

# UCLA

## K-12 Integration and Diversity

### Title

Private Schools in American Education: A Small Sector Still Lagging in Diversity (working paper)

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6213b2n5>

### Journal

www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu, March(2018)

### Authors

Ee, Jongyeon  
Orfield, Gary  
Teitell, Jennifer

### Publication Date

2018-03-05

### Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6213b2n5#supplemental>

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

# Private Schools in American Education A Small Sector Still Lagging in Diversity

Jongyeon Ee  
Gary Orfield  
Jennifer Teitell

The Civil Rights Project



*Proyecto Derechos Civiles*

**Table of Contents**

List of Tables ..... 3  
List of Figures ..... 4  
Executive Summary ..... 5  
Private Schools in American Education: A Small and Distinctive Sector of a Vast Enterprise..... 7  
National Trends: Private School Declining Share, Public School Growth..... 12  
Regional Trends: Southern Private School Growth..... 17  
Student Enrollment in Private and Public Schools in States with Voucher Programs ..... 23  
Segregation Analysis – National Level..... 26  
Segregation Analysis – Regional Level..... 28  
Most Segregated States ..... 38  
Conclusion ..... 41  
Appendix..... 46

## List of Tables

Table 1: Private School Enrollment Rates, by Race/Ethnicity and Sector, 2015-2016 .....	14
Table 2: Racial Composition of School Enrollments, by Sector and Type of Private School, 2015-2016.	15
Table 3: Number of Schools by Sector and by Region, 2015-2016.....	17
Table 4: Total Enrollment and Racial Composition of Private and Public Schools in States with Voucher Laws, 1995-96 through 2015-16.....	23
Table 5: Average Intergroup Contacts in Northeastern Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015 .....	31
Table 6: Average Intergroup Contacts in Midwestern Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015 .....	33
Table 7: Average Intergroup Contacts in Southern Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015 .....	35
Table 8: Average Intergroup Contacts in Western Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015 .....	37
Table 9: Exposure to White Students by the Typical Black Student in Private Schools and Black and White Enrollment in Private Schools by State, 2015-2016.....	38
Table 10: Exposure to White Students by the Typical Hispanic Student in Private Schools and Hispanic and White Enrollment in Private Schools by State, 2015-2016.....	39
Table 11: Private and public schools and enrollment, by state and by race: 2015-2016 .....	43
Table 12: Comparisons of Public, Charter, and Private Schools by State, 2015-2016.....	44
Table 13: Low-income student enrollment in Private and public schools and, by state and by Sector: 2015-2016 .....	45

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Total Enrollment in Public and Private Schools, 1991-2015 .....	12
Figure 2: Number of Public and Private Schools, 1995-2015 .....	13
Figure 3: Racial Composition in Public and Private Schools, 1995-2015 .....	13
Figure 4: K-12 Private School Attendance Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1995-2015.....	14
Figure 5: Private Schools and Total Enrollments by Sector, 1995-2015 .....	15
Figure 6: Racial Composition in Private Schools by Sector, 1995-2015.....	16
Figure 7: Total Private Schools by Region, 1995-2015.....	17
Figure 8: Total Enrollment Trends in Private Schools by Region and by Sector, 1995-2015.....	18
Figure 9: Racial Composition in Private Schools by Region, 1995-2015 .....	19
Figure 10: Racial Composition in Private Schools by Region and by Sector, 1995-2015.....	20
Figure 11: Average Intergroup Contacts that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences, 1995-2015	27
Figure 12: Average Intergroup Contacts that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Region, 2015-2016 .....	29

## Executive Summary

Private schools have a long and important tradition in U.S. education and have been the focus of a great deal of political controversy in recent years. There is deep division among Americans over the desirability of using public funds to finance vouchers for private education—an issue that has become the leading educational goal of the Trump Administration. Surveys of the public show that substantial majorities of Americans do not favor voucher policies, yet these efforts have long been supported by significant shares of the public, the religious groups that operate nonpublic schools, and leaders of one of our national parties. This deep division is reflected in the extraordinary differences among the states in their adoption of voucher policies over the past two decades. Examining these differences, along with data on national and regional trends in private education, provides a useful framework for considering the relationship between private school enrollment and the impact of voucher policies.

This report explores how the size and share of private education has changed in the U.S. over two decades, from 1995 to 2015-16 (the most recent federal data), along with how the students are divided among different kinds of private schools: secular, Catholic, and non-Catholic religious schools. It also examines the racial composition of these schools, providing key data for evaluating the civil rights dimension of private schooling and voucher policies. The civil rights questions concern how well private schools serve students of color, what kinds of schools these students attend, how segregated they are, and whether students of color are getting a major share of the growth of private schools in the areas they are growing, especially in the South.

Key findings of the report include:

- Student enrollment in private schools peaked in 2001 and has moderately declined over the past fifteen years. In 2015, private schools served 9 percent of the nation's students and accounted for 28 percent of the nation's schools.
- Private schools seem to compete with charter schools. Since its appearance a decade ago, the growth of charter schools is noticeable. In 2015, private schools serve 4.9 million students while charter schools enroll 2.7 million students.
- The 2015 racial composition of private school enrollment was 68.6% white, 9.3% black, 10.4% Hispanic, 6.9% Asian. The student body of public schools differed substantially from private schools, comprising 48.7% white, 15.2% black, 26.3% Hispanic, and 5.4% Asian students,
- Private school enrollment rates among white students have not changed over time—one in eight white students in the nation attend private schools. Meanwhile, private school attendance rates among non-white students have slightly declined. As of 2015, 5.6 percent of blacks, 3.8 percent of Hispanics, and 11.3 percent of Asians in the nation are enrolled in private schools.
- Students from low-income families are underrepresented in private schools, accounting for 9% of the private school student body. The secular sector in particular has the

smallest percentage of poor students: 5.4%. In public schools, poor students make up more than 50% of student enrollment.

- White students are overrepresented in private schools, making up 69 percent of private school enrollment; they comprise 51 percent of total enrollment of school-aged population in the country. African American and Hispanic students are severely underrepresented in private schools. The latter comprise over 25 percent of students in the public sector but only 10 percent of students in private schools.
- The South has seen an 11% increase in the number of private schools—non-Catholic religious schools in particular—over the past two decades unlike other regions in which private schools have declined over years.
- The number of Catholic private schools and Catholic school enrollment have decreased over the past two decades in the Northeast and Midwest in particular. Enrollment in non-Catholic religious private schools and secular private schools has grown during the same period. The growth of non-Catholic religious schools stands out in the Northeast and the South in particular.
- The South has the largest number of schools for both private and public sectors, which account for one third of the country's schools. Given the number of schools for both private and public systems, private schools are most overrepresented in the Northeast.
- Black and Hispanic private school students on average experience more diversity compared to their peers in public schools. White students are the most isolated group in terms of intergroup contact, and white students in the non-Catholic religious sector across regions have the most limited intergroup experiences, typically attending schools with large white majorities.
- The secular sector has seen the largest increase in diversity over time compared to Catholic and non-Catholic religious schools, although the level of diversity does not reach the same level of public schools.

## **Private Schools in American Education: A Small and Distinctive Sector of a Vast Enterprise**

Americans are deeply invested in public education—the country’s largest set of public institutions. The public education system is widely seen as central to the country’s development as its only near-universal institution. However, private schools have a long and important tradition in education as well and have been the focus of a great deal of political controversy in recent years. They are very visible, especially in large cities with overwhelming nonwhite and poor public school populations, and they can seem in those contexts to be a large sector of the educational offerings. This is true in some places, especially for white students, but private schools are not a large share on a state or national level, and their numbers are not increasing. In fact, they are shrinking slowly, and public schools are gaining share. They have been growing significantly in recent years in few states.

There is deep division among Americans over the desirability of vouchers for private education. Surveys of the public show that substantial majorities of Americans do not favor using public funds to pay for students’ access to private schools, yet these efforts have long been supported by significant shares of the public, the religious groups that operate nonpublic schools, and the leaders of one of our national parties. The annual Gallup education poll has been asking for many years, “Do you favor or oppose allowing students and parents to choose a private school to attend at public expense?” In 2017, 52 percent were opposed, but 39 percent favored vouchers. The survey also asked a more specific question: “Some people say public funds should be used only to pay for public schools that offer tuition-free education for all students. Others say parents should be able to direct some public funds to any school their child attends, whether public, private, or religious. This would cover the full cost of public school or the partial cost of private or religious schools.” The response showed that “61% prefer a system that funds public schools only vs. 34% support for the voucher option, a broader 27-point gap. Further, when told that a voucher system either could help public schools by making them compete or hurt them by reducing their funding, preference for only funding public schools rises to 67%, compared to 26% support for vouchers, a 41-point gap.”<sup>1</sup> In other words, we are looking at trends happening in a country that is deeply divided, a reality reflected in the extraordinary differences among the states in their embrace of voucher policies (reflected in the state-by-state table of changes over two decades included in this report). Since the issue has become the leading educational goal of the Trump Administration, this data on national trends helps set the stage for considering expanded voucher programs.

This report explores how the size and share of private education has changed in the U.S. over two decades, from 1995 to 2015-16 (the most recent federal data) and how private school students are divided among different kinds of schools: secular, Catholic, and non-Catholic religious schools. The civil rights questions raised concern how well the private schools serve students of color and students living in poverty, what kinds of schools these students attend, how segregated they are, and whether students of color are getting a major share of the growth of private schools in the areas they are growing, especially in the South.

---

<sup>1</sup> 49<sup>th</sup> annual PDK Survey of the Public’s Attitude toward the Public Schools,” supplement to *Kappan*, Sept. 2017.



U.S. children are overwhelmingly educated in regular public schools. Unlike many countries where the government has historically supported religious schools and middle class families avoid public schools, the great majority of U.S. students (about nine-tenths) go to public schools. The share of students in private schools, which peaked in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, has declined significantly since that time. Since 2000, public school enrollment is up by millions, but enrollment in private schools has dropped modestly in spite of the enactment of vouchers or other subsidies for private school enrollment in several states and the national capital. There is no real sign of a private school revival except in the South and in a handful of states where they have been heavily subsidized. The private schools have long been overwhelmingly religious schools (almost four of every five). Many were originally set up by religious groups, of course, to protect and perpetuate their religious beliefs. Catholic schools, the largest private sector, are mostly run by parishes and were initially created to counter perceived anti-Catholic bias in the public schools when an overwhelmingly Protestant nation was divided over large immigrations from Catholic countries.<sup>2</sup>

The issue of public funds for religious schools long faced the dual obstacles: (1) the prohibition of policies that amounted to the “establishment of religion” by the government, forbidden by the First Amendment, and (2) the opposition of public school advocates and religions that did not run their own schools or wanted government to keep out of religious schooling, fearing regulation of religion. Division over this issue was one of the major reasons why it was impossible to enact general federal aid to education until 1965, when President Lyndon Johnson worked out a bargain that included some indirect aid to private schools serving low-income children and launched what has been the basic federal aid structure ever since.<sup>3</sup> The voucher effort became serious under President Reagan and was a major issue in the 1996 presidential campaign. Voucher policies have long been favored by conservatives but were voted down in referenda in a number of states. Use of federal funds for religious schools was supported by the increasingly conservative Supreme Court in the 1972 *Zelman* decision. In a closely divided (5-4) decision, the court authorized funds for religious schools for nonwhite students locked into weak urban public schools. There have been legal battles in many states since. Though the federal Constitution says nothing about education, there is specific language and prohibitions in many state constitutions concerning funding for religious schools (see Green & Welner, 2018).

Private schools do disproportionately serve white and higher-income families. In contrast, more than half of public school students are from families so poor that they cannot afford school lunches. The nation’s private schools show a very different pattern, with only nine percent poor students. This number is slightly higher for Catholic schools (11 percent), but is only one-twentieth for the secular private schools. In other words, contemporary U.S. private schools serve overwhelmingly white and middle class students (Table 13). There has been a dramatic widening in the economic gap between public and private school enrollment since the late 1960s, with a substantial drop in private enrollment not only of students from poor families but also

---

<sup>2</sup> Anthony S. Bryk, Valerie E. Lee, Peter B. Holland *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993, pp. 23-33.

<sup>3</sup> G. Orfield, “Lyndon Johnson and American Education,” in Robert H. Wilson, Norman J. Glickman and Laurence E Lynn, Jr., *LBJ’s Neglected Legacy*, Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 2015, pp. 204-207.

among middle-income families. Only the proportion of higher-income families going to private schools has held constant.<sup>4</sup> This helps explain the pressure—once vouchers or subsidies through tax provisions are created for poor children—to expand them to students from higher income ranges, many of whom are in private schools and finding it hard to pay the bills.

The strongest evidence for the academic strength of private religious schools came from studies of Catholic schools a generation ago,<sup>5</sup> but the Catholic schools have declined dramatically from their peak in 1965, and their rapid decline has continued since 2000. In the past, parish schools had modest budgets because there was a large supply of nuns who volunteered their time and skills. However, women’s religious orders in the Catholic Church have drastically declined since, greatly increasing the cost of labor for the schools.<sup>6</sup> The growth in private schools is largely among non-Catholic religious schools, including many fundamentalist Christian schools. Private schools are very weakly regulated in many states. There is some evidence that the non-Catholic religious schools place much more priority on religious teaching and less on general academic achievement. The *Zelman* decision said nothing prohibiting the subsidization of religious instruction or proselytism.

Only a very small share of black, Latino and American Indian children attend private schools. The growth in private schools has been most rapid in the South, which has become predominantly nonwhite in its school age population. Curiously, although the West has by good measure the smallest share of whites, private school enrollment is not growing significantly there, and the number of private schools is down significantly. The number of low-income private school students is very low there. Among the states with voucher programs, some, including D.C., have actually seen shrinkage in private school enrollment while a few, including Indiana and Florida, have seen substantial growth. It seems likely that the outcomes may be related both to the characteristics of the programs and subsidies and the alternatives that exist for families. It may depend upon whether or not the voucher programs include funds or tax subsidies for middle class families.

Black and Latino students, on average, experience significantly less segregation in private schools—not surprising, given the very low percent of such students in typical private schools and in the overall private school population. In Washington, D.C., for example, a white child is seven times as likely as a black child to attend private schools, something that half of white children in the city do but only one in fourteen black children. In spite of that, given the large white enrollment in private schools and the relatively small black enrollment, black private school students experience less segregation, on average. Private schools attended by white students across the nation are slowly becoming diverse but remain overwhelmingly white on average. One clear advantage of the private schools now is that the small minority of black and Latino students are considerably less segregated than in the public system, primarily because there are so few students of color in private schools and a very disproportionate share of whites. In a region where only 3 or 5 percent of the private students are black, it is hard to segregate

---

<sup>4</sup> Richard J. Murnane and Sean F. Reardon, “Long-Term Trends in Private School Enrollments by Family Income,” NBER Working Paper No. 23571, *Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research*. July 2017.

<sup>5</sup> Bryk, Lee, and Holland, 1993.

<sup>6</sup> The number of religious sisters in the U.S. declined by 72% between 1965 and 2014. Michael Lipka, “U.S. nuns face shrinking numbers and tensions with the Vatican,” *FactTank*, Pew Research Center, Aug. 2014.

blacks from whites. If the private schools were to expand substantially and serve a significant share of the nonwhite majority of students, the integration numbers would likely change and so would the race and class composition.

In terms of creating a real alternative for students of color, the analysis must begin with the fact that these schools have historically served a small share of black students and an even smaller share of Latino students. In both of the states we are closely examining, the expansion of vouchers has taken place as the overall private school share of enrollment of students of color was actually declining. Based on the history and the recent trends, private schools are a minor factor in the education of blacks and Latinos. Without major changes adding substantial money, expanding the system without regulations would serve an overwhelmingly white higher-income population unless there were specific civil rights policies, priorities, and accountability. Making untargeted subsidies available will likely increase the participation of white, Asian and middle-class students. We know from research on school choice conducted by Charles Clotfelter and others that, when holding constant other factors, whites will choose to move from schools with more nonwhites to whiter schools, triggering re-segregation.<sup>7</sup> The much whiter racial composition of private schools could well be an important reason for white enrollment choices.<sup>8</sup> As the share of nonwhite students in public schools continues to grow, it is important to watch this issue.

Part of the difficulty in assessing private schools is that they have an important overlap with charter schools. When charter schools provide a major alternative to public schools at no cost to the families, it undermines a substantial part of the argument for subsidizing access to private schools. Although charter schools are publicly funded and are more subject to regulation than private schools, they typically are given a large degree of autonomy, are not directly supervised by elected boards or officials, and most are independent of teachers unions. Indeed, blocking large voucher programs was one of the attractions of charters to those who were opposed to a large transfer of resources to non-public schools and ending the tradition of separation of church and state in American education. The whole situation is made even more complex when religious schools convert into charters, as did a whole group of Catholic schools in Washington. Though these schools no longer teach religion in school time, they retain staff from that religion, and many former students from the same religion continue to attend the same school. And, of course, public schools and charter schools often make provisions for groups that wish to do voluntary religious instruction outside of regular class time. As we examine the data presented here, the important thing to remember is that the private school trends are taking place in the context of a transforming national population and a broad expansion of school choice, including a rapidly growing charter system. By 2015, there were 2.7 million charter school students and the rapidly growing charter sector was already more than half as big as the private school sector.

When there is a major increase in private school support, do the schools become whiter or more integrated? Private schools are becoming significantly more diverse as a group, but they

---

<sup>7</sup> Charles T. Clotfelter. After "*Brown*": *The Rise and Retreat of School Desegregation* Princeton University Press, 2006.

<sup>8</sup> Robert W. Fairlie and Alexandra M. Resch, "Is There "White Flight" into Private Schools? Evidence from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2002 84:1, 21-33.

are experiencing a much slower change than the overall change in the country—so they are increasingly diverging from the public school levels. When the whole society is changing rapidly, private schools can become more unrepresentative simply by changing significantly more slowly than their public counterparts.

What is really distinctive about private schools in racial terms is the very high isolation of whites within this system.<sup>9</sup> One of the obvious risks of an untargeted voucher system is that it could have some of the same effects the “segregation academies” of the 1960s did. Those institutions were private, highly segregated, often religious schools explicitly created to provide a refuge for whites who did not want their children going to desegregated public schools. They were fueled by fear and provided a basic mechanism for white flight. These schools, where they had a major impact, undermined support and funding for public schools. In an extreme case, a Virginia district voted to stop funding public schools altogether for several years and distributed funds for vouchers instead. As there was no voucher school created for black students, this effectively barred them from accessing education. The Supreme Court struck down the plan in the 7-2 *Griffin* decision holding that the local government had denied the black student the opportunity they provided to other students. *Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County* (377 U.S. 218 (1964)). If modern-day vouchers reached the point where they were seriously taking funding away from public schools that were overwhelmingly occupied by students of color in some areas, this doctrine might be applicable. So far, however, the changes are modest except in a handful of states.

What we see in the following tables shows the trends and the variation within the country. It does not show what would happen if there were a major federal voucher initiative, but our study of the only existing significant federal program shows a modest impact. The 2017 tax reform bill included an important subsidy for private schools by allowing tax-sheltered savings accounts like those provided for college savings to be used to finance K-12 private school education. This means that families with enough money to save substantial amounts years in advance can earn large profits on investments and pay no tax, which amounts to a subsidy of a third or more for high-income families. Unsurprisingly, only families with high incomes, an overwhelmingly white and Asian population, have used these subsidies significantly.

These tables do not answer the large questions about the future of private schools and the varied policies that may evolve. They do show very clearly, the role private schools have played in the past two decades and what the basic pattern of changes has been. Without very large policy changes, the trends and patterns show that private schools are likely to play a very small role in the future of American communities of color, though they may be quite important for the students who attend them and in some localities or states. This makes careful analysis of the large state and federal programs very important in informing the conversation.


---

<sup>9</sup> Emma Brown, “The overwhelming whiteness of U.S. private schools, in six maps and charts,” *Washington Post*, March 29, 2016

### National Trends: Private School Declining Share, Public School Growth


After increasing from 4.8 million to 5.4 million between school years (SY) 1991-92 and 2001-02 private school enrollment gradually fell to 4.9 million in 2015-16, according to analysis of U.S. National Center for Education Statistics Private School Universe Survey data (Figure 1). Over the past two decades, there was very little net change in enrollment in spite of all the public discussion and policy changes concerning vouchers. In SY 2015-16, on the other hand, there were 50.3 million public school students, an increase of 19.7 percent from the 42 million students reported in SY 1991-92. This means that the private school share of all U.S. students dropped from 10.4 percent to 8.9 percent over the past two decades. As of SY 2015-16, private schools accounted for 27.5 percent of the nation's schools, but only enrolled 8.9 percent of the national total, likely due to their small size (Figure 2). Additionally, since the advent of charter schools about a decade ago, the number of charter schools has risen, and they have attracted a noticeable portion of public students across the nation.

Figure 1: Total Enrollment in Public and Private Schools, 1991-2015



Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Common Core of Data 1991-92 through 2015-16; Private School Universe Survey, 1991-92 through 2015-16. Note: Analysis included private schools offering no grade higher than kindergarten.


Figure 2: Number of Public and Private Schools, 1995-2015



Source: NCES Common Core of Data 1995-96, 2005-06, and 2015-16; Private School Universe Survey, 1995-96, 2005-06, and 2015-16. Note: Analysis included private schools offering no grade higher than kindergarten.

White students were the largest group in both public (48.7 percent) and private schools (68.6 percent) in 2015, but the white shares have decreased over time. Since a decade ago, Hispanic students have been the second largest group, rapidly increasing in public schools. Hispanic students now account for more than one-quarter of the student body in public schools. The shares of black and Latino students were similar in private schools over time. The black share, in particular, remained around the same over the past 25 years in both public (15 percent) and private schools (9 percent). The proportion of Asian students grew gradually in both systems, increasing faster in private schools (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Racial Composition in Public and Private Schools, 1995-2015




Source: NCES Common Core of Data 1995-96, 2005-06, and 2015-16; Private School Universe Survey, 1995-96, 2005-06, and 2015-16.

Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students

(for 2015-16 only).

The percentage of white students attending private schools has not changed significantly over the past two decades. In general, one in eight white K-12 students have been enrolled in private schools. In 1995, around 6 percent of black and Hispanic students attended private schools, but the black and Hispanic private school enrollment rates dropped to 5.6 percent and 3.8 percent, respectively. Asian private school enrollment rates were similar to those of white students in 1995 but declined slightly to 11.3 percent in 2015, still much higher than the black and Hispanic levels (Figure 4).

Figure 4: K-12 Private School Attendance Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1995-2015



Source: NCES Common Core of Data 1995-1996, 2005-2006, and 2015-2016; Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-2006, and 2015-2016.

Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students in this chart.

Table 1: Private School Enrollment Rates, by Race/Ethnicity and Sector, 2015-2016

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Multiracial	Total
Public	87.8	94.4	96.2	88.7	95.4	88.9	91.0
Private	12.2	5.6	3.8	11.3	4.6	11.1	9.0
Catholic	4.5	1.9	2.2	3.7	1.9	4.3	3.5
Other Religious	5.1	2.5	0.9	3.8	1.6	3.3	3.5
Secular	2.5	1.2	0.6	3.8	1.1	3.5	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: NCES Common Core of Data 2015-16; NCES Private School Universe Survey, 2015-16.

In 2015, 12.2 percent of white students, 5.6 percent of black students, 3.8 percent of Hispanic students, 11.3 percent of Asian students, 4.6 percent of Native American students, and 11.1 percent of multiracial students were enrolled in private schools. White students were the most likely to attend private schools in general, whereas Hispanic students were the least likely (96.2 percent attended public schools). Of Hispanics enrolled in private schools, those enrolled in Catholic schools outnumbered those enrolled in non-Catholic religious or secular private schools.

Asian and multiracial students were significantly more likely than white students to attend secular private schools (Table 1).


The 2015 racial composition of public school enrollment was 48.7 percent white, 15.2 percent black, 26.3 percent Hispanic, 5.4 percent Asian, 1 percent Native American, and 3.4 percent multiracial. Private school enrollment, by contrast, was 68.6 percent white, 9.3 percent black, 10.4 percent Hispanic, 6.9 percent Asian, 0.5 percent Native American, and 4.3 percent multiracial. White, Asian, and multiracial students were substantially overrepresented in private schools. The most drastic overrepresentation was of white students, who made up 65.9% of private school enrollment despite comprising only 50.6 percent of total enrollment of school-aged population in the country. Black, Hispanic, and Native American students were severely underrepresented in private schools, with Hispanic students experiencing the most underrepresentation (10.4 percent compared to 25 percent of total enrollment) (Table 2).

Table 2: Racial Composition of School Enrollments, by Sector and Type of Private School, 2015-2016

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Multiracial	Total
Public	48.7	15.2	26.3	5.4	1.0	3.4	100.0
Private	68.6	9.3	10.4	6.9	0.5	4.3	100.0
Catholic	65.9	7.8	15.6	5.8	0.5	4.3	100.0
Other Religious	73.1	10.6	6.6	5.9	0.4	3.3	100.0
Secular	65.2	9.3	8.0	10.8	0.5	6.2	100.0
Total	50.6	14.8	25.0	5.5	1.0	3.5	100.0

Source: NCES Common Core of Data 2015-16; NCES Private School Universe Survey, 2015-16.

Figure 5: Private Schools and Total Enrollments by Sector, 1995-2015




Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-0606, and 2015-2016.

Both the number of Catholic private schools and Catholic private school enrollment have declined in the past two decades. Between 1995 and 2015, Catholic school enrollment dropped from 2.5 million to 1.9 million students. Non-Catholic religious private schools rose in



prominence between 1995 and 2005, with the number of schools increasing more than a thousand from 15,082 to 16,164 and enrollment increasing by over a million students. However, the number of institutions and enrollment in this category has remained fairly stagnant over the past decade, with extremely slight increases in both. Over the 20 years, secular private schools increased their enrollment by over 200,000 students, yet the number of secular institutions actually decreased by 143 schools, indicating growth in the average student body size at these institutions.

Figure 6: Racial Composition in Private Schools by Sector, 1995-2015



Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-0606, and 2015-2016.

Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students

### Regional Trends: Southern Private School Growth


Changes in the number of private schools over the past two decades clearly reflect regional differences. Our analyses show that the South has the largest number of schools for both private and public systems, which account for one third of the nation’s schools. Following the South, the Midwest has one quarter of the nation’s schools, including both private and public sectors. However, private schools are most overrepresented in the Northeast, when compared to its respective percentage of all schools (22.5 percent vs. 17.9 percent). The 6,491 private schools in the West made up the lowest percentage of total private schools (18.8 percent), and this share was 4.3 percentage points lower than the share of the nation’s public schools in this region (Table 3).

Table 3: Number of Schools by Sector and by Region, 2015-2016

Region	Public		Private		All Schools	
	Number	Percent (%)	Number	Percent (%)	Number	Percent (%)
Northeast	14,451	16.2	7,771	22.5	22,222	17.9
Midwest	23,092	25.9	8,985	26	32,077	25.8
South	31,224	34.8	11,328	32.8	42,552	34.3
West	20,685	23.1	6,491	18.8	27,176	21.9
Total	89,452	100	34,576	100	124,028	99.9

Source: NCES Common Core of Data, 2015-2016; NCES Private School Universe Survey, 2015-2016. Note: See appendix for the Census defined regions. In this report we use the Census definition of regions, not the definition normally used in the Civil Rights Project reports.

Figure 7: Total Private Schools by Region, 1995-2015




Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-2006, and 2015-2016.

Between 1995 and 2015, the number of private schools in the Northeast declined by 8.2 percent, or about 700 institutions. The West saw a 13.6 percent reduction from 1995 levels. Private school growth in the Midwest was modest, increasing by only 3 percent between 1995 and 2015. The South was the only region where private school numbers increased each decade. Between 1995 and 2015, the region experienced a 10.7 percent increase in the number of private schools.

In 2015, the South had the most private schools (11,328), followed by the Midwest (8,985) and the Northeast (7,771). The West had the least, with 6,491 institutions (Figure 7).


Figure 8: Total Enrollment Trends in Private Schools by Region and by Sector, 1995-2015



Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-2006, and 2015-2016.

Between 1995 and 2015, enrollment in Catholic private schools decreased in all regions, with the most drastic decline being a decrease of 358,800 students (-45%) in the Northeast. Declines in the South and West were more modest. Changes in enrollment at non-Catholic religious private schools were mixed, with increases in the Northeast and South and modest declines in the West. Secular private schools saw growth in all regions and experienced a particularly large growth of students (+35.4%) in the South (Figure 8).

Figure 9: Racial Composition in Private Schools by Region, 1995-2015





Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-2006, and 2015-2016.

Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).

Between 1995 and 2015, the percentage of white students in private school student bodies decreased in all regions, with the largest reduction (10 percentage points) being in the West. During the same time period, the percentage of black students decreased in the Northeast and West, but increased in the Midwest and South. The Hispanic portion of private school student bodies increased across all regions, with the largest increase being in the Midwest (from 3.9 to 7.0 percent). The Asian portion of private school student bodies increased in all regions, with the largest increase in the South (from 2.5 to 5 percent) (Figure 9).

Figure 10: Racial Composition in Private Schools by Region and by Sector, 1995-2015





Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-2006, and 2015-2016.

Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).

Between 1995 and 2015, Catholic private schools in all regions experienced a rise in the nonwhite portion of the student body. Northeastern Catholic private schools saw an increase in the black portion of the student body, but this number decreased in the Midwest, South, and West. The Hispanic portion of the student body in Catholic private schools increased in all regions, and the Asian portion of the student body increased in every region but the West. Non-Catholic religious private schools also saw a decrease in the white portion of the student body. The black portion of these schools' student bodies decreased in the Northeast and West, yet increased in the Midwest and South. The Hispanic and Asian portions increased across all regions, reflecting the large immigrations of the 1980s until the Great Recession. Secular private schools experienced a decrease in the white portion of their student bodies. The black portion of these schools decreased in every region except the South. The Hispanic portion increased in every region except the West, where it experienced a very slight decline. The Asian portion increased in every region. All three sectors experienced a decrease in the portion of white students in every region, mixed changes in the portion of black students, and mostly across-the-board increases in the Hispanic and Asian portions (Figure 10).

### Student Enrollment in Private and Public Schools in States with Voucher Programs

Fourteen states offer voucher programs, will vary greatly in their characteristics and target populations. In general, mixed patterns emerge in terms of overall effects of voucher programs, although the effects of the programs vary depending on each state’s program content. In some states (e.g., Ohio and Vermont), both private and public schools have experienced substantial drops in total enrollment. However, the decreasing rates for the private and public sectors differ from state to state. In contrast, some states have witnessed a huge increase in total enrollment in both private and public sectors (e.g., Florida, Georgia, Indiana, North Carolina, and Utah), in several cases likely influenced by large growth in state population. With regard to the growth of public and private schools, Washington D.C. requires further investigation. DC's public school total enrollment grew by 2 percent for the past ten years, but its private school enrollment declined by 9 percent, which may well be related to DC charter schools' significant growth for the past ten years. For Georgia and Indiana, the expansion of their private schools outpaced the growth of their public schools, although relationships between their voucher programs and the overall increase in private schools remain unknown (Table 4).

Table 4: Total Enrollment and Racial Composition of Private and Public Schools in States with Voucher Laws, 1995-96 through 2015-16

		Private Schools				Public Schools			
		1995-96	2005-06	2015-16	Percentage Change*	1995-96	2005-06	2015-16	Percentage Change*
Arizona	Total Enrollment	46,290	52,006	46,265	-0.06%	722,511	1,018,451	1,089,339	50.77%
	% White	71.3	65.8	57.8		56.5	46.9	39.7	
	% Black	3.3	3.5	3.6		4.3	5.2	5.3	
	% Hispanic	18.1	22.6	23.8		30.2	39.6	44.8	
	% Asian	2.8	3.0	5.0		1.7	2.5	3.1	
	% Native American	4.5	5.0	4.5		7.3	5.8	4.5	
	% Multiracial			5.2				2.7	
Washington DC	Total Enrollment	17,480	18,220	15,856	-9.29%	79,802	71,607	81,307	1.89%
	% White	47.4	48.6	53.6		4.0	4.5	10.4	
	% Black	44.4	41.8	25.7		87.6	82.9	70.3	
	% Hispanic	4.8	5.9	10.8		7.0	11.0	15.6	
	% Asian	3.3	3.4	3.7		1.4	1.5	1.6	
	% Native American	0.1	0.3	0.1		0.0	0.1	0.2	
	% Multiracial			6.2				1.9	
Florida	Total Enrollment	256,975	325,963	328,509	27.84%	2,172,841	2,614,178	2,727,105	25.51%
	% White	73.1	66.9	53.1		57.5	49.8	39.7	
	% Black	7.1	11.1	14.0		25.3	23.5	22.1	
	% Hispanic	17.0	18.7	24.7		15.3	24.1	31.7	
	% Asian	2.6	2.2	4.3		1.8	2.3	2.8	
	% Native American	0.3	1.1	0.3		0.2	0.3	0.3	
	% Multiracial			3.6				3.4	
Georgia	Total Enrollment	99,413	127,275	167,913	68.90%	1,311,126	1,552,319	1,753,296	33.72%
	% White	81.1	79.5	75.0		58.2	49.2	41.1	
	% Black	15.2	13.8	13.7		37.9	39.2	36.9	
	% Hispanic	1.5	3.3	4.0		2.2	8.7	14.6	
	% Asian	2.1	2.3	4.1		1.6	2.8	3.9	
	% Native American	0.1	1.1	0.1		0.1	0.1	0.2	



Private Schools in American Education [Working Paper], March 5, 2018  
UCLA Civil Rights Project

	% Multiracial			3.0				3.4	
Indiana	Total Enrollment	100,764	118,885	149,460	48.33%	971,499	1,030,582	1,045,085	7.57%
	% White	88.9	88.3	83.4		85.6	80.4	69.3	
	% Black	6.7	5.6	5.0		11.1	12.4	12.4	
	% Hispanic	3.1	3.8	6.6		2.3	5.7	11.1	
	% Asian	1.3	1.4	2.0		0.8	1.2	2.2	
	% Native American	0.1	0.9	0.3		0.2	0.3	0.2	
	% Multiracial			2.7				4.7	
Louisiana	Total Enrollment	147,681	124,968	152,955	3.57%	797,366	639,218	714,923	-10.34%
	% White	82.8	83.5	70.9		51.0	51.9	45.5	
	% Black	12.4	11.1	20.7		46.0	43.9	44.2	
	% Hispanic	2.9	2.8	3.2		1.1	2.1	5.9	
	% Asian	1.8	1.9	3.4		1.3	1.3	1.6	
	% Native American	0.1	0.7	0.4		0.5	0.8	0.7	
	% Multiracial			1.3				2.0	
Maine	Total Enrollment	16,986	18,894	17,273	1.68%	213,768	195,418	176,396	-17.48%
	% White	96.5	93.7	85.3		97.3	95.1	90.3	
	% Black	1.0	2.0	2.4		0.8	2.0	3.4	
	% Hispanic	0.7	1.2	2.1		0.4	0.9	2.0	
	% Asian	1.4	2.4	7.8		0.9	1.4	1.6	
	% Native American	0.5	0.6	0.8		0.6	0.5	0.7	
	% Multiracial			1.6				2.1	
Mississippi	Total Enrollment	50,427	50,931	38,168	-24.31%	506,272	494,954	487,178	-3.77%
	% White	92.0	88.3	83.1		47.7	46.5	44.8	
	% Black	6.3	9.5	10.9		51.0	51.2	49.2	
	% Hispanic	0.4	0.9	2.8		0.3	1.4	3.4	
	% Asian	1.1	0.7	2.1		0.6	0.8	1.1	
	% Native American	0.1	0.6	0.2		0.4	0.2	0.2	
	% Multiracial			1.0				1.3	
North Carolina	Total Enrollment	82,652	102,919	110,242	33.38%	1,182,780	1,408,664	1,536,724	29.92%
	% White	87.8	82.5	76.8		64.6	56.7	49.8	
	% Black	9.1	12.1	8.9		30.7	31.4	25.7	
	% Hispanic	1.2	2.5	5.6		1.9	8.4	16.2	
	% Asian	1.6	1.7	4.7		1.3	2.1	3.1	
	% Native American	0.3	1.1	0.4		1.5	1.4	1.3	
	% Multiracial			3.6				3.8	
Ohio	Total Enrollment	259,225	225,324	222,881	-14.02%	1,837,042	1,785,820	1,708,484	-7.00%
	% White	88.7	87.2	79.2		82.2	79.0	71.4	
	% Black	7.9	8.1	10.4		15.3	17.0	16.3	
	% Hispanic	1.7	2.4	3.8		1.4	2.4	5.1	
	% Asian	1.5	1.3	3.1		1.0	1.4	2.2	
	% Native American	0.1	1.0	0.1		0.1	0.1	0.1	
	% Multiracial			3.4				4.8	
Oklahoma	Total Enrollment	24,844	30,208	26,977	8.59%	610,793	634,739	692,546	13.38%
	% White	84.9	81.8	72.9		69.5	59.6	50.0	
	% Black	6.1	5.2	4.6		10.4	10.9	8.9	
	% Hispanic	3.3	5.8	6.9		3.9	8.9	16.2	
	% Asian	2.9	3.8	6.9		1.3	1.7	2.3	
	% Native American	2.8	3.5	5.5		15.0	18.9	14.3	
	% Multiracial	0.0		3.2				8.4	
Utah	Total Enrollment	13,076	17,255	17,636	34.88%	475,518	497,873	636,734	33.90%
	% White	87.5	81.5	72.3		90.3	81.9	75.4	

Private Schools in American Education [Working Paper], March 5, 2018  
UCLA Civil Rights Project

	% Black	2.0	3.1	4.0		0.7	1.3	1.4	
	% Hispanic	6.4	8.0	10.9		5.4	12.2	16.5	
	% Asian	3.5	5.2	7.3		2.2	3.1	3.3	
	% Native American	0.6	2.1	0.8		1.4	1.5	1.1	
	% Multiracial			4.8				2.3	
Vermont	Total Enrollment	9,872	10,389	9,339	-5.40%	105,565	93,858	84,355	-20.09%
	% White	93.4	92.3	89.5		97.3	95.5	90.8	
	% Black	2.5	2.2	2.5		0.7	1.5	2.0	
	% Hispanic	2.3	1.5	2.0		0.4	1.0	1.8	
	% Asian	1.4	1.9	4.2		1.0	1.6	2.1	
	% Native American	0.4	2.2	0.1		0.6	0.4	0.2	
	% Multiracial		0.0	1.8				3.1	
Wisconsin	Total Enrollment	143,608	125,669	126,035	-12.24%	870,175	870,745	861,518	-0.99%
	% White	90.6	81.2	66.7		83.2	77.9	71.4	
	% Black	4.9	10.8	17.0		9.4	10.4	9.3	
	% Hispanic	2.2	5.5	10.2		3.3	6.7	11.2	
	% Asian	1.5	1.4	3.0		2.8	3.6	3.9	
	% Native American	0.7	1.1	0.6		1.3	1.4	1.2	
	% Multiracial			2.5				3.0	

Source: NCES Common Core of Data 1995-96, 2005-06, and 2015-16; Private School Universe Survey, 1995-96, 2005-06, and 2015-16.

Note: Percentage change shows an increase or a decrease in total enrollment between School Years 1995-96 and 2015-16.


### **Segregation Analysis – National Level**

The nation has witnessed rapidly increasing racial and ethnic diversity for the past two decades. In public schools, the sharp growth of racial and ethnic minority populations—particularly Hispanic and Asian students—over the past two decades has changed the overall intergroup contact levels for students of all racial and ethnic groups. Unlike this fast-moving nationwide change, changes in intergroup contacts within private schools during the same period were modest. In this section, we will first look at nationwide trends of private school intergroup contact experiences and then explore regional trends. Finally, we will examine different patterns and trends of intergroup experiences in each private sector by region.

The Civil Rights Project has done many studies of patterns of public school segregation and several of charter school racial patterns, showing high levels of segregation in both and even worse segregation in charter schools than in public schools. One of the advantages cited by voucher advocates has been that students of color would get a much less segregated experience. In general, it is true that black and Hispanic students in private schools, which have very large white majorities, are, on average, in schools with substantially more white classmates.

The group that has the most isolated intergroup experiences in private schools, both 20 years ago and now, is white students. In 2015, the typical white student attended a private school where white students made up an overwhelming percentage (81 percent) of the student body—much like the situation white students experienced twenty years ago. The remaining 20 percent of private school enrollment was approximately 5 percent black, Hispanic, and Asian students, respectively, and 5 percent students of other races. The change in intergroup contacts that the typical black student in private school experiences has not been substantial in the last two decades, either. Nevertheless, twenty years ago, the typical black student went to a private school where more than half of his/her peers were black, but today he/she attends a school that has 44 percent blacks, 37 percent whites, and less than 10 percent Hispanics. Regarding intergroup experiences of Hispanic students, the typical Hispanic student goes to a private school where Hispanic students account for more than 40 percent of the student body, as he/she did twenty years ago. In 2015, he/she also meets less than 40 percent whites, 9 percent blacks, and 7 percent Asians. A decade ago, the typical Asian student went to a private school where more than half of students were white, but now the white share has dropped below 50 percent. The percentages of Asian, black and Hispanic students that the typical Asian student meets remain unchanged at 29 percent, 7 percent, and 10 percent, respectively (Figure 11).

Figure 11: Average Intergroup Contacts that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences, 1995-2015



Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-2006, and 2015-2016.

Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).

### Segregation Analysis – Regional Level

The population growth rates of each ethnic group vary from region to region. As a result of such variation, patterns of intergroup experiences in private schools of each region are far more diversified than those of the country.

Similar to national trends, regional patterns also show that white students in private schools have the most isolated experiences. The case of white students in the Northeast and Midwest, in particular, is even more extreme compared to the South and West. The white share in the two regions' private schools that the typical white student goes to is approximately 85 percent. No other groups of students, including non-white and white students in the country, experience such severe degrees of isolation as white students in the Northeast and Midwest do. The typical white student in the West has more diversity than his/her white peers in the other three regions. However, given that the white proportion in the West is less than 40 percent, white students in private schools in the West also have relatively very isolated intergroup experiences. Other groups' exposure to white students vary by group and by region. Black and Hispanic students' exposure to white students across the four regions is similar, ranging from 32 to 40 percent. Nevertheless, Hispanic students' exposure to whites in the Midwest private schools is higher (47 percent) than the average levels. Asian students, on average, attend private schools where whites make up the majority of the student body. However, Asians in private schools in the West experience higher exposure (41 percent) to fellow Asians than to white students (34 percent) (Figure 12).


As for black students, the typical black private school student in the Midwest goes to a less integrated school than his/her black peers in the other regions, probably reflecting the extreme residential segregation in some centers of Midwest black population. On average, black students in private schools had more than half black schoolmates. Black students' exposure to fellow blacks in the Northeast and South private schools was at 40 percent, but this number dropped to 22 percent in the West due to the region's much smaller proportions of blacks (Figure 12).

With regard to Hispanic students' exposure to other racial groups, the typical Hispanic student in private schools in the South and West has the highest exposure (45-47 percent) to Hispanic students. However, the typical Hispanic students in the Northeast and Midwest go to private schools in which their group makes up slightly more than 35 percent of the student body. Regional variation in Hispanic students' exposure to fellow white students is not large. In general, the typical Hispanic student across regions attends private schools that enroll 32 percent or more white students. The share of black students that the typical Hispanic student is exposed to varies from region to region, ranging from 4.6 percent (West) to 15.2 percent (Northeast). In private schools in the Midwest and South, the typical Hispanic student's exposure to Asians is very minimal, around 4 percent, but the typical Hispanic student in the West has more exposure to Asians (11 percent) compared to the other regions (Figure 12).

Finally, our analyses find that Asian students in private schools have the most isolated intergroup experiences after white students, but their exposure to other racial groups differs tremendously from region to region. The typical Asian student's exposure to white students, for example, is the largest in the Midwest (64 percent), but the figure drops to half (34 percent) in the West. Except

white students, the group that the typical Asian student is most exposed to is fellow Asian students. The typical Asian student’s exposure to the same racial group in private schools in the West (41 percent) exceeds his/her exposure to whites (34 percent), which shows a high concentration of Asian population in the West. In contrast, the typical Asian’s exposure to Hispanic and black students in private schools is modest—less than 10 percent in most cases—compared to his/her exposure to white and Asian students (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Average Intergroup Contacts that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Region, 2015-2016



Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 2015-2016.

Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).

In this section, we explore to what extent intergroup experiences change over time by region and by sector to show varying schooling experiences of each group of private school students.

### Intergroup Contact Analysis – Northeast

Our analyses show that the overall levels of intergroup experiences in Northeastern private schools have grown over time, but the degree varies by sector. Nevertheless, while private school students in Catholic and secular sectors experience increasing diversity in general, students in non-Catholic religious schools experience less diversity. The typical white student in non-Catholic religious private schools, in particular, has extremely isolated schooling experiences, virtually meeting only white students in his/her school. Black and Asians students in such religious schools also experience less diverse intergroup contacts compared to their peers in Catholic and secular sectors in the Northeast. Among Hispanic students across all three sectors, those who attend secular private schools have the least diversity in terms of intergroup

experiences. Specifically, the typical Hispanic student in the secular sector goes to a private school that enrolls more than 50 percent Hispanic students (Table 5).

Table 5: Average Intergroup Contacts in Northeastern Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015

		1995-96				2005-06				2015-16			
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
<b>Catholic</b>		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
	white student	89.3	3.8	4.1	2.6	86.9	4.6	5.0	2.4	79.0	5.6	7.0	5.3
By the	black student	29.1	50.1	16.6	4.0	29.0	48.1	18.1	3.7	32.7	40.0	17.3	6.2
typical...	Hispanic student	33.6	17.8	42.2	6.2	31.7	18.2	43.6	4.6	35.6	15.0	38.8	6.9
	Asian student	56.5	11.1	16.3	15.9	51.6	12.6	15.5	19.8	54.2	10.8	13.9	17.0
<b>Other Religious</b>		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
	white student	94.1	3.1	1.5	1.3	93.3	3.3	1.6	1.3	92.4	2.2	1.3	2.5
By the	black student	25.1	66.9	5.5	2.3	25.6	64.0	6.9	2.7	32.0	50.6	7.4	6.1
typical...	Hispanic student	44.7	21.3	29.9	4.0	40.4	23.1	31.5	3.9	35.5	14.0	40.2	6.6
	Asian student	62.1	13.8	6.3	17.6	51.3	13.4	5.9	28.3	41.6	7.0	4.0	33.6
<b>Secular</b>		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
	white student	83.7	7.6	3.5	4.9	81.6	8.1	4.2	4.4	75.4	7.1	4.5	7.9
By the	black student	37.2	50.7	8.5	3.4	45.9	39.0	10.2	3.7	44.6	33.9	9.6	6.7
typical...	Hispanic student	49.2	24.1	20.7	5.6	49.7	21.4	23.3	4.2	50.4	17.0	19.6	7.7
	Asian student	65.2	9.2	5.3	20.0	63.9	9.3	5.1	20.9	56.9	7.7	5.0	24.1

Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-0606, and 2015-2016. Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).



## **Intergroup Contact Analysis – Midwest**

As in the Northeast, private schools of each sector in the Midwest have witnessed slowly increasing diversity over time, but again, the non-Catholic religious sector remains the most insensitive to the change. Moreover, white students in both Catholic and non-Catholic religious sectors are more isolated than their peers in the secular sector. For black students, those who are in non-Catholic religious private schools experience the most isolated intergroup contacts, having more than 60 percent black students in their schools. Conversely, other groups' exposure to black students is tremendously limited, ranging from 3 to 15 percent across sectors. Next, Hispanic students in Midwestern Catholic schools have the largest exposure to the same racial group, which is 42 percent, followed by the religious sector (23 percent) and the secular sector (12 percent). Asians in Midwestern private schools tend to have far higher exposure to whites compared to their black and Hispanic peers. The typical Asian student in Catholic schools attends a school where 70 percent of his/her classmates are white. In contrast, Asian students in religious and secular private schools have more diverse intergroup experiences, having 22% Asians and 60% whites than their peers in Catholic private schools (Table 6).

Table 6: Average Intergroup Contacts in Midwestern Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015

		1995-96				2005-06				2015-16			
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
<b>Catholic</b>	white student	92.5	2.7	3.0	1.6	91.6	2.8	3.5	1.3	85.6	3.4	5.4	2.7
	By the												
	typical... black student	31.6	61.7	5.0	1.6	40.4	50.6	6.9	1.3	41.3	41.3	10.2	2.7
	Hispanic student	53.4	7.7	35.3	3.2	53.0	7.1	36.9	2.1	44.0	7.0	41.6	3.3
	Asian student	76.0	6.4	8.6	8.8	77.1	5.1	8.2	8.7	70.1	5.9	10.6	9.1
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
<b>Other Religious</b>	white student	93.9	3.4	1.4	1.1	91.7	4.3	2.0	1.3	89.2	4.0	2.6	2.4
	By the												
	typical... black student	34.0	62.4	2.1	1.3	34.7	60.2	3.2	1.3	27.5	62.7	3.9	2.4
	Hispanic student	60.9	9.3	26.5	2.7	54.8	10.9	30.7	2.6	54.4	12.0	25.5	4.5
	Asian student	72.4	7.9	3.9	14.8	62.7	7.7	4.7	24.4	60.0	8.5	5.3	22.4
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
<b>Secular</b>	white student	83.2	7.9	2.9	5.5	81.6	7.6	3.4	5.2	72.0	7.1	4.0	9.5
	By the												
	typical... black student	30.4	62.2	3.9	3.0	35.0	54.9	5.8	3.0	40.8	40.7	6.5	6.2
	Hispanic student	48.8	17.1	26.1	7.4	45.4	16.9	29.3	6.0	53.6	15.2	15.5	9.4
	Asian student	65.4	9.2	5.2	20.0	65.8	8.1	5.7	19.5	57.7	6.6	4.3	22.4

Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-0606, and 2015-2016. Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).

## **Intergroup Contact Analysis – South**

In Southern private schools, the last two decades have seen a steady increase in white student contact with other groups of students, including Hispanic, black, and Asian students. Although it is not as severe as religious schools in the Northeast and Midwest, non-Catholic religious private schools in the South still remain the most limited in terms of white contact with other racial groups. The percentage of white students where the typical white student attends private school is 82 percent in the non-Catholic religious sector, but the same figure declines to 78 percent in the Catholic and secular sectors. Black students in the non-Catholic religious sector also have very limited intergroup experiences. The typical black student in this sector goes to a school where more than half of his/her classmates are of the same race. A similar trend exists for Hispanic students in Catholic private schools in the South. The Hispanic proportion in a Catholic school that the typical Hispanic student attends is more than 54 percent, and his/her exposure to black and Asian students is less than 6 percent. Asians' exposure to whites is larger than whites' exposure to Hispanic and black students, and Asians in the Catholic sector tend to have more white classmates than their peers in the other sectors do. The typical Asian student in the South has more exposure to fellow Asian students in non-Catholic religious (20 percent) or secular (26 percent) schools than his/her peers in Catholic schools (Table 7).

Table 7: Average Intergroup Contacts in Southern Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015

		1995-96				2005-06				2015-16			
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
<b>Catholic</b>	white student	87.5	4.4	5.5	2.4	85.1	4.9	6.9	1.9	77.5	5.5	9.4	4.0
	By the black student	32.9	59.2	5.6	2.2	41.6	47.0	8.1	2.1	35.8	46.9	10.2	3.6
	typical... Hispanic student	33.2	4.5	59.9	2.3	36.0	5.0	55.9	2.1	33.3	5.5	54.3	3.4
	Asian student	71.3	8.8	11.4	8.1	63.3	8.5	13.7	13.8	61.7	8.5	15.2	9.3
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
<b>Other Religious</b>	white student	89.7	5.0	3.3	1.8	86.9	6.4	4.2	1.8	81.5	7.9	4.9	3.3
	By the black student	38.1	55.0	4.3	2.4	37.2	55.1	5.2	1.9	36.5	50.2	6.9	3.4
	typical... Hispanic student	47.7	8.1	40.8	3.1	49.6	10.5	36.4	2.7	41.1	12.5	39.9	3.7
	Asian student	67.4	11.5	8.0	12.5	57.8	10.4	7.3	23.8	55.1	12.4	7.4	20.4
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
<b>Secular</b>	white student	89.1	4.9	2.8	3.0	85.0	6.7	3.9	3.2	77.6	7.0	5.5	5.9
	By the black student	46.4	45.8	4.4	3.0	48.5	40.1	7.1	3.2	45.9	35.4	8.3	6.3
	typical... Hispanic student	45.2	7.6	42.7	4.1	44.7	11.1	39.4	3.6	38.0	8.8	43.7	5.5
	Asian student	72.8	7.8	6.2	13.0	66.9	9.2	6.6	16.1	53.7	8.7	7.3	25.6

Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-0606, and 2015-2016. Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).

## **Intergroup Contact Analysis – West**

The private schools of the West show the greatest regional increase in diversity. Still, white students have the least diverse intergroup experiences among all racial groups, and those who are in the non-Catholic religious sector in particular have extremely isolated intergroup contacts despite the region's high level of diversity. For example, the typical white student in the religious sector goes to a school where the student enrollment is more than three-quarters white. Given the region's relatively low black population, the typical black student of each sector has similar exposure to fellow blacks, ranging from 20 to 24 percent. Hispanic students' exposure to their group stands out the most in Catholic schools. The typical Hispanic student in the Catholic sector goes to a school with 53 percent Hispanic students. On the other hand, the typical Hispanic student's exposure to the same racial group in the non-Catholic religious and secular sectors is not as high as the one in Catholic schools. As opposed to Hispanic students, Asian students tend to have higher exposure to the same racial group in non-Catholic religious and secular private schools. The typical Asian student in those sectors has 46-49 percent Asian classmates, and his/her exposure to Asians is higher than his/her exposure to white students in these two sectors (Table 8).

Table 8: Average Intergroup Contacts in Western Schools that the Typical Student of Each Race experiences by Sector, 1995-2015

		1995-96				2005-06				2015-16			
		Percent (%)				Percent (%)				Percent (%)			
<b>Catholic</b>		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
	white student	72.0	2.5	14.9	9.9	71.9	2.8	15.1	7.0	62.7	2.6	16.0	10.2
By the	black student	26.9	38.9	22.8	11.0	33.8	27.7	26.0	8.7	32.9	20.3	25.2	12.7
typical...	Hispanic student	32.6	4.7	50.6	11.4	30.2	4.3	53.9	7.4	25.6	3.2	53.7	10.5
	Asian student	38.1	4.0	20.1	37.3	37.7	3.8	19.9	37.6	35.3	3.5	22.9	27.0
<b>Other Religious</b>		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
	white student	83.4	3.6	6.8	5.5	80.4	4.1	8.4	5.0	75.6	3.3	8.1	8.0
By the	black student	34.7	47.4	9.8	7.6	42.6	33.8	13.3	7.3	42.6	22.0	14.7	13.7
typical...	Hispanic student	53.1	7.9	28.9	9.2	49.6	7.5	32.5	7.4	43.1	6.1	32.6	12.1
	Asian student	40.1	5.8	8.6	45.1	37.9	5.3	9.5	46.4	31.2	4.2	8.9	45.9
<b>Secular</b>		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
	white student	79.4	4.8	6.3	8.8	76.8	5.1	6.9	8.0	70.3	4.0	6.5	10.5
By the	black student	38.8	40.6	12.2	7.6	46.0	30.5	13.8	6.9	44.4	24.4	12.6	10.0
typical...	Hispanic student	49.8	11.9	27.4	9.8	48.1	10.7	29.1	8.5	45.2	7.9	27.9	11.3
	Asian student	37.1	4.0	5.2	53.4	51.7	4.9	7.8	33.9	34.3	3.0	5.3	49.4

Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 1995-1996, 2005-0606, and 2015-2016. Note: Total percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to the exclusion of Native American students and multiracial students (for 2015-16 only).

### Most Segregated States

For the past decades, the Civil Rights Project has been publishing lists of the states where black and Hispanic students have been most severely segregated. Most of our work has focused on public schools, but the tables below show segregation in private schools. The tables demonstrate three results: black (or Hispanic) students' exposure to white students, the share of black (or Hispanic) students, and the proportion of white students in each state, so that results can be interpreted in each state's context.

The private school data below show that some Midwestern and Southern states, including Wisconsin, Washington D.C., Missouri, Maryland, and Florida, rank in the top five most segregated states in terms of black students' exposure to white students (Table 9). The same analyses for public schools, however, reveal slightly different landscape, showing that New York, California, Illinois, Maryland, and Texas have the nation's highest segregation for black students (Orfield, Ee, Frankenberg, and Siegel-Hawley, 2016).

Table 9: Exposure to White Students by the Typical Black Student in Private Schools and Black and White Enrollment in Private Schools by State, 2015-2016

State	Black exposure to white students	State percentage of black enrollment	State percentage of white enrollment
Wisconsin	15.8	17.0	66.7
District of Columbia	21.8	25.7	53.6
Missouri	26.6	12.6	76.2
Maryland	27.0	23.5	61.2
Florida	28.2	14.0	53.1
Illinois	29.0	9.9	67.6
New York	29.9	8.9	71.1
Alabama	34.4	15.5	76.3
California	34.6	5.1	48.9
New Jersey	35.6	9.3	69.8
New Mexico	36.3	2.8	42.4
Georgia	36.5	13.7	75.0
Pennsylvania	37.0	11.0	75.6
Hawaii	37.8	0.9	21.2
Texas	39.3	6.8	58.1
Ohio	42.1	10.4	79.2
Louisiana	44.9	20.7	70.9
Oregon	45.0	4.6	69.9
Massachusetts	47.0	7.2	72.6
Virginia	47.3	10.6	70.1
Connecticut	48.1	9.4	71.3
Arizona	50.6	3.6	57.8
Delaware	51.0	10.6	76.6
Mississippi	52.1	10.9	83.1
Indiana	52.3	5.0	83.4
Minnesota	53.4	5.2	78.1
Oklahoma	53.9	4.6	72.9
Nevada	54.2	4.5	67.5
Tennessee	54.4	9.2	80.5
South Carolina	55.1	8.1	82.1
North Carolina	55.4	8.9	76.8
Rhode Island	55.6	6.2	75.7
Iowa	56.4	2.9	84.9
Washington	56.7	4.3	68.8
Colorado	57.1	3.2	74.8
Kansas	57.7	3.3	76.6

Nebraska	59.3	3.2	86.1
North Dakota	59.8	3.6	83.6
Michigan	59.9	4.8	83.1
Utah	63.5	4.0	72.3
Alaska	68.1	3.1	67.5
Wyoming	68.7	2.7	81.6
Kentucky	69.8	3.9	88.3
South Dakota	71.0	4.9	73.7
New Hampshire	72.3	3.8	81.0
Arkansas	73.0	5.3	82.5
Maine	78.1	2.4	85.3
Idaho	78.8	2.1	86.9
Montana	80.3	0.8	77.5
Vermont	84.0	2.5	89.5
West Virginia	84.2	2.8	91.1

Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 2015-2016

With regard to segregation for Hispanic students, private schools in Alaska, Washington D.C., Wisconsin, New Mexico, and California, are more segregated from whites than those of other states. Wisconsin and Washington D.C. rank high again as was seen in the list of segregation for black students (Table 10). Our analyses of segregation for Hispanic students in public schools find that states with higher shares of Hispanic population, such as California, Texas, New York, New Mexico, and Maryland, have the nation's highest segregation for Hispanic students (Orfield, Ee, Frankenberg, and Siegel-Hawley, 2016). These results show that New Mexico and California are listed for segregation in both private and public sectors. However, analyzing segregation in private schools requires understanding overall contexts and backgrounds, including different private sectors and policy and legal decisions.

Table 10: Exposure to White Students by the Typical Hispanic Student in Private Schools and Hispanic and White Enrollment in Private Schools by State, 2015-2016

State	Hispanic exposure to white students	State percentage of Hispanic enrollment	State percentage of white enrollment
Alaska	16.8	15.0	67.5
District of Columbia	24.0	10.8	53.6
Wisconsin	26.1	10.2	66.7
New Mexico	27.7	37.0	42.4
California	28.2	20.3	48.9
Florida	29.9	24.7	53.1
New York	30.5	9.7	71.1
Texas	31.8	23.1	58.1
North Dakota	33.1	4.8	83.6
Hawaii	34.1	1.8	21.2
Arizona	34.3	23.8	57.8
Minnesota	40.0	6.5	78.1
Illinois	41.7	11.5	67.6
New Jersey	42.4	8.2	69.8
Pennsylvania	44.6	4.6	75.6
Rhode Island	45.6	8.1	75.7
Colorado	49.1	13.5	74.8
Maryland	51.7	4.4	61.2
Massachusetts	51.8	7.0	72.6
North Carolina	52.6	5.6	76.8
Connecticut	53.7	7.8	71.3
Indiana	53.7	6.6	83.4
Oklahoma	54.4	6.9	72.9
Nevada	54.5	10.1	67.5



Oregon	54.6	8.9	69.9
Iowa	54.6	8.3	84.9
South Dakota	55.6	3.5	73.7
Kansas	55.8	12.0	76.6
Georgia	56.4	4.0	75.0
Ohio	57.1	3.8	79.2
Mississippi	57.2	2.8	83.1
Washington	58.3	6.4	68.8
Missouri	58.4	3.5	76.2
Virginia	58.5	6.4	70.1
Michigan	59.3	4.5	83.1
Maine	60.1	2.1	85.3
Alabama	60.3	2.8	76.3
Louisiana	61.8	3.2	70.9
Wyoming	61.9	10.2	81.6
Utah	62.6	10.9	72.3
Tennessee	63.5	3.6	80.5
Nebraska	65.0	5.7	86.1
South Carolina	67.9	3.3	82.1
Delaware	69.4	3.5	76.6
Arkansas	69.5	3.7	82.5
New Hampshire	69.6	3.9	81.0
Idaho	77.1	5.5	86.9
Montana	78.6	2.6	77.5
West Virginia	81.4	1.6	91.1
Kentucky	81.4	2.4	88.3
Vermont	87.2	2.0	89.5

---

Source: NCES Private School Universe Survey, 2015-2016

## Conclusion

The private school data for the U.S. show that private schools are, by and large, a small and shrinking sector of American education. They serve a largely white population and a very small proportion of low-income students—about one tenth of their enrollment in a society where a majority of all public school students are poor enough to need subsidized lunches. Private schools differ from public schools in a variety of ways. In multiple Civil Rights Project reports, we demonstrate that American public schools have witnessed a wide spectrum of diversity in many ways that schools in the past did not experience before. This notable increase in diversity has stimulated and changed various aspects American students' schooling experiences, and these new conditions require a great deal of policy efforts to better serve students in the public sector.

Although the portion of private schools responsible for American education has been declining for decades, private schools still play a significant role in many communities of each region. Since the charter system emerged a decade ago, private schools in some areas have been competing with charter schools, which can increasingly absorb private school students. Competing with this growing charter system and local public schools, private schools need to maintain good educational programs and quality education for their students. More importantly, private schools need to seriously consider how to incorporate the nation's growing diversity into their system in order to offer diversified interpersonal contact and to develop appropriate social skills for their students who will work and study in a racially diverse society.

Our data analyses throughout this report find that private schools have shown signs of change, which vary by region and by sector, but the pace of change experienced by private schools is still sluggish compared to public schools. Specifically, whites are the most segregated group in private education, and, even within the three major sectors, the white students are disproportionately concentrated with whites. Moreover, private school enrollment rates among other racial groups have declined for years, but the number has remained unchanged for white students in the past 20 years. Compared to public school statistics, students of color in private schools experience considerably greater contact with whites. In spite of the fact that black and Hispanic students make up a very small fraction of the enrollments, in some sectors and regions there are substantial concentrations of these groups. The historically dominant Catholic school segment continues to shrink while the other religious and secular sectors have grown but not dramatically.

Among the states with voucher programs, there are very divergent patterns in the growth or shrinkage of the number and capacity of the private school sector. The only national voucher program, in Washington, D.C. has not produced a growth in the private sector, which has declined both in the number of schools and their enrollment. Given the extreme variety and complex elements of voucher policies and the widely varying local contexts and charter competition, it is very important to study individual programs in depth. One clear policy need is much better and more open data from all schools and programs that are receiving public funds, either from vouchers or from tax subsidies, to permit a serious evaluation of these programs and to maintain transparency and openness in operating public funds. From a civil rights perspective, it would be invaluable to collect data on applications and acceptances, income levels of participating families, attrition as students pass through the schools, curriculum and testing, and

other inputs and outcomes. It would, of course, enrich our understanding if the data could include subgroups of Asians and Latinos by national origin of their families and statistics in ELL status. This data is only a start but it is an important start to give context to our other papers and work to come in the field.

Table 11: Private and public schools and enrollment, by state and by race: 2015-2016

School Count			Total Enrollment in Private Schools									Total Enrollment in Public Schools									Private school enrollment as a percent of total enrollment in all schools, by race								
State	Private	Public	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Multiracial	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Multiracial	Private schools as a percent of all schools	as a percent of total enrollment in all schools, by race											
																		All	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Multiracial					
<b>United States</b>	<b>34,576</b>	<b>89,452</b>	<b>4,903,596</b>	<b>3,363,901</b>	<b>453,594</b>	<b>510,395</b>	<b>339,917</b>	<b>24,035</b>	<b>211,776</b>	<b>49,314,194</b>	<b>24,193,609</b>	<b>7,567,877</b>	<b>12,723,369</b>	<b>2,645,069</b>	<b>497,224</b>	<b>1,687,046</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>11.2</b>				
Alabama	352	1,320	63,920	48,740	9,901	1,766	2,243	206	1,065	740,713	412,780	245,229	50,612	11,072	6,558	14,462	21.1	7.9	10.6	3.9	3.4	16.8	3.0	6.9					
Alaska	53	478	4,518	3,049	138	677	235	225	194	129,054	62,074	4,038	8,599	11,275	29,731	13,337	9.9	3.4	4.7	3.3	7.3	2.0	0.7	1.4					
Arizona	321	1,961	46,265	26,740	1,680	11,029	2,333	2,077	2,405	1,090,158	432,676	57,375	487,758	34,259	48,936	29,154	14.1	4.1	5.8	2.8	2.2	6.4	4.1	7.6					
Arkansas	333	1,052	30,607	25,239	1,629	1,123	1,024	230	1,362	491,390	303,856	102,023	60,533	10,990	3,125	10,863	24.0	5.9	7.7	1.6	1.8	8.5	6.9	11.1					
California	3,424	8,805	544,570	266,312	28,036	110,439	89,546	2,711	47,527	6,044,665	1,460,133	343,111	3,256,266	726,876	32,941	225,338	28.0	8.3	15.4	7.6	3.3	11.0	7.6	17.4					
Colorado	604	1,756	47,875	35,798	1,553	6,479	2,115	237	1,693	878,804	478,040	40,371	290,930	29,490	6,172	33,801	25.6	5.2	7.0	3.7	2.2	6.7	3.7	4.8					
Connecticut	422	1,062	60,353	43,007	5,679	4,722	4,525	96	2,323	519,528	293,038	65,830	118,095	27,018	1,405	14,142	28.4	10.4	12.8	7.9	3.8	14.3	6.4	14.1					
Delaware	97	198	17,310	13,253	1,827	608	1,135	35	453	124,161	56,980	38,050	19,786	4,849	471	4,025	33.0	12.2	18.9	4.6	3.0	19.0	6.8	10.1					
District of Columbia	93	216	15,856	8,505	4,072	1,705	583	10	981	81,307	8,473	57,196	12,709	1,289	126	1,514	30.1	16.3	50.1	6.6	11.8	31.2	7.2	39.3					
Florida	2,204	3,716	328,509	174,534	45,920	80,993	14,136	1,095	11,854	2,727,105	1,082,320	602,652	864,512	77,084	8,779	91,758	37.2	10.8	13.9	7.1	8.6	15.5	11.1	11.4					
Georgia	1,216	2,237	167,913	125,969	23,061	6,674	6,888	231	5,091	1,753,296	720,207	646,499	255,484	68,373	3,447	59,286	35.2	8.7	14.9	3.4	2.5	9.2	6.3	7.9					
Hawaii	142	288	41,703	8,832	386	753	23,019	313	8,401	181,870	23,378	3,517	21,744	110,329	574	22,328	33.1	18.7	27.4	9.9	3.3	17.3	35.3	27.3					
Idaho	255	635	13,901	12,073	295	764	460	102	207	286,447	218,179	2,892	50,244	4,445	3,945	6,742	28.7	4.6	5.2	9.3	1.5	9.4	2.5	3.0					
Illinois	1,498	3,927	231,275	156,442	22,958	26,712	14,090	409	10,664	2,012,523	983,611	345,799	515,746	97,193	5,374	64,800	27.6	10.3	13.7	6.2	4.9	12.7	7.1	14.1					
Indiana	1,664	1,863	149,460	124,595	7,470	9,923	3,003	416	4,053	1,045,085	724,684	129,562	116,404	23,207	2,267	48,961	47.2	12.5	14.7	5.5	7.9	11.5	15.5	7.6					
Iowa	509	1,324	59,419	50,449	1,694	4,911	1,360	242	7,633	497,345	386,093	27,643	51,031	13,025	1,864	17,689	27.8	10.7	11.6	5.8	8.8	9.5	11.5	4.1					
Kansas	209	1,315	37,786	28,933	1,262	4,546	1,803	269	972	488,382	317,862	34,146	93,578	14,192	4,497	24,107	13.7	7.2	8.3	3.6	4.6	11.3	5.6	3.9					
Kentucky	329	1,222	61,766	54,569	2,414	1,453	1,776	197	1,357	676,793	531,204	70,062	40,281	11,564	809	22,873	21.2	8.4	9.3	3.3	3.5	13.3	19.6	5.6					
Louisiana	578	1,341	152,955	108,506	31,634	4,887	5,246	681	2,002	714,923	325,371	316,117	42,495	11,483	4,936	14,521	30.1	17.6	25.0	9.1	10.3	31.4	12.1	12.1					
Maine	143	581	17,273	14,728	413	371	1,350	132	279	176,396	159,239	5,958	3,600	2,804	1,170	3,625	19.7	8.9	8.5	6.5	9.4	32.5	10.1	7.1					
Maryland	765	1,329	122,207	74,820	28,700	5,372	6,343	196	6,776	861,595	339,304	291,871	134,208	55,935	2,464	37,813	36.5	12.4	18.1	9.0	3.8	10.2	7.4	15.2					
Massachusetts	755	1,796	105,960	76,918	7,638	7,449	9,026	172	4,757	914,158	572,713	79,852	168,143	61,466	2,048	29,936	29.6	10.4	11.8	8.7	4.2	12.8	7.8	13.7					
Michigan	886	2,363	151,909	126,310	7,365	6,776	5,655	602	5,201	1,412,238	953,788	250,154	103,919	47,179	9,299	47,899	23.0	9.7	11.7	2.9	6.1	10.7	6.1	9.8					
Minnesota	472	1,686	65,496	51,120	3,399	4,260	3,602	796	2,319	832,485	574,007	84,119	72,106	55,408	13,248	33,597	21.9	7.3	8.2	3.9	5.6	6.1	5.7	6.5					
Mississippi	182	915	38,168	31,708	4,161	1,080	788	63	369	487,178	218,053	239,763	16,499	5,300	1,163	6,400	16.6	7.3	12.7	1.7	6.1	12.9	5.1	5.4					
Missouri	869	2,247	110,089	83,852	13,862	3,846	3,909	455	4,169	913,246	660,617	145,557	53,860	19,855	3,678	29,679	27.9	10.8	11.3	8.7	6.7	16.4	11.0	12.3					
Montana	122	817	9,604	7,443	75	247	220	1,429	189	145,240	114,975	1,272	6,495	1,515	16,508	4,475	13.0	6.2	6.1	5.6	3.7	12.7	8.0	4.0					
Nebraska	346	1,009	43,985	37,893	1,387	2,501	1,209	108	887	316,014	213,942	21,136	57,120	8,477	4,370	10,969	25.5	12.2	15.0	6.2	4.2	12.5	2.4	7.5					
Nevada	146	610	19,166	12,934	863	1,938	1,940	127	1,364	464,272	157,799	48,372	193,638	32,013	4,399	28,051	19.3	4.0	7.6	1.8	1.0	5.7	2.8	4.6					
New Hampshire	259	490	19,993	16,185	765	773	1,859	100	311	181,307	157,322	3,444	9,026	5,935	502	5,078	34.5	9.9	9.3	18.2	7.9	23.9	16.6	5.8					
New Jersey	1,269	2,384	172,214	120,262	15,979	14,137	14,180	301	7,355	1,337,561	624,001	208,460	349,561	132,767	1,644	21,128	34.7	11.4	16.2	7.1	3.9	9.6	15.5	25.8					
New Mexico	171	841	19,571	8,292	550	7,242	955	1,444	1,088	330,429	77,985	6,387	202,871	4,196	33,546	5,444	16.9	5.6	9.6	7.9	3.4	18.5	4.1	16.7					
New York	1,939	4,618	461,297	327,813	41,041	44,584	29,312	689	17,858	2,634,356	1,191,065	455,685	680,289	237,586	16,832	52,899	29.6	14.9	21.6	8.3	6.2	11.0	3.9	25.2					
North Carolina	646	2,497	110,242	84,645	9,793	6,228	5,183	467	3,927	1,536,724	765,554	394,920	249,110	48,297	20,333	58,510	20.6	6.7	10.0	2.4	2.4	9.7	2.2	6.3					
North Dakota	49	481	6,404	5,353	228	310	144	280	89	108,464	85,447	4,576	4,980	1,885	9,534	2,042	9.3	5.6	5.9	4.7	5.9	7.1	2.9	4.2					
Ohio	1,357	3,479	222,881	176,527	23,201	8,448	6,838	217	7,651	1,708,484	1,219,819	278,828	87,938	37,894	2,142	81,863	28.1	11.5	12.6	7.7	8.8	15.3	9.2	8.5					
Oklahoma	183	1,791	26,977	19,654	1,251	1,851	1,874	1,489	860	692,546	346,313	61,367	112,286	15,632	98,899	58,049	9.3	3.7	5.4	2.0	1.6	10.7	1.5	1.5					
Oregon	412	1,209	47,078	32,892	2,181	4,167	4,477	464	2,897	562,870	357,054	13,474	126,573	26,361	8,007	31,801	25.4	7.7	8.4	14.3	3.2	14.5	5.5	8.3					
Pennsylvania	2,737	2,925	271,050	205,018	29,933	12,445	13,248	345	10,062	1,692,726	1,146,615	247,427	175,306	63,950	2,578	56,850	48.3	13.8	15.2	10.8	6.6	17.2	11.8	15.0					
Rhode Island	131	297	18,104	13,711	1,123	1,461	1,023	49	737	136,719	83,029	10,813	32,047	4,691	957	5,182	30.6	11.7	14.2	9.4	4.4	17.9	4.9	12.4					
South Carolina	375	1,185	48,393	39,729	3,899	1,581	1,624	141	1,418	761,721	393,902	261,361	64,788	12,319	2,464	26,887	24.0	6.0	9.2	1.5	2.4	11.6	5.4	5.0					
South Dakota	72	651	8,758	6,453	432	304	245	1,081	244	132,433	99,897	3,859	6,845	2,425	14,867	4,540	10.0	6.2	6.1	10.1	4.3	9.2	6.8	5.1					
Tennessee	500																												

Table 12: Comparisons of Public, Charter, and Private Schools by State, 2015-2016

	Public School		Charter School		Private School		Percent (%)			
	Number	Total Enrollment	Number	Total Enrollment	Number	Total Enrollment	Charter Schools out of All Public Schools	Public School Students Enrolled in Charter Schools	Private Schools out of All Schools	Students Enrolled in Private Schools
<b>United States</b>	<b>89,431</b>	<b>49,314,194</b>	<b>6,373</b>	<b>2,751,900</b>	<b>34,576</b>	<b>4,903,596</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>9.0</b>
Alabama	1,320	740,713			352	63,920	-	-	21.1	7.9
Alaska	478	129,054	28	6,343	53	4,518	5.9	4.9	9.9	3.4
Arizona	1,948	1,090,158	546	175,439	321	46,265	28.0	16.1	14.2	4.1
Arkansas	1,052	491,390	63	23,927	333	30,607	6.0	4.9	24.0	5.9
California	8,804	6,044,665	1,203	566,371	3,424	544,570	13.7	9.4	28.0	8.3
Colorado	1,756	878,804	208	101,101	604	47,875	11.8	11.5	25.6	5.2
Connecticut	1,062	519,528	24	9,132	422	60,353	2.3	1.8	28.4	10.4
Delaware	198	124,161	28	13,622	97	17,310	14.1	11.0	33.0	12.2
Washington D.C.	216	81,307	111	35,001	93	15,856	51.4	43.0	30.1	16.3
Florida	3,716	2,727,105	560	250,797	2,204	328,509	15.1	9.2	37.2	10.8
Georgia	2,237	1,753,296	81	71,980	1,216	167,913	3.6	4.1	35.2	8.7
Hawaii	288	181,870	34	10,444	142	41,703	11.8	5.7	33.1	18.7
Idaho	635	286,447	48	18,729	255	13,901	7.6	6.5	28.7	4.6
Illinois	3,927	2,012,523	64	64,108	1,498	231,275	1.6	3.2	27.6	10.3
Indiana	1,863	1,045,085	88	39,671	1,664	149,460	4.7	3.8	47.2	12.5
Iowa	1,324	497,345	3	430	509	59,419	0.2	0.1	27.8	10.7
Kansas	1,315	488,382	10	3,186	209	37,786	0.8	0.7	13.7	7.2
Kentucky	1,221	676,793			329	61,766	-	-	21.2	8.4
Louisiana	1,341	714,923	137	73,647	578	152,955	10.2	10.3	30.1	17.6
Maine	581	176,396	7	1,518	143	17,273	1.2	0.9	19.7	8.9
Maryland	1,329	861,595	50	20,988	765	122,207	3.8	2.4	36.5	12.4
Massachusetts	1,796	914,158	81	40,199	755	105,960	4.5	4.4	29.6	10.4
Michigan	2,961	1,412,238	332	139,499	886	151,909	11.2	9.9	23.0	9.7
Minnesota	1,686	832,485	213	50,682	472	65,496	12.6	6.1	21.9	7.3
Mississippi	915	487,178	2	226	182	38,168	0.2	0.0	16.6	7.3
Missouri	2,247	913,246	70	21,619	869	110,089	3.1	2.4	27.9	10.8
Montana	817	145,240			122	9,604	-	-	13.0	6.2
Nebraska	1,009	316,014			346	43,985	-	-	25.5	12.2
Nevada	610	464,272	47	35,130	146	19,166	7.7	7.6	19.3	4.0
New Hampshire	490	181,307	31	3,011	259	19,993	6.3	1.7	34.5	9.9
New Jersey	2,384	1,337,561	89	41,026	1,269	172,214	3.7	3.1	34.7	11.4
New Mexico	841	330,429	94	22,079	171	19,571	11.2	6.7	16.9	5.6
New York	4,617	2,634,356	253	117,114	1,939	461,297	5.5	4.4	29.6	14.9
North Carolina	2,497	1,536,724	157	82,260	646	110,242	6.3	5.4	20.6	6.7
North Dakota	480	108,464			49	6,404	-	-	9.3	5.6
Ohio	3,479	1,708,484	336	114,012	1,357	222,881	9.7	6.7	28.1	11.5
Oklahoma	1,791	692,546	41	19,769	183	26,977	2.3	2.9	9.3	3.7
Oregon	1,209	562,870	126	30,728	412	47,078	10.4	5.5	25.4	7.7
Pennsylvania	2,924	1,692,726	175	130,940	2,737	271,050	6.0	7.7	48.4	13.8
Rhode Island	297	136,719	27	6,434	131	18,104	9.1	4.7	30.6	11.7
South Carolina	1,185	761,721	67	29,420	375	48,393	5.7	3.9	24.0	6.0
South Dakota	651	132,433			72	8,758	-	-	10.0	6.2
Tennessee	1,804	991,648	98	28,862	500	79,878	5.4	2.9	21.7	7.5
Texas	7,872	5,224,531	499	241,108	2,399	269,180	6.3	4.6	23.4	4.9
Utah	935	636,734	115	67,093	162	17,636	12.3	10.5	14.7	2.7
Vermont	298	84,355			115	9,339	-	-	27.8	10.0
Virginia	1,846	1,281,866	7	1,001	952	110,987	0.4	0.1	34.0	8.0
Washington	1,989	1,039,665			641	83,300	-	-	24.4	7.4
West Virginia	682	276,449			128	12,951	-	-	15.8	4.5
Wisconsin	2,147	861,518	220	43,254	1,054	126,035	10.2	5.0	32.9	12.8
Wyoming	361	94,717			37	1,510	-	-	9.4	1.6

Source: NCES Common Core of Data Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey Data, 2015-2016; NCES PSU Survey, 2015-2016.

Table 13: Low-income student enrollment in Private and public schools and, by state and by Sector: 2015-2016

	Public School		Private School							
	Enrollment	% Low-income	Enrollment				% Low-income			
			All	Catholic	Other religious	Nonsectarian	All	Catholic	Other religious	Nonsectarian
<b>United States</b>	<b>49,314,194</b>	<b>50.9</b>	<b>4,903,596</b>	<b>1,901,474</b>	<b>1,932,819</b>	<b>1,069,303</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>5.4</b>
Alabama	740,713	51.1	63,920	12,178	35,722	16,020	2.8	7.2	1.6	2.2
Alaska	129,054	42.8	4,518	1,696	2,397	426	-	-	-	-
Arizona*	1,090,158	44.4	46,265	21,032	18,135	7,098	11.8	20.8	4.2	4.8
Arkansas	491,390	63.5	30,607	7,352	19,404	3,851	3.1	7.5	1.4	3.8
California	6,044,665	58.8	544,570	221,063	163,652	159,855	3.4	5.7	0.9	2.7
Colorado	878,804	41.6	47,875	16,514	16,982	14,378	6.1	10.4	0.6	7.7
Connecticut	519,528	37.6	60,353	24,993	9,318	26,041	4.9	2.5	11.0	5.0
Delaware	124,161	38.5	17,310	6,999	5,322	4,989	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.1
Washington D.C.*	81,307	74.8	15,856	4,270	5,338	6,249	8.1	21.9	1.5	4.3
Florida*	2,727,105	59.0	328,509	83,794	153,041	91,674	5.7	2.7	6.6	7.1
Georgia*	1,753,296	62.4	167,913	17,031	110,417	40,465	1.4	3.8	0.9	1.8
Hawaii	181,870	49.6	41,703	6,256	18,527	16,920	0.7	4.7	0.1	-
Idaho	286,447	46.6	13,901	3,703	7,148	3,049	4.6	12.6	1.5	2.3
Illinois	2,012,523	49.9	231,275	142,283	53,483	35,509	10.4	10.6	9.0	11.4
Indiana*	1,045,085	48.2	149,460	52,960	85,640	10,860	10.5	22.2	4.4	1.7
Iowa	497,345	41.2	59,419	42,331	15,775	1,312	14.9	17.3	5.4	52.7
Kansas	488,382	49.2	37,786	26,344	8,512	2,929	13.6	18.2	4.1	0.9
Kentucky	676,793	59.4	61,766	37,512	17,255	6,999	5.9	8.6	1.8	1.5
Louisiana*	714,923	58.4	152,955	68,556	70,051	14,348	10.6	20.1	3.0	2.1
Maine*	176,396	46.0	17,273	2,247	2,624	12,402	8.2	4.0	0.0	10.7
Maryland	861,595	44.7	122,207	53,341	38,041	30,825	6.0	9.3	4.4	2.2
Massachusetts	914,158	0.0	105,960	49,326	11,182	45,451	8.4	12.1	1.9	6.0
Michigan	1,412,238	45.8	151,909	61,940	77,454	12,516	6.0	9.0	4.0	3.6
Minnesota	832,485	37.6	65,496	37,282	20,713	7,502	10.5	13.4	8.8	0.9
Mississippi*	487,178	75.0	38,168	6,483	20,756	10,929	3.1	11.8	1.7	0.6
Missouri	913,246	50.0	110,089	56,868	36,856	16,366	6.5	7.3	4.4	8.9
Montana	145,240	44.8	9,604	4,094	4,004	1,506	19.9	39.5	3.1	11.5
Nebraska	316,014	44.2	43,985	30,380	12,368	1,237	11.0	13.9	4.9	-
Nevada	464,272	57.3	19,166	6,059	9,281	3,826	0.1	-	0.3	-
New Hampshire	181,307	28.3	19,993	6,313	4,884	8,796	2.9	0.6	1.6	5.3
New Jersey	1,337,561	37.5	172,214	76,243	54,882	41,089	10.9	6.4	19.3	8.2
New Mexico	330,429	71.7	19,571	5,287	7,288	6,996	10.3	19.3	9.3	4.6
New York	2,634,356	48.4	461,297	157,675	217,226	86,396	27.2	13.4	44.0	10.0
North Carolina*	1,536,724	57.2	110,242	15,761	58,194	36,287	0.9	6.1	0.0	0.1
North Dakota	108,464	31.1	6,404	3,762	2,540	102	9.7	10.3	7.8	36.5
Ohio*	1,708,484	44.7	222,881	159,397	45,423	18,061	12.6	14.3	9.3	5.4
Oklahoma*	692,546	61.3	26,977	8,471	14,660	3,846	4.1	7.0	2.8	2.6
Oregon	562,870	49.7	47,078	16,312	19,838	10,927	5.0	4.8	1.2	12.3
Pennsylvania	1,692,726	46.9	271,050	106,782	117,235	47,033	10.4	16.3	3.7	13.9
Rhode Island	136,719	46.3	18,104	12,148	1,262	4,695	6.5	3.6	-	15.9
South Carolina	761,721	60.0	48,393	6,405	29,313	12,674	3.6	17.2	1.5	1.6
South Dakota	132,433	41.7	8,758	4,434	4,006	317	12.1	15.3	2.2	91.6
Tennessee	991,648	57.5	79,878	11,384	46,915	21,579	4.0	9.4	3.4	2.7
Texas	5,224,531	58.8	269,180	76,332	126,374	66,474	2.7	4.6	1.1	3.4
Utah*	636,734	36.2	17,636	5,871	3,142	8,623	3.0	7.5	0.1	1.0
Vermont*	84,355	38.4	9,339	1,783	690	6,866	15.3	13.0	5.9	16.9
Virginia	1,281,866	40.8	110,986	24,926	36,422	49,638	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.4
Washington	1,039,665	45.8	83,300	26,328	32,704	24,268	2.4	5.0	1.0	1.6
West Virginia	276,449	49.3	12,951	5,709	6,021	1,221	2.2	4.8	-	0.9
Wisconsin*	861,518	39.4	126,035	64,591	53,918	7,527	26.9	22.7	33.3	17.6
Wyoming	94,717	37.5	1,510	672	484	354	20.1	22.7	0.4	42.3

Source: NCES Common Core of Data Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey Data, 2015-2016; NCES PSU Survey, 2015-2016. Note: \* shows states with voucher laws. - shows data missing or too small to report.

## Appendix

This report includes private schools that offer no grade higher than Kindergarten.

This report uses Census-defined regions:

- Northeast: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont;
- South: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia;
- Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and
- West: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

### Segregation Statistics (Exposure Rates)

This report uses exposure statistics to measure segregation and to capture student experiences of segregation. Exposure of certain racial groups to one another or to majority groups shows the distribution of racial groups among organizational units and describes the average contact between different groups. It is calculated by employing the percentage of a particular group of students of interest in a small unit (e.g., school) with a certain group of students in a larger geographic or organizational unit (e.g., state or district) to show a weighted average of the composition of a particular racial group. The formula for calculating the exposure rates of a student in racial group A to students in racial group B is:

$$P^* = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{a_i b_i}{A t_i}$$

where

- $n$  is the number of small units (e.g., school) in a larger unit (e.g., state or district)
- $a_i$  is the number of students in racial group A in the small unit  $i$  (school  $i$ )
- $A$  is the total number of students in racial group A in the larger unit (state or district)
- $b_i$  is the number of students in racial group B in the small unit  $i$  (school  $i$ )
- $t_i$  is the total number of students in all racial groups in the small unit  $i$  (school  $i$ )