other instructional materials. The term does not refer to equipment such as projectors.

Participating school. This term refers to a school

which borrowed Title II materials for its pupils and teachers in a given school year. In cases where two schools with separate library facilities were under the jurisdiction of one administrator, each was counted as a participating school.

Secondary school. Junior and senior high schools were included in this category.

III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Annual Survey Reports. Participating schools were required to submit to NANS what is commonly known as an annual survey report. This untitled report consisted of seven mimeographed pages of data related to library resources found in the individual schools. (See sample copy in Appendix A.) These forms, basically an adaptation of Evaluation Criteria, Section F. National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, 1960, were designed by the NANS director. Some refinement was done during the period under study. This refinement has been indicated where it affected items considered in the study.

These reports, presently found in the NANS files, formed the source for the major portion of the study. Not all information found on the reports was considered relevant. A number of items, which to the casual reader may seem to be pertinent, were not considered because the obviously wide range of interpretation on the part of respondents rendered any valid generalization impossible.

The Questionnaire. Rather early in the study it became obvious that an additional dimension, although subjective in

nature, was needed to balance the information extracted from the survey forms. A questionnaire was then designed by the writer (See sample copy in Appendix B), to be sent to librarians and others responsible for library resources in the non-public schools in Nebraska. A questionnaire was sent to 221 of the 233 schools which indicated participation in the Title II program during the 1968-69 school year. Twelve schools were not included because the writer felt their participation in the Title II loan program was not of sufficient duration to permit meaningful responses to the questions asked.

The questionnaire was designed to receive a high response, respondents having only to circle appropriate choices on a self-addressed post card. Many of the 82 per cent who responded also volunteered additional interpretations of the situation as it prevailed in their schools.

Informal Interviews. Unstructured interviews were conducted on numerous occasions with the director of NANS, the NANS office staff, and the NANS library consultant. These interviews were most helpful in the interpretations of the data found on the survey forms.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

"Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787

Customarily those engaged in a research project consult and review current literature which has specific bearing on the problem under consideration. The writer has corresponded with those responsible for the administration of Title II funds on the state and national levels and has been convinced that no other formal research has been done on the specific topic of this study.

With an eye to avoiding the twin pitfalls of expanding the scope of the study beyond all manageable proportions and that of including extraneous material only remotely relevant to the topic at hand, an attempt is made in this chapter to (1) delineate the rationale which enabled Title II funds to be expended for materials used by students and teachers in non-public, and particularly church-related schools, and (2) indicate the current concern in Nebraska for general financial assistance to non-public schools from the state treasury.

I. THE RATIONALE FOR THE USE OF TITLE II FUNDS

BY NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS AND TEACHERS

One need not search diligently to find instances wherein the Congress of the United States has written legislative docu-

ments which benefit educational endeavors in all kinds of schools regardless of whether the sponsorship of the schools is public, private, or church related. Blum notes that in recent years Congress has enacted laws which have established more than fifty distinct educational programs which aid church-related education.¹⁰ Some of the more well-known enacted prior to 1965 were: (1) G.I. Bill of Rights of 1944 and 1952; (2) National Defense Education Act of 1958; (3) National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and (4) Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

One may well pose the question as to how such financial aid may be reconciled with the First Amendment to the Constitution which supposedly erects, in Jefferson's much quoted phrase, "a wall of separation between church and state." Three judicial theories may be cited which provide the rationale for such aid.

The first of these, the theory of "public purpose," appeared in the Cochran decision of 1930. The Supreme Court recognized that the teaching of secular subjects in church-related schools could amount to the achieving of a public purpose. Justice Hughes delivered the opinion of the Court which upheld a Louisiana law which provided free textbooks to all children of the state. Pertinent excerpts from his opinion may be cited as follows:

¹⁰Virgil C. Blum, Freedom in Education, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 104. Chapter V., titled "Precedents in Freedom in Education," gives detailed examples of many of these laws.

The appropriations were made for the specific purpose of purchasing school books for the use of the school children of the state, free of cost to them. It was for their benefit and the resulting benefit to the state that the appropriations were made..... The schools are not the beneficiaries of these appropriations.....The school children and the state alone are the beneficiaries.....viewing the statute as having the effect thus attributed to it, we cannot doubt that the taxing power of the state is exerted for a public purpose.....Individual interests are aided only as the common interest is safeguarded.¹¹

It is evident that this theory has remained valid.

Paul G. Kauper of the University of Michigan delivered a lecture in 1962 which Miller quotes as being most relevant. Kauper said,

A study of all the relevant considerations of actual court hearings and of historically sanctioned practices makes clear that no authoritative support can be found for the proposition that the First Amendment forbids any kind of aid to a parochial school or to the educational programs there.....

It is plain that parochial schools do have a secular aspect recognized by law and that when a parent sends his children to a parochial school, he is sending them to an institution that satisfies the public purpose of the compulsory education laws while at the same time exercising his constitutional right to have his children receive religious instruction.¹²

The "child benefit" theory, closely related to the doctrine of "public purpose," is a second important theory

¹¹Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education, 281 U. S. 370 (1930).

¹²Arthur L. Miller, "Current issues in Church-State Relations," Legal Aspects of Lutheran Parish Education, (1964 Yearbook, Lutheran Education Association, Peter A. Zadeik, Editor, River Forest, Illinois, 1964) p. 62.

pertaining to the question of federal aid to the non-public school student. In essence, this theory suggests that certain kinds of public aid to children attending non-public schools are permissible because the aid is directly to the child and only incidentally to his school. The genesis of this reasoning is present in the Cochran decision and even more explicitly stated in the Everson decision of 1947 which held that government may provide bussing for children to get to a church-related school, or more broadly interpreted, that government may aid a student to obtain an education, even though in a church-related school.

Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. Pertinent sections of his opinion are as follows:

The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another,No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion....the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between Church and State."

Measured by these standards, we cannot say that the First Amendment prohibits New Jersey from spending tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of parochial school pupils as a part of a general program under which it pays the fares of pupils attending public and other schools....Of course, cutting off church schools from these services, so separate and indisputably marked off from the religious function, would make it far more difficult for the schools to operate. But such is not the purpose of the First Amendment. That Amendment requires the state to be neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and non-believers; it does not require the state to be their

adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them.¹³

The third judicial theory which provides a rationale for Title II funds being used in non-public schools is that of the "primacy of secular effects." Indicated already in the *Everson* decision, this theory says in effect that the First Amendment is not violated when government legislates for a secular purpose and some benefit accrues to a church school as an incidental by-product. The legislative purpose and primary effect of the law are controlling in a test of constitutionality, not the incidental by-products. The *Schempp* decision of 1963 in which the practice of Bible-reading was declared unconstitutional in public schools clearly asserted this principle. The Court said,

The test may be stated as follows: What are the purpose and the primary effect of the enactment? If either is the advancement or inhibition of religion, then the enactment exceeds the scope of legislative power as circumscribed by the Constitution. That is to say that to withstand the strictures of the Establishment Clause there must be a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion.¹⁴

Congress has repeatedly enacted laws which had the secular purpose in mind but which also benefited religiously-oriented institutions. The Hill-Burton Act, enacted in 1946, provides federal matching funds for the construction of hospitals and public health centers. Many of these grants have

¹³Everson v. Board of Education of the Township of Ewing, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

¹⁴School District of Abington Township, Pennsylvania v. Schempp, 374 U.S. (1963).

gone to private and church-related hospitals.

These three judicial theories provide the rationale for Title II funds being used for the benefit of non-public school teachers and pupils.

II. CURRENT ISSUES IN STATE AID FOR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS IN NEBRASKA

It is not within the scope of this study to attempt to deal even superficially, with the entire question of government aid to private education. After having sketched in broad outlines the rationale for government aid on the federal level through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, it does, however, seem pertinent to indicate the extent to which this rationale is being employed on the state level, particularly in Nebraska. The answer can be stated succinctly: not at all. The reason for this situation may be found in Article VII, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of Nebraska which states:

No sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public funds set apart for educational purposes, nor shall the state accept any grant, conveyance, or bequest of money, lands or other property to be used for sectarian purposes. Neither the State Legislature nor any county, city or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation from any public fund, or grant any public land in aid of any sectarian or denominational school or college, or any educational institution which is not exclusively owned and controlled by the state or a governmental subdivision thereof.¹⁵

¹⁵Constitution of the State of Nebraska of 1875, Article VII, Section 7, (As amended and in force, November 1, 1966.)

An unusual and somewhat bizarre situation has developed especially since the advent of Titles II and III. Non-public school teachers and students are welcome to make use of government-financed materials and services available under the various titles of ESEA and at the same time barred from utilizing other government-financed services, Educational Service Units for instance, because the latter are under state administration.

This seeming inconsistency plus the increasing financial burden borne by the patrons of non-public schools have caused two bills to be submitted to the Nebraska Unicameral for consideration. The first of these is a bill (LB1083), submitted by Senators Mahoney, Carpenter, and Warner which would, upon the affirmative vote of the people of the state, change the Constitution of Nebraska so that "grants could be made for the benefit of students enrolled in non-public schools as reimbursement for a portion of their tuition."¹⁶ The second bill (LB1022), is one submitted by Senator Moylan which would create a special fund for all federal grants for educational purposes.¹⁷ This would eliminate the necessity of the state treasurer being involved in the distribution of federal funds earmarked for non-public schools.

As can be observed from a cursory reading of LB1083,

¹⁶ News item in the Lincoln (Nebraska) Journal, February 12, 1969.

¹⁷ News item in the Omaha World Herald, March 12, 1969.

this bill is not directed toward merely textbooks, bus rides, and other items which may be ascribed to the area of "child benefits." This bill is dealing with tuition, buildings, and teachers' salaries. Proponents of the measure advance several reasons for suggesting such a radical departure from past practices. These reasons may be summarized as follows:

(1) Parents have a constitutional right to send their children to a school of their own choice. Because many people cannot exercise this right without tangible financial support, the government should provide such support.

(2) Many non-public schools are on the brink of financial disaster. Their demise would mean an enormous increase in taxes.

(3) Continuation of a pluralistic society requires options in education. This will not be possible if non-public schools are forced to close.

(4) Public schools need the competition offered by other schools.

(5) Parents of non-public school children must pay a double tax for education.

(6) The education of children in non-public schools serves a public purpose, no less than the education of children in public schools.

At the time of this writing an organization known as Citizens for Educational Freedom has just begun to become well organized in Nebraska for the purpose of supporting legislation such as the two bills mentioned. It is not yet clear how these pieces of legislation will be received by the Unicameral or by the populace in general.¹⁸

¹⁸The ideological background for the Citizens for Educational Freedom movement was developed by Anthony W. Daly, an attorney in Illinois, and Virgil C. Blum, S.J., associate professor of political science at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Father Blum's book Freedom of Choice in Education (Macmillan, 1958) emphasizes the point that government subsidies given directly to the student or his parents would avoid the church-state controversy.

There seems to be little uniformity among the various states as to the amount and kinds of financial aid given to non-public school students. There are no states which at the present writing do as much as LB1083 is suggesting. ¹⁹

¹⁹The most recent compendium of what various states are doing or not doing in this area may be found in a news article appearing in the February 16, 1969 issue of the Lutheran Witness Reporter (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House) by William A. Kramer. Kramer questioned chief state education officers in each state on four topics: (1) bus transportation, (2) other forms of aid, (3) legislation introduced or likely to be introduced in 1969 legislatures, and (4) litigation.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF SELECTED STATISTICAL DATA AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

I. SELECTED STATISTICAL DATA FROM ANNUAL SURVEY FORMS

As was indicated in Chapter I, the statistical data found on the annual survey forms submitted by each participating non-public school were the major source of information for the study. Those items which the writer felt were significant to the purpose of the study are thus presented in the first part of this chapter.

While Title II loan materials were meant to benefit students and teachers, the administration of the program was delegated to NANS and ultimately to the administrative officers of the individual schools. Each school was given the annual option of participating in the program and receiving an allotment of materials for use by the students and teachers in that school. If a school chose not to participate, the students and staff associated with that school forfeited any claim to Title II materials for that year.

An initial question might well be concerned with the extent to which the non-public schools of Nebraska participated in the program during the period under examination. The data related to the number of schools involved during each of the years and also the percentage of eligible schools which participated are indicated in Table I. An examination of this information leads to the conclusion that the Title II loan program met with

immediate acceptance among the great majority of non-public schools operating in Nebraska and maintained a high percentage of participation during the entire period under study. The elementary school data shows a gradual rise from 81 per cent to 85 per cent participation. The secondary school reports reveal that, with the exception of a small bloc of schools from two denominations which chose not to participate in the program, acceptance was almost unanimous. A closer examination of the data indicates that most non-participating schools were those with small enrollments. Three elementary schools accepted loans and then withdrew from the Title II program.

A study of Table I reveals a trend which, while not directly pertinent to the specific emphasis of the study, is important to the question of government aid to non-public schools. The number of non-public schools declined from 310 to 271 in a four-year period, a 12 per cent decline. Some of these schools merged with others in the same locality while a larger number closed and sent students to public schools.

A second and more immediate concern of the study than the number of participating schools was the number of students who received the benefits of Title II expenditures. In a state with a sizeable number of non-public schools located in small communities and rural areas, it was conceivable that, if a number of large schools chose not to participate, the percentage of participating pupils could have been significantly lower than the percentage of participating schools. The fact that the percentage of students served was in every case higher than the

TABLE I

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION OF NEBRASKA NON-PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE TITLE II LOAN PROGRAM, 1965-66 THROUGH 1968-69

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
ELIGIBLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	246	240	230	219
PARTICIPATING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	199	200	196	186
PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATION	81	83	85	85
ELIGIBLE SECONDARY SCHOOLS	64	60	52	52
PARTICIPATING SECONDARY SCHOOLS	57	55	48	47
PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATION	89	91	92	90
TOTAL ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	310	300	282	271
TOTAL PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS	256	255	244	233
TOTAL PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATION	83	85	87	86

percentage of participating schools (Table I) indicated that such was not the case. On the contrary, most non-participating schools had relatively small enrollments.

Recognition should be made at this point of an important factor which is not indicated by the statistics recorded on Table II: pupils attending schools with small enrollments had proportionately fewer Title II items available for their use than did pupils attending schools with larger enrollments. This condition resulted from the fact that size of loans was determined mainly on the total enrollment of schools. This situation is not restricted to the administration of government programs; it is related to the whole problem of providing adequate learning resources for the student in the small school.

A decrease in non-public school enrollment which closely parallels the 12 per cent reduction in the number of schools indicated in Table I may also be noted at this point.

The magnitude of the Title II program among the Nebraska non-public schools is depicted on Table III. This table has little significance, however, without a consideration of the number of pupils involved. During the 1965-66 school year, for instance, 57,694 students were enrolled in participating schools. The total number of volumes loaned was 29,953--approximately one-half book per student.

The expenditures recorded on Table III do not include the administrative costs involved with the NANS office, but the various handling and processing charges made by book

TABLE II

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION OF NEBRASKA NON-PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PUPILS IN THE TITLE II LOAN PROGRAM, 1965-66 THROUGH 1968-69

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
ELIGIBLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS	45,648	44,780	43,447	42,066
PARTICIPATING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS	43,470	42,811	41,900	40,065
PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATION	95	96	96	95
ELIGIBLE SECONDARY SCHOOL PUPILS	14,794	14,490	14,267	13,667
PARTICIPATING SECONDARY SCHOOL PUPILS	14,224	14,095	13,855	13,182
PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATION	96	97	97	96
TOTAL ELIGIBLE PUPILS	60,442	59,270	57,714	55,248
TOTAL PARTICIPATING PUPILS	57,694	56,906	55,755	53,247
TOTAL PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATION	95	96	96	96

TABLE III

ANNUAL INVESTMENT OF TITLE II FUNDS AND THE NUMBER OF BOOKS
LOANED TO THE NON-PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF NEBRASKA, 1965-66 THROUGH 1968-69

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69*</u>
TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR LIBRARY RESOURCES	\$124,089	\$119,715	\$108,755	\$47,695
PER-PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR LIBRARY RESOURCES	\$2.15	\$2.10	\$1.95	\$0.95
NUMBER OF BOOKS LOANED**	29,953	27,181	24,000	incomplete

*Data for the 1968-69 school year was not complete at the time the study was made. The director of the NANS program was at that time of the opinion that the estimated amounts here recorded would be quite accurate.

**No attempt was made to determine the number of other items of instructional material that were loaned. A cursory comparison of the total expenditures for 1965-66 with the number of books loaned in the 1965-66 term, a term in which only books were loaned, with the same figures for the two succeeding years suggests the great preponderance of materials loaned during the entire period under study was in the form of books.

suppliers are included. In determining the value of the materials to be loaned to individual schools, three criteria were employed: enrollment, total library collection, and per-pupil library collection. Actual allotments were made in terms of books rather than monetary terms, the latter being forbidden by Title II regulations in the case of non-public schools.

The 1968-69 amount, while not precise at the time of this writing, may be considered a workable figure. The rather drastic decline in the size of the annual allotments, due to curtailment of federal appropriations, was of serious concern for those involved in the program.

No attempt was made to catalog each item of library resource material loaned to participating schools. Only books were available for loan to non-public schools during the first year of operation. This was due to the fact that time was very limited between the formation of NANS and the first appropriation deadline. In succeeding years participating schools were permitted to borrow up to 50 per cent of the value of their assigned allotment in library resource materials other than books. Although textbooks were included among the kinds of materials available under the original working of the Title II program, they were deleted from the plan as submitted to the federal government by the Nebraska State Department of Education. Those responsible for this decision were of the opinion

that library resource materials were more urgently needed in most Nebraska schools than were new textbooks.

One of the underlying principles of the entire Title II loan program was that the federal funds were to be supplemental to what was being spent on the local level. That the Title II materials and services would serve as an impetus to the expenditure of additional funds for library resources by the local school or school district was one of the goals of the program. An examination of Table IV indicates that such was the case in the non-public schools of Nebraska during the period under study. The gradual leveling of expenditures per pupil on the elementary level suggests that a plateau was being reached. Informal discussions with non-public school administrators from many parts of Nebraska indicate that the dramatic rise in costs in other areas of budget appropriation will tend to curtail the acquisition of library resources by non-public schools in the immediate future.

The data for Table IV was extracted from the revised annual survey forms used for the 1967-68 school year which called for information on previous expenditures. The earlier form was obviously misinterpreted by many respondents in that textbooks and other instructional materials not classed as library resources were considered in computing annual expenditures for library resource materials. Note should also be made of the fact that information reported for the 1968-69 term represented budgeted and estimated amounts from projections made in the fall of 1968.

TABLE IV

EXPENDITURE OF PRIVATE FUNDS FOR LIBRARY RESOURCE MATERIALS BY THE NON-PUBLIC
 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF NEBRASKA PARTICIPATING IN
 THE TITLE II LOAN PROGRAM, 1965-66 THROUGH 1968-69

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
<u>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</u>				
ELEMENTARY	\$65,843	\$77,433	\$88,107	\$89,501
SECONDARY	\$41,865	\$48,295	\$52,962	\$59,583
COMBINED	\$107,708	\$125,728	\$141,069	\$149,084
<u>PER-PUPIL EXPENDITURES</u>				
ELEMENTARY	\$1.51	\$1.81	\$2.10	\$2.23
SECONDARY	\$2.94	\$3.43	\$3.82	\$4.52
COMBINED	\$1.87	\$2.21	\$2.53	\$2.80

The next area of consideration was the quantitative and qualitative changes in the library book collections found in the participating schools. An examination of the initial annual survey forms lead to the conclusion that it was impossible to determine the number of volumes in the elementary schools which did not have organized libraries during the 1965-66 school term. Although provision was made on the annual survey forms for recording the total number of volumes, this item was often misinterpreted and sometimes ignored by respondents. A tabulation was made of the total volumes found in the elementary schools which had centralized library facilities of some kind at the outset of the Title II program. This included approximately one-half of the participating elementary schools. The results were as follows:

<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
77,426	93,472	105,575	120,974

This numerical increase of 56 per cent is noteworthy. Although these schools received 40,001 volumes as Title II loans during this period, on-site inspection by NANS staff members also attests to the fact that literally thousands of volumes were discarded as libraries underwent reorganization. This factor would further substantiate the conclusion that many of these schools have made a serious effort to increase the number of library books available to their pupils and staff members through the expenditure of private funds.

The secondary school libraries of schools participating in the Title II program during the entire period under study

showed an increase of 26 per cent in total volumes. The following array suggests steady progress.

<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
113,428	123,968	131,174	142,476

A comparison of the size of library book collections of elementary and secondary schools on a per-pupil basis suggests that the Title II materials served a greater need in the elementary libraries. Many of the secondary school libraries had sizeable collections at the outset of the program.

No objective data were available to ascertain the qualitative change in library books. Informal interviews with NANS personnel indicated that definite progress toward the improvement of the quality of the collections was made in most participating schools. This was due in no small part to the guidance of the NANS office in the selection of Title II loan materials. It was the goal of the NANS personnel to encourage the building of collections which had quality and balance. Schools were made cognizant of the standards and recommendations of the American Library Association and the Nebraska Department of Education.

An attempt was made to measure changes in the composition of library collections by compiling the total number of volumes in selected categories at the beginning of the period under study and comparing these numbers with those reported for the 1968-69 school year. All participating secondary schools were included. All elementary schools which had an organized library by the fall of 1966 were included in the comparison. This

represented 76 per cent of the participating elementary schools. The categories were selected on the advice of professional librarians. Experience has alerted them to the fact that poorly-balanced school library collections are usually well stocked with fiction books and deficient in books dealing with pure science, useful arts, fine arts, and in the case of elementary schools, quality easy readers.

Data contained in Table V indicate that gradual improvement toward recommended proportions was made during the period under study on both the elementary and secondary levels. Conspicuous is the preponderance of fiction. Library consultants suggest that the number of easy readers has not grown as rapidly as might be expected because of the fact that the bulk of this category in some school collections was composed of cheap, low-quality volumes which have short life-spans when used in a school setting. In the case of some schools the term "conglomeration" would be more fitting than collection since lack of funds and guidance from library specialists encouraged the solicitation of miscellaneous donations of new and used books from well-meaning patrons and friends.

During the same period that more and better library materials were made available to the non-public school pupil and his teacher, an even more dramatic, and perhaps more important, change took place in the ways these materials were made available for use in the school. Particularly on the elementary school level, an unprecedented surge of improvements took place.

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCENTAGES OF SELECTED CATEGORIES OF LIBRARY BOOKS
 IN CENTRALIZED LIBRARY COLLECTIONS OF NEBRASKA NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
 WHICH PARTICIPATED IN THE TITLE II LOAN PROGRAM
 1965-66 THROUGH 1968-69

	<u>1965-66</u>		<u>1968-69</u>	
	RECOMMENDED	ACTUAL DIFFERENTIAL	RECOMMENDED	ACTUAL DIFFERENTIAL
ELEMENTARY				
Pure Science	8	7 -1	8	9 1
Useful Arts	5	2 -3	5	4 -1
Fine Arts	5	2 -3	5	3 -2
Fiction	20	34 14	20	31 11
Easy Books	25	17 -8	25	18 -7
SECONDARY				
Pure Science	10	6 -4	10	7 -3
Useful Arts	10	4 -6	10	5 -5
Fine Arts	5	3 -2	5	4 -1
Fiction	20	27 7	20	24 4
				32

Four items may especially be noted: the establishment of central libraries, shelf lists, card catalogs, and the assignment of school librarians. The following array illustrates the magnitude of some of the changes in the elementary school library facilities and services in participating schools.

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
Central Libraries	54%	76%	82%	87%
Shelf Lists	47%	80%	90%	93%
Card Catalogs	49%	78%	88%	94%
Assigned Librarians	40%	59%	62%	64%

As can be noted, the most noticeable changes took place between the first two years the Title II program was in operation. In all probability a peak was reached in the establishment of central libraries, for there were some school situations where the size of the enrollment would make a central library impractical. Conversely, a close scrutiny of individual schools revealed that in several cases the enrollment was of such size that the lack of a central library was inexcusable. Even in those schools which reported having the above facilities, much reorganization and refinement was necessary. Informed library consultants registered dismay at what had in some cases been reported as functional card catalogs.

The statistics dealing with assigned librarians indicate progress, and undoubtedly progress was made during the four years under study. The term "assigned librarian" which appeared on the annual survey forms was nebulous and could lead

to a misinterpretation of the data contained in the above array. In actual fact there are few non-public schools, particularly on the elementary level, in Nebraska which have at the time of this writing a full-time, trained librarian whose duty it is to coordinate library resource materials. Most participating schools depend on volunteer assistance to "check out the books." A number of schools have teachers assigned to order books and be responsible for the organization of the central library, but this work is usually done after school hours, and the teachers in many instances have no formal training in library science.

The writer concluded that the changes recorded above were a direct result of Title II loans and services. Responses to the questionnaire substantiated this assumption.

II. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

As the study progressed, the writer became increasingly aware of a lack of perspective inherent in the initial approach which was dependent almost exclusively on the use of statistical data. A brief questionnaire was then designed and sent to 221 of the 233 participating schools in care of the responsible administrator or librarian. The purpose of the questionnaire was to receive personal opinions as to the effectiveness of the Title II program in the improvement of library resources for the non-public school pupil in Nebraska. (See Appendix B for sample of the questionnaire). Responses were received from 181 schools, a return of 82 per cent. Since no sampling was involved, no attempt was made to analyze each response as to

the affiliation, size, or location of the school. The only differentiation made was whether the school responding was elementary or secondary. Junior high schools were classed as secondary.

The first question asked was:

What impact have Title II materials had in the quantitative and qualitative improvement of library resources available to your students?

none minor moderate major

Responses were as follows:

	<u>none</u>	<u>minor</u>	<u>moderate</u>	<u>major</u>
ELEMENTARY	1%	5%	43%	51%
SECONDARY	0%	16%	54%	30%

This question dealt with the essence of the entire study. On the basis of these responses it must be concluded that Title II materials had a tremendous positive impact on the library resources available to students and teachers in the non-public schools of Nebraska.

The second question was designed to determine the extent to which Title II funds achieved the goal of encouraging the expenditure of private funds on library resource materials. Table III indicated an increase of private expenditures per pupil for these materials.

The second question asked was:

To what extent have the Title II loans and services been a stimulant to the increased expenditure of your own funds for library resources?

negative none minor moderate major

Responses were as follows:

	<u>negative</u>	<u>none</u>	<u>minor</u>	<u>moderate</u>	<u>major</u>
ELEMENTARY	1%	6%	22%	53%	19%
SECONDARY	8%	16%	27%	32%	16%

The responses to this question seem to substantiate the data recorded on Table III. Title II loans had at least a moderately stimulating effect on the private expenditures for library resources in approximately half of the participating secondary schools and three-quarters of the participating elementary schools.

The third question was designed to get some indication of how the librarians and/or administrators in the participating schools evaluated the library book resources available to their students at the end of 1968. The question read as follows:

How would you evaluate the book resources now available to your students? (Include Title II material and any other except textbooks.)

very poor poor fair good excellent

The responses were as follows:

	<u>very poor</u>	<u>poor</u>	<u>fair</u>	<u>good</u>	<u>excellent</u>
ELEMENTARY	0%	2%	25%	58%	15%
SECONDARY	0%	3%	27%	59%	11%

The responses to this question are parallel at both levels. Three-fifths of the respondents felt that the book resources available to their students were good. The writer did not consult professional librarians on specific schools; however, on site observations in many schools by these consultants give the general evaluation that there are very few

libraries in participating schools which could be classed as good. In seeking to reconcile these divergent evaluations one should consider that many respondents were making a relative judgement, comparing what was available to their students at the end of 1968 to what had been available several years earlier. It might also be the case that most respondents were not aware of what really constitutes a functional library on the elementary or secondary level. Still another factor which could have caused the favorable evaluations on the part of the school administrators was the availability of books from public libraries and other sources outside of the school plant.

The fourth question was designed to get some indication of how the librarians and/or administrators in the participating schools evaluated the non-book instructional resources available to their students at the end of 1968. The question read as follows:

How would you evaluate the non-book instructional resources now available to your students? (Include Title II materials but not equipment such as projectors.)

very poor poor fair good excellent

Responses were as follows:

	<u>very poor</u>	<u>poor</u>	<u>fair</u>	<u>good</u>	<u>excellent</u>
ELEMENTARY	3%	21%	47%	22%	4%
SECONDARY	0%	22%	38%	38%	0%

The replies to this question seem to point up a condition which needs attention. It should be noted that 71 per cent of the elementary respondents and 60 per cent of the

secondary respondents felt the materials available to their students were less than good. Not a single secondary respondent felt that the materials available could be characterized as excellent. Title II materials have not made a great impact in the non-book classification of instructional materials in most of the participating schools. One may only speculate as to how these responses would have been tabulated had the writer excluded any materials which the schools had been borrowing from federally-funded instructional resource centers on a temporary basis.

Three per cent of the respondents on each level failed to offer a response to this question.

The fifth question attempted to determine how the library resource materials available to the student attending a non-public school in Nebraska compared to those available to his public school counterpart. The underlying question which the writer was dealing with was whether the need of government aid to non-public schools was necessary in this area.

The question read:

Compare, to the best of your knowledge, the library resources available to your students and those available to students in public schools in the surrounding area. Are your resources...

much poorer poorer equivalent better much better

Responses to the question were as follows:

	<u>much poorer</u>	<u>poorer</u>	<u>equivalent</u>	<u>better</u>	<u>much better</u>
ELEMENTARY	7%	31%	39%	15%	1%
SECONDARY	8%	27%	41%	16%	8%

Perhaps the responses gathered for this question are less reliable than for any of the others. It is impossible to determine which respondents had adequate information about the local public schools. In general it could be said that a significant number of respondents had the opinion that the library resource materials available to the local public school pupils were better than those available to their own students. Personal observations by qualified educators suggest that there is a woeful lack of library resources in a great number of schools in Nebraska--public and non-public.

Six per cent of the elementary school respondents failed to answer this question.

The sixth and final question dealt with the improvement of library facilities. It has been demonstrated in the first section of this chapter that significant strides were made during the period of 1965-68 in the organization of non-public school libraries and in the establishment of shelf lists and card catalogs. This question was designed to ascertain the influence of Title II loan materials and also the services offered by the NANS office on these improvements. The question read:

If you established a central library, shelf list, card catalog, or carried out a major reorganization of your library materials since January 1, 1966, to what extent were Title II loans and services an influence?

none minor moderate major does not apply

The responses were as follows:

	<u>none</u>	<u>minor</u>	<u>moderate</u>	<u>major</u>	<u>does not apply</u>
ELEMENTARY	6%	4%	31%	46%	17%
SECONDARY	3%	16%	16%	11%	49%

The significant data to be noted in the responses to this question are on the elementary level. Approximately half of the elementary schools which made the improvements credited the Title II program with a major influence.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was enacted, it represented the most ambitious federally-financed program ever designed to improve the educational opportunities of the school children of the United States. Drawing upon the established judicial theories of "public purpose", "child benefit", and "primacy of secular effects", the Act provided that the benefits embodied in its several sections be made available to children and teachers in all elementary and secondary schools throughout the country, regardless of whether they attended public or non-public schools. In this respect the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 stood, and at the time of this writing still stands, in marked contrast to the financial aid policies of most states with regard to the child attending a non-public school.

The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain the effects which Title II loans and services had on the availability of library resource materials to the child attending a non-public school in Nebraska which participated in the program. The study covered a period which began with the 1965-66 school year and ended with the 1968-69 school year. Most of the data was gathered in December, 1968.

The data from which the conclusions were drawn were extracted from three sources: (1) annual survey reports submitted by participating schools to the Nebraska Agent for Non-

public Schools, an administrative agency specifically established to provide Title II loans and services to the non-public schools in Nebraska, (2) a questionnaire designed by the writer and sent to 95 per cent of the elementary and secondary non-public schools in Nebraska which participated in the program during 1968-69 school year, and (3) unstructured interviews with the NANS director and his staff.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in the foregoing chapter suggests that the following statements may be posited with regard to the impact of the Title II program on the availability of library resource materials to the student attending a participating non-public school in Nebraska during the period 1965-1968.

- (1) The Title II program met with initial approval by a large majority of the eligible schools. This acceptance was sustained during the entire period.
- (2) Title II loans and services had a positive impact on the improvement of the quality and quantity of library resource materials.
- (3) Title II loans and services provided a major impetus for the organization and reorganization of libraries which took place, particularly on the elementary level.
- (4) The library resources available in 1968 were a marked improvement over what had been the case prior to the implementation of the Title II program, but much further improvement was needed in many schools.
- (5) Participating schools substantially increased the expenditure of private funds for library resource materials.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Implementation of the following recommendations would encourage further progress:

- (1) In-service programs of training should be instituted for teachers in non-public schools who have had no formal training in library science in order that the developing libraries may better serve students as learning tools.
- (2) The success demonstrated by the Title II program as carried on in the non-public schools of Nebraska suggests that the program, or one similar in nature, should be continued in the future with increased federal funding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Blum, Virgil C. Freedom in Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

Blum, Virgil C. Freedom of Choice in Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.

Constitution of the State of Nebraska of 1875. (As amended and in force, November 1, 1966.)

Johnson, Lyndon B. "State of the Union Message," January 4, 1965.

Miller, Arthur L. "Current Issues in Church-State Relations," Legal Aspects of Lutheran Parish Education, 1964 Yearbook, Lutheran Education Association, Peter A. Zadeik, Editor, River Forest, Illinois: 1964.

National Audio-Visual Association. Nothing Matters More. A Summary of the Titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Fairfax, Virginia: National Audio-Visual Association, 1966.

C. COURT DECISIONS

Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education, 281 U.S. 370, 1930.

Everson v. Board of Education of the Township of Ewing, 330 U.S. 1, 1947.

School District of Abington Township, Pennsylvania v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 1963.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

"A State Plan, for making available school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, under Sections 201-207 inclusive of Title II and Sections 601-605 inclusive of Title IV, Public Law 89-10 April 11, 1965." Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska State Department of Education, 1965-66. (Mimeographed.)

E. NEWSPAPERS

Lincoln Nebraska Journal, February 12, 1969.

Lutheran Witness Reporter, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, February 16, 1969.

New York Times, April 12, 1965.

Omaha World Herald, March 12, 1969.

APPENDIX A

PHOTOGRAPHIC REDUCTION OF THE NANS REVISED ANNUAL SURVEY FORM

SCHOOL YEAR, 19____-19____

SUBMIT ONE COPY

INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL BUILDING Where elementary and junior and senior high schools are
in one building, complete separate form for each level.

This report covers the following grades: (Encircle one) K(1)-6 K(1)-8 7-9

10-12 7-12 9-12 Other _____

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER PRINTED
AND PUBLISHED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS.*

Name of School _____

Address of School _____

City _____

Name of Official Submitting this report: _____

Title _____ Date _____

Number of Teachers in this school: _____ Number of Students: _____

(Please use same figures as in State Department of Education October 1 report)

BUDGET DETAILS: How much money was expended for library resources and/or other printed
and published instructional materials (books-hard or paperback, charts, documents, films,
filmstrips, globes, kinescopes, maps, pamphlets, periodicals, microfilms, musical scores
excluding textbooks, pictorial or graphic works, prepared transparencies, processed slides,
sound recordings-disc or tape, videotapes, photographs, reproductions):
Don't count federal funds

During the last fiscal year (July 1-June 30) \$ _____ The previous year \$ _____

How much during the same years, was expended for textbooks. (Do not include if students
are required to buy.)

Last year \$ _____ The previous year \$ _____ Rental charged? Yes _____ No _____

How much is to be expended (in the budget) for the present fiscal year:

For library resources and/or instructional materials \$ _____

For Textbooks \$ _____

DIRECTIONS: Please supply the information requested on the following pages and
rate the materials now available according to the scale below:

5	Quantity extensive and quality excellent
4a	Quantity extensive and quality moderate
4b	Quantity moderate and quality excellent
3	Quantity and quality moderate
2a	Quantity moderate and quality poor
2b	Quantity poor and quality moderate
1	Quantity and quality poor
M	Missing
N	Does not apply

* Adapted from: Evaluative Criteria. Section F. Washington, D. C.:
National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, 1960.

SECTION I: SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES

A. Printed Materials

NOTE: If the school does not have a centralized school library, omit this Section IA and place an M in this box _____

(If you have library resources in other places such as classroom collections, see Section III, page 6.)

1. Library Books
(Include Title II materials)

Classification	No. of Different Titles	% of Total Titles	** No. of Volumes	No. of Titles Copyrighted Within Last 5 years *	Evaluation: How adequate is each classification for instructional needs? (Use Rating Scale p. 1)
General Works*					() a.
Philosophy					() b.
Social Sciences*					() c.
Languages (Includes books in foreign languages)					() d.
Pure science,* math*					() e.
Useful arts*					() f.
Fine arts, recreation					() g.
Literature					() h.
History*					() i.
Travel*					() j.
Biography					() k.
Fiction					() l.
Easy Books					() m.
Total					

2. How many Titles do you have in your library of Professional materials for the staff? _____

3. How adequate is this collection for the purpose it should serve? (Use scale.) _____

* Recency of date of Materials is especially important in these areas.

** This number cannot be less than the corresponding number of different titles in the first column.

4. Periodicals

a. Evaluation (Use Rating Scale, P. 1):

- () 1. Periodicals are provided which include general coverage of a variety of subjects pertinent to the instructional program.
- () 2. Periodicals are provided which are appropriate for the educational level.
- () 3. Periodicals are provided which meet pupil needs and interests.
- () 4. Periodicals are provided which meet faculty needs.

Check the areas of curriculum and extracurricular activities represented by periodicals.

_____ Agriculture	_____ Mechanical arts
_____ Arts	_____ Music
_____ Aviation	_____ National and world affairs
_____ Book reviews and creative writing	_____ Nature study
_____ Business and economics	_____ Occupations
_____ Drama and theater	_____ Outdoor life
_____ Family and consumer education	_____ Photography
_____ Fashion and grooming	_____ Physical education
_____ Geography and travel	_____ Radio and television
_____ Guidance	_____ School and club activities
_____ Handicrafts	_____ Science
_____ Health and safety	_____ Space exploration
_____ Homemaking	_____ Sports
_____ Language Arts	_____ Trade and industry
_____ Mathematics	_____ Vocational education
	_____ Other _____

c. Supply number of titles of periodicals regularly obtained by subscription _____

d. Do you subscribe to the Readers Guide to Periodical Literature?

Yes _____ No _____
 (d. means either abridged or non-abridged)

5. Other printed library materials

Type of Materials	No. of Different Titles	No. of Titles Copyrighted within last 5 Years*	Evaluation How adequate is each type for Instructional needs? (Use Rating Scale, p. 1)
Pamphlets			() a.
Documents			() b.
Musical Scores			() c.
Supplementary textbooks			() d.
Others (list)			() e.

End Section IAB. Audiovisual Materials*

NOTE: Supply information and rating on this sheet whether or not audiovisual materials are a part of the school library resources.

Type of Materials	No. of Titles in School (Include Title II)	No. of Titles from School system Central Depository or Outside Source during Last School Year	Evaluation: How adequate is each type for instructional needs? (Use Rating Scale, p. 1)
Motion Pictures			() a.
Filmstrips			() b.
Slides			() c.
Disc recordings			() d.
Tape recordings			() e.
Picture sets			() f.
Maps			() g.
Globes			() h.
Charts			() i.
Others (list)			() j.

*Recency of Date of Materials is Especially Important in Areas Starred on Page 2

SECTION II: TEXTBOOKS USED AS TEXTS
(i.e. one for each student)

Subjects	No. of Different Titles	No. of Copies	No. of Titles Copyrighted during last 5 Years*	Evaluation: How adequate are textbooks in each subject area for instructional needs? (Use Rating Scale, p. 1)
Agriculture				() a.
Art (Including crafts)				() b.
Business Education				() c.
Distributive Education				() d.
English or language arts				() e.
Foreign language arts				() f.
Health Education				() g.
Home economics				() h.
Industrial arts				() i.
Mathematics				() j.
Music				() k.
Physical Education				() l.
Science				() m.
Social studies				() n.
Vocational Education				() o.

* See Footnote 1, Page 2

What materials do you have on hand for use in programmed instruction?
Quantity and name.

SECTION III: OTHER PRINTED AND PUBLISHED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

(Not cataloged in the central library and probably housed in a place other than the library.)

Note: These may be counted under "School Library Resources", if appropriate.

DO NOT DUPLICATE COUNT. If you do not have a central library in the building and did not complete Section IA, then this section is quite important to complete.

Include Title II Materials

Type of Material	No. of Titles or Items	No. of Titles or Items copyrighted within last 5 years*	Evaluation: How adequate is each type for instructional needs? (Use Rating Scale, p. 1)
Books: Ref., etc.			() a.
Supplementary textbooks			() b.
Periodicals			() c.
Pamphlets			() d.
Documents			() e.
Musical scores			() f.
Others (list)			() g.

* See Footnote 1, Page 2

SECTION IV: FUNDS FOR MATERIALS

Evaluation (Use Rating Scale, as it applies to quantity, p. 1)

- () a. How adequate are funds for the purchase of library printed materials?
- () b. How adequate are funds for the purchase of audiovisual materials?
- () c. How adequate are funds for textbooks?
- () d. How adequate are funds for other printed and published instructional materials?

SECTION V: PERSONNEL & FACILITIES

1. Is there a librarian assigned in the building? Yes _____ No _____
Name _____ Hrs. Library Science _____
2. How many minutes per week does the librarian have assigned to her for work in the library in this building (This does not include time assigned study halls, etc.) _____
3. Is there a person who has assigned school time to coordinate the audiovisual materials, equipment, etc.? Yes _____ No _____
4. How many minutes per week is this person assigned solely to this responsibility? _____
5. Is there a central library in the building? Yes _____ No _____
6. Is a current shelf-list for all library resources and instructional materials maintained? Yes _____ No _____
7. Is a current and functional card catalog for all library resources and instructional materials maintained? Yes _____ No _____
8. Are all library resources and instructional materials classified according to either the Dewey Decimal System or the Library of Congress System? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, which? _____
9. Is there space with equipment and materials where staff can produce instructional materials? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, how adequate? Use rating scale, page 1: _____
10. Does the SCHOOL DISTRICT have a central processing and administrative library-instructional materials facility? Yes _____ No _____
11. Put a check mark by each of the following library selection, classification, reference, etc. tools available in your building for use in proper organization and administration of the library resources and instructional materials:

-Children's Catalog, 10th ed. _____	-Basic Book Collection for High Schools _____
-Standard Catalog for High School Libraries, 8th ed. _____	-Standards for School Library Programs 1960 _____
-Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin _____	-Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index _____
-School Library Journal _____	-Magazine: Audiovisual Instruction _____
-Basic Book Collection for Elementary Grades _____	List Others on separate sheet. _____
-Basic Book Collection for Junior High Schools _____	
12. How adequate is your EQUIPMENT (Projectors, stands, etc.) to fulfill the instructional and learning needs of the teachers and students in this building? Use the rating scale on page 1 with reference to both quality and quantity. _____

APPENDIX B

PHOTOGRAPHIC REDUCTION OF THE WRITER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

St. Paul Lutheran School
51st and Grand Avenue
Omaha, Nebraska 68104

Dear Non-public School Educator,

I am in the process of conducting a detailed study dealing with the impact of Title II loans on the availability of library resource material to students attending non-public schools in Nebraska.

This study is being carried on under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Burkholder and Dr. Darrell Kellams of the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Dr. Dean Lusienke, Program Director for the Nebraska Agent for Non-public Schools, has given his approval for this study and has given me access to the pertinent statistical data available in his office.

I have tabulated much statistical data, but it has become apparent that the personal observations of key educators closely associated with the use of these Title II materials would add a dimension to the study which is now lacking. You are such a person. You can, by checking the appropriate responses on the enclosed post card, help to add validity to a study which I hope will be of value to all non-public schools in Nebraska.

- 1) What impact have Title II materials had in the quantitative and qualitative improvement of library resources (book and non-book) available to your students?
a) none b) minor c) moderate d) major
- 2) To what extent have the Title II loans been a stimulant to the increased expenditure of your own funds for library resources?
a) negative b) none c) minor d) moderate e) major
- 3) How would you evaluate the book resources now available to your students?
(Include Title II material and any other except textbooks.)
a) very poor b) poor c) fair d) good e) excellent
- 4) How would you evaluate the non-book instructional resources available now available to your students? (Include Title II material but not equipment such as projectors.)
a) very poor b) poor c) fair d) good e) excellent
- 5) Compare, to the best of your knowledge, the library resources available to your students and those available to students in public schools in your surrounding area. Are your resources...
a) much poorer b) poorer c) equivalent d) better or e) much better?
- 6) If you established a central library, shelf list, card catalog, or carried out a major reorganization of your library materials since January 1, 1966, to what extent were the Title II loans and services an influence?
a) none b) minor c) moderate d) major e) does not apply

Thank you for your time and interest.

Cordially,

R. Ulmer

Richard B. Ulmer, Principal