

Chapter 15

Private Education Initiatives by Latter-day Saints

E. Vance Randall and Chris Wilson

EDUCATION HOLDS A prominent place in Latter-day Saint theology. Well-known verses from revealed scriptures in the Doctrine and Covenants quickly come to mind: “The glory of God is intelligence” (93:36). “Whatever principle of intelligence we attain unto in this life, it will rise with us in the resurrection. And if a person gains more knowledge and intelligence in this life through his diligence and obedience than another, he will have so much the advantage in the world to come” (130:18–19). “Seek ye out of the best books words of wisdom; seek learning, even by study and also by faith” (88:118). “Teach ye diligently and my grace shall attend you, that you may be instructed more perfectly in theory, in principle, in doctrine, in the law of the gospel, in all things that pertain unto the kingdom of God, . . . of things both in heaven and in the earth” (88:78–79).

For Latter-day Saints, acquiring a good education is a religious duty. Education provides us with the mental tools and knowledge to read, understand, and apply gospel principles; to better provide for the temporal necessities of life; and to make us more serviceable in building the kingdom of God. Thus, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has been very involved in K–16 education since the early days of the Restoration, though the nature of the involvement has changed over the years due to changing circumstances.

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: (1) to provide a very brief historical sketch of the Church's involvement in formal K–16 education; and (2) to present major highlights of some of the current efforts of individual Latter-day Saints in providing K–16 education, especially K–12, with a special interest in developing countries. We deliberately do not give much attention to the important topic of religious education, which is beyond the scope of this chapter. An excellent source of the history of religious education can be found in William E. Berrett's *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education*.¹

Historical Sketch of K–16 Education in the Church

The historical development of the Church's provision of K–16 education can be divided into four eras: 1830–47, beginnings; 1847–90, early Utah period; 1890–1935, time of transition and retrenchment; and 1935–2001, expansion, internationalization, and contraction.

1830–47, beginnings. It was not long after the Saints had relocated to Kirtland, Ohio, from New York that the call for the provision of a common school or elementary education went out. In a revelation to W. W. Phelps, the Lord instructed him to assist Oliver Cowdery “to do the work of printing, and of selecting and writing books for schools in this church, that little children also may receive instruction before me as is pleasing unto me” (D&C 55:4). In June 1832, a column titled “Common Schools” appeared in the *Evening and Morning Star*. Members of the Church were admonished to “lose no time in preparing schools for their children, that they may be taught as is pleasing unto the Lord, and brought up on the way of holiness.” The preparation and selection of schoolbooks for the children were to wait until more urgent matters were completed, but “parents and

1. See William E. Berrett, *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education: A History of the Church Educational System* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Printing Center, 1988).

guardians in the Church of Christ need not wait—it is all-important that children to become good should be taught.”²

The appearance of these Church organized and supported K–12 schools had to wait for another two years. In December 1834, the Kirtland [Elementary] School started with around 130 students under the tutelage of William E. McLellin, a schoolteacher by profession, who had taught school in five different states. Classes were held in the printing office. In the “Report of the Kirtland School,” dated February 27, 1835, Joseph Smith Jr., Frederick G. Williams, Sidney Rigdon, and Oliver Cowdery were listed as trustees. Some thirty students were dismissed from the school because they were too young. A final enrollment of 100 students pursued their studies in “penmanship, arithmetic, English grammar, and geography.”³ The following year a high school was established in November 1836. The Kirtland High School was held in the attic of the Kirtland Temple, and the 140 students were taught by H. M. Hawes, Esq., a professor of Greek and Latin languages. He was assisted by two other instructors. The curriculum was divided into three departments: classical languages; English (comprising mathematics, common arithmetic, geography, English grammar, writing, and reading); and the juvenile department.⁴

The other major educational development in Kirtland was the School of the Prophets, a combination of secondary education and religious instruction. This adult education movement, or School of the Elders, was for adult males to prepare them for their missions and other callings related to building the kingdom (see D&C 88:77–80, 127; 90:7, 15). The School of the Prophets was held during the winter months of 1833, 1834–35, 1835–36, and 1836–37. Instructors included

-
2. Joseph Smith, *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2nd ed. rev. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1957), 1:276.
 3. Smith, *History of the Church*, 2:200.
 4. See Smith, *History of the Church*, 2:474.

Joseph Smith, Orson Hyde, Sidney Rigdon, William E. McLellin, and Joshua Seixas. Topics of instruction included theology, English grammar, penmanship, arithmetic, geography, reading, writing, and Hebrew.⁵

With a Church center in Missouri as well as Ohio, schools continued to be organized by Latter-day Saints. In 1831, Church members in Kaw Township laid the foundations for the first school in Missouri. Members also established the first school in Jackson County in 1833. As the Saints were driven out of Jackson County and surrounding areas to the northern part of Missouri, they built more schools. A large schoolhouse was built at Far West, where it also served as a church and a courthouse. In the *History of Caldwell County*, reference is made to the keen interest the Mormon settlers had in education: “There were also many persons of education and accomplishments. School teachers were plenty and schools were numerous. . . . The Mormons very early gave attention to educational matters. There were many teachers among them and schoolhouses were among their first buildings.”⁶ As in Kirtland, a School of the Elders, or School of the Prophets, was organized for adult males and was under the direction of Elder Parley P. Pratt (see D&C 97:3–6).

The determination of the Saints to secure good education did not diminish with the loss of their homes in Missouri and subsequent move to Nauvoo. On December 16, 1840, the city of Nauvoo was granted a charter for the University of Nauvoo by the state of Illinois. In addition to providing postsecondary education, the University of Nauvoo had the role as “parent school,” which provided support and supervision for all other K–16 schools organized in

5. See Lyndon W. Cook, *The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith: A Historical and Biographical Commentary of the Doctrine and Covenants* (Provo, UT: Seventy’s Bookstore, 1981); see also Smith, *History of the Church*, 1:342.
6. *History of Caldwell County*, 121, as quoted in B. H. Roberts, *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1957), 1:425n18.

Nauvoo.⁷ Concern for good textbooks and education was repeated as part of the Church conference in 1845. Elder Heber C. Kimball reminded the Saints of the need for “school books printed for the education of our children, which will not be according to the Gentile order.” W. W. Phelps was commissioned to write some of these schoolbooks.⁸ However, gathering storm clouds of persecution would soon drive the Saints from Nauvoo to Utah.

1847–90, early Utah period. Like their Pilgrim forefathers, Mormon pioneers arriving in the Salt Lake Valley faced the incredible task of recreating a society with its social and religious institutions out of the barren wilderness. True to their beliefs in the Restoration, two of their initial tasks were to select a site for a temple and to organize a school. The first school in Utah opened its door (or tent flap) in October 1847. The teacher, seventeen-year-old Mary Jane Dilworth, began the school day with nine pupils. As more pioneers arrived and moved to settle other areas, schools increased in number and in location. Eventually, five types of K–12 schools dotted the Utah landscape: private free schools, private tuition schools, ward schools, territorial or common schools, and specialty schools.

In 1851 the first public school law was passed, which sought to establish a system of schools and allowed towns and cities to provide support for these schools through taxation. The University of Deseret, later to become the University of Utah, was also established by the territorial legislature. For the first twenty years, these publicly supported schools were Latter-day Saint schools. They were often organized at the ward level, and classes were held in the ward meeting-house and were frequently taught by someone called or hired by the bishop. Many opposed the concept of using taxes to support schools,

7. See Ernest L. Wilkinson and W. Cleon Skousen, *Brigham Young University: A School of Destiny* (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1976).

8. Smith, *History of the Church*, 7:474.

“because institutions supported by general taxes cannot be conducted on a religious basis.”⁹

In the late 1860s, Gentiles began to move into Utah. Some were seeking silver, others establishing businesses, and others hoping to redeem Latter-day Saint children from their benighted religious beliefs. The introduction of religious and social diversity into Utah society had an important impact on Utah education. It became increasingly difficult to explicitly imbue public schools with Latter-day Saint theology. Protestant denominations, with some help from the federal government, sent missionaries to Utah to set up private Protestant schools. The objective of these schools was to enroll Latter-day Saint children and wean them away from their religious beliefs. These Protestant schools sought the redemption of the children from false religious beliefs and the eventual eradication of the “Mormon problem” in one generation. Although many Latter-day Saint children enrolled in these Protestant schools, very few were converted to Protestantism.

The increased secularization of Utah society, with its impact on public schools, the rise of private Protestant schools, and even the hiring of Gentile teachers in some ward schools were of great concern to Church leaders. Control of education and schools was gradually eroding and falling into the hands of those outside the faith. The response by Church leaders was to admonish the Saints to hire members as schoolteachers and to get more involved in the educational decision-making process, both at the territory and town levels. The final blow, however, came with the Edmunds-Tucker Act of 1887, when control of public schools was placed under the direction of an appointed commissioner, and the sale of Church assets was to be used to support the public schools of the territory.

The response of Church leaders to the loss of control over public schools was to establish their own school system “independent of

9. *Deseret Evening News*, November 26, 1884.

the District School system . . . in all places where it is possible.”¹⁰ In June 1888 a letter from the First Presidency stated: “We feel that the time has arrived when the proper education of our children should be taken in hand by us as a people. Religious training is practically excluded from the District Schools. The perusal of books that we value as divine records is forbidden. Our children, if left to the training they receive in these schools, will grow up entirely ignorant of those principles of salvation for which the Latter-day Saints have made so many sacrifices. To permit this condition of things to exist among us would be criminal.”¹¹ The First Presidency asked that each stake form a stake board of education to oversee educational matters in the stake and to establish an academy in every stake. Some academies had been established prior to this letter from the First Presidency. Union Academy was the first academy and was established in Salt Lake in 1860. Brigham Young Academy, later to be known as Brigham Young University (BYU), was established in 1875. Between 1860 and 1909, thirty-five Church academies were established from Canada through the western United States and into Mexico. These academies gave Church leaders control over the curriculum and who would be hired to teach.

1890–1935, transition and retrenchment. 1890 was a watershed year for the Church and the beginning of a major transition from a Mormon theocracy and society into the mainstream of American life.¹² Through revelation, plural marriage was discontinued. In education, the territorial legislature established a system of free public elementary schools. These schools were to be supported by taxes

-
10. “Epistle to Saints in Semi-Annual Conference, October 6, 1886,” *Messages of the First Presidency*, comp. James R. Clark (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965), 3:86–87.
 11. “Establishment of Stake Boards of Education, June 8, 1888,” *Messages of the First Presidency*, 3:168.
 12. See Thomas G. Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890–1930* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986).

collected by the territorial government. The territorial government soon began to provide financial support of public high schools in nearly every county. Church members now found themselves in a financial dilemma. They had been asked to support stake academies by Church leaders, and now they also had to pay taxes to support the public schools. The financial burden was too great.

The response of the Church was twofold. First, seminaries were established adjacent to public schools, where children could receive religious instruction. The first seminary was established in 1912 next to Granite High School. The second major change in Church educational policy was the closure of the stake academies. In 1919, Apostle David O. McKay was appointed commissioner of education with Adam S. Bennion as superintendent of Church schools. President Heber J. Grant assigned them to examine the Church's education policy with regard to stake academies. They decided that to ask members to financially support both stake academies and public schools was too heavy a burden. Furthermore, the Church did not have sufficient resources to fund the academies. The proposed solution was to close the academies. By 1935 all the academies had been closed, transferred to the state as high schools, or transformed into two-year public colleges (for example, Weber College, Snow College, and Dixie College) and then given later to the state.

There were several exceptions. The stake academy at Colonia Juárez remained open as a stake academy, Ricks was converted into a two-year private college and retained by the Church as Ricks College (renamed BYU-Idaho), and Brigham Young Academy became Brigham Young University. Also, an elementary school in Laie, Hawaii, continued and was elevated to junior college status in 1954 by President David O. McKay. This college was initially named the Church College of Hawaii. It is now a four-year institution and is known as BYU-Hawaii. The Church also kept the LDS Business College, which was organized by Karl G. Maeser and William B. Dougall in 1886.

BYU's major role was to prepare teachers of faith who would then teach in the public schools. This would help ensure that public schools would not become godless schools, but the school culture would be indirectly influenced and shaped by Latter-day Saint values and beliefs. The seminary and institute programs, providing religious instruction for high school students and college students, continued to expand, as did provision of higher education at Brigham Young University and Ricks College. In contrast, the Church's direct involvement in K-12 education decreased to the stake academy in Colonia Juárez.

1935-2001, expansion, internationalization, and contraction. In 1953 all Church education programs were consolidated under one organization, the Unified Church School System. The organizational change allowed for better coordination and correlation of educational programs and initiatives. Two major things happened. First, enrollments in seminary and institute programs exploded during the following twenty years. Seminary enrollment increased from 34,467 in 1953 to 141,514 in 1970. Institute enrollment shot up more than tenfold, from 4,555 in 1953 to 49,168 in 1970. The second major event, which foreshadowed the major focus of the 1970s and 1980s, was the internationalization of the seminary and institute program. In 1953 the only place outside the United States where seminary and institute programs were held was Canada. By 1970 programs were established in twenty-five countries and territories.¹³

In 1970 the Unified Church School System was reorganized into the Church Educational System (CES) with Neal A. Maxwell as commissioner of education. CES was given the mandate that seminaries and institutes should follow the Church throughout the world. In addition to religious education, CES also "operated seventy-five elementary and middle schools and seven secondary schools in Bolivia, Chile, Fiji, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Western Samoa, American

13. Berrett, *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education*, 240.

Samoa, Tahiti, and Tonga in 1970.”¹⁴ As Elder Neal A. Maxwell, then Commissioner of Education, reported to the Church General Board of Education, “Without literacy individuals are handicapped—spiritually, intellectually, physically, socially and economically. Education is often not only the key to the individual member’s economic future, but also to his opportunities for self-realization, for full Church service and for contributing to the world around him—spiritually, politically, culturally and socially.”¹⁵ By 1976 the Church operated fifty-one elementary and twenty secondary schools in fourteen countries. However, in harmony with a change in Church policy that the Church should not sponsor K–12 education in areas where the government is able to do so, many of these schools were closed. By 1986, CES operated only thirty schools: eight elementary schools, thirteen middle schools, eight secondary schools, and college preparatory schools in Mexico and the South Pacific.

The period of 1935 to the present time has witnessed extraordinary growth, both in enrollment in seminary and institute programs and the number of countries where these programs are found. The involvement of Church education in K–12 education programs saw a brief increase in the 1970s but a retraction in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The recent inauguration of the Perpetual Education Fund to provide financial assistance in the form of loans to assist young adults with postsecondary education is not so much an expansion of Church education programs as it is a modest effort to assist young adults, especially in developing countries, to continue their education.

It appears that current Church policy does not foresee expansion of K–16 schools sponsored by the Church. This does not, however, preclude efforts by individual Church members from providing K–16 educational opportunities. The second part of this chapter

14. Berrett, *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education*, 185.

15. Quoted in Berrett, *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education*, 185.

describes the efforts of these individuals to furnish formal education at the K–12, as well as the college, levels.

Private K–16 Education Initiatives by Church Members

As the period of expansion, internationalization, and refocusing of education progressed to its present state, a number of private international education initiatives (PIEI) have begun to emerge. These PIEIs vary considerably in both their composition and focus. The descriptive research that follows is a preliminary step to a more systematic inquiry that will yield a greater understanding of these initiatives. This type of descriptive data gathering is an ongoing process, never a finished step. Therefore, expansion and clarification of these initial efforts is welcomed and encouraged.

A PIEI is defined as a formal or nonformal international education activity not officially sponsored by the Church but originating and continuously sustained by the private efforts of Church members. Education, as used in this definition, can be divided into two distinct types. The first is formal education or instruction leading to a formal certification or degree. The second type is nonformal education or instruction that focuses on self-help and skills improvement and does not directly lead to a certificate or a degree. With these working definitions, it is possible to describe the current status of PIEIs and ask specific questions regarding education, globalization, and the Church.

To this point, nineteen specific PIEIs have been identified; seventeen of these could be contacted. Information regarding the seventeen accessible PIEIs was gathered from individual PIEI Web sites and through individual telephone interviews. Inquiries were made in three general areas: history and perceptions for their future, the scope and focus of their operations (geographical as well educational), and, finally, their perceptions of the nature and role of formal Church departments and programs in their unique operations. To facilitate the discussion of these three areas of inquiry, we will begin with PIEIs engaged in primarily formal education.

Formal education initiatives. Four of the nineteen PIEIs have been involved in the process of providing formal education. These include the Rose Education Foundation (REF), Future Hope International (FHI), Southern Virginia University (SVU), and the now-defunct Alma Success Academy (ASA). The first of these formal education initiatives began in 1996 (SVU), and the most recent commenced operations in the year 2000 (FHI). Like many young organizations, the major perception for their future activities is growth. Expansion of both existing schools and programs and the introduction of new schools in new places is a major goal of formal PIEIs. The existence of the necessary government connections and skilled people fluent in the cultural context are vital in selecting sites for expansion. Private formal international education initiatives are truly in their infancy. The impact and challenges faced by these pioneering groups deserves greater study.

The geographical distribution of formal education initiatives by Church members is limited to two continents, South America and Asia, and three countries within those continents, Guatemala (REF), Haiti (FHI), and Cambodia (FHI). Within each country, the size of operations is diminutive, with operations being limited to one or two schools. There are significant questions to consider: Why did formal PIEIs begin in the locations they have and not elsewhere? What role, if any, has the Church played in influencing the location of these formal PIEIs? Why does a returned missionary from Cambodia, for example, establish Future Hope International, while returned missionaries from numerous other countries do not? What attributes, skills, and opportunities existed to make operating formal PIEIs possible? While the descriptive data conducted thus far are helpful in raising questions, they are not suitable for answering these questions. Further research is required to form a clearer picture of the explanations to such questions. While geographic focus is important to consider, population and curriculum focus within countries is also significant and varies considerably.

The focuses of formal PIEIs vary, both in the population they wish to serve and the curriculum they work to provide. FHI, for example, focuses on Vietnamese minority children not served by the Cambodian government. It attempts to accomplish this by embracing a nondenominational approach. Others, like REF, attempt to focus first on the indigenous population and then the broader population in Guatemala. Currently, formal PIEIs choose to focus on one level of education rather than provide a comprehensive system that spans primary, secondary, and higher education.

Curriculum within these organizations also varies according to the historical and social context of the different countries, the specific standards for certification in the respective countries, the financial and personnel conditions of the organizations, and also according to the broader developmental vision of the individual PIEI. The implications of choosing differing arrangements and populations have yet to be examined. In concluding this section, the perceptions of non-formal PIEIs concerning the role of the Church will be introduced.

In researching PIEI perceptions of the role of the Church departments and organizations, we focused on the following: CES, Church welfare, Latter-day Saint Charities, BYU, the Missionary Department, and local stakes, wards, and branches. Responses from both formal and nonformal PIEIs were similar at the general level. For example, both groups see CES as a prime location for conducting recruitment of both students and local field personnel. Latter-day Saint Charities is recognized as a financial resource capable of contributing to certain projects. Both formal and nonformal groups see BYU as fulfilling a research and training role. Local missionaries and wards are seen as sources of volunteer support. The only major difference discovered at this level is that formal PIEIs did not perceive Church welfare as being related to their activities, while nonformal PIEIs do. When we move from the general level of perception to the more specific level, we begin to notice differences that carry implications for the relationship between PIEIs, Church departments, and affiliated organizations.

Perhaps these specific differences and their implications are best illustrated by using BYU as an example. Formal PIEIs perceive BYU as providing research and training relevant to formal education in various international contexts. Formal PIEIs see themselves as future partners in developing a body of knowledge that would be useful in establishing and maintaining operations and training of both foreign and domestic teachers and administrators, who would then take positions in formal education in various country contexts. The nonformal PIEIs, in contrast, are much less interested in building capacity in terms of the existing formal education structures within a country. Their level of analysis focuses on the individual and economic development through the less-structured approaches of nonformal education. The research and training for nonformal initiatives would be positions in development NGOs, rather than formal education positions. The implications of these differing PIEI perceptions for BYU are research and training programs heading in two directions based on differing strategies of educational development. This seems to be a pattern that relates to the perceptions of other Church departments as well. The difference in strategies leads to differing needs, which leads to different perceptions of the role Church departments and affiliated organizations might play. We will now turn our attention to the discussion of nonformal PIEIs.

Nonformal education initiatives. Nonformal PIEIs¹⁶ are more common than formal PIEIs. One reason for this may be the flexibility of nonformal initiatives in terms of length of projects, financial requirements, and so forth. Nonformal private international

16. The following is the list of identified, nonformal, private Latter-day Saint international education initiatives: Choice Humanitarian, UNITUS, JUCONI, Chasqui Humanitarian, Enterprise Mentors International, Called 2 Serve Foundation/Academy for Creating Enterprise, Reach the Children, Norma I. Love Foundation, Rose Foundation, Help-International, American Indian Services, Huntsman Armenian Projects, Ouelessebouougou-Utah Alliance, Norman Gardner/Braille Resource and Literacy Center. (The status of Engage Now and Mesa International is uncertain.)

initiatives began earlier than their formal PIEI counterparts. Three were founded during the period from 1980 to 1985, four from 1986 to 1990, one from 1991 to 1995, and five from 1995 to 2001. Many of these nonformal PIEIs are spin-offs from earlier projects and organizations. They continue to define and redefine themselves at a rapid pace. As with formal PIEIs, their perceptions for the future are the expansion of both the geographical scope and the content of their projects. Therefore, the questions regarding where and why a PIEI forms in a given location apply to nonformal initiatives as well. The majority of nonformal PIEIs are involved in some configuration of microenterprise.

Geographically, nonformal PIEIs are represented on four continents, although they are most heavily concentrated in Latin American countries. In Latin America, three organizations operate in Mexico, three in Bolivia, one in Guatemala, three in Honduras, two in Peru, one in El Salvador, one in Venezuela, and one in Ecuador. Africa has two organizations with active operations, both in Kenya. Armenia, in Eastern Europe, has one organization actively working, while Asia has three different countries represented. One group has operations in Vietnam; Nepal is served by one group, as is the Philippines. Currently, the scope of operations is somewhat larger than the formal PIEIs, serving a greater number of people, with a wider range of programs.

In terms of curriculum focus and population there is a broad mix. As stated previously, microenterprise is part of the majority of nonformal PIEIs. An initiative like JUCONI, which focuses on street children, uses a comprehensive human development approach that addresses biological, cognitive, affective, and communicative development and social integration. In contrast, the Academy for Creating Enterprise's curriculum focuses specifically on providing entrepreneurial skills training in microenterprise to returned Filipino missionaries. While some initiatives have a broad focus in terms of the populations they serve, the majority focus on women, children, and minorities within the broader population. Like their

formal educational counterparts, some focus specifically on Latter-day Saint populations and work outward, while others prefer to work in a nondenominational fashion.

Nonformal PIEIs' perceptions regarding the role of the Church, its departments, and its affiliated organizations has been introduced previously. While at the general level the perceived role of the Church is very similar, at a more specific level the difference in perception begins to become apparent. While difficult to determine with the young organizations involved, it seems that the greater flexibility of nonformal PIEIs enables them to find more ways to link their activities with the Church, and they are therefore more common than formal PIEIs. Nonformal PIEI projects require smaller, shorter, and more flexible commitments by Church departments and organizations and therefore find support more frequently. While nonformal PIEIs are currently more prevalent, there is insufficient research to demonstrate which approach might be more successful in building local capacity through education.

In summary, private international Latter-day Saint initiatives are a recent and growing attempt to meet the individual educational needs of people internationally. Currently, two approaches are represented, one that provides formal educational opportunities and a second that concentrates on nonformal education. The geographical trend of these initiatives is diverse, but it is concentrated in Latin American countries. Within countries being served by PIEIs, there are a wide variety of configurations. Some initiatives signify Latter-day Saint populations as their focus, while others have a broad nondenominational approach. Nonformal PIEIs often employ some arrangement of microenterprise as a means of developing local capacity. At the general level, both formal and nonformal PIEIs have similar perceptions of the role they would like the Church departments and affiliated organizations to play. However, at the more fundamental level, formal and nonformal PIEIs have differing developmental agendas. These similarities at the general level and divergent paths at the fundamental level create implications for the

present and future relations of PIEIs and Church departments and organizations. The history of the Church and K–16 education, from its beginnings in 1830 to the current period of expansion, internationalization, and refocus, affirms that the Church has always been, and continues to be, dedicated to education. Where governments and private sources can offer education, the Church encourages their efforts to do so. Internationally, the Church does not provide formal education (schooling) in areas where government-sponsored schools are adequate to provide appropriate education for Latter-day Saint members. Globalization creates a space for both formal and non-formal Latter-day Saint private education initiatives to operate. The descriptive information provided herein raises questions that should be considered. For example:

- What should be done with regions without any private Latter-day Saint formal or nonformal education opportunities? Should expansion of these opportunities be encouraged in some way? How?
- How successful have formal and nonformal PIEIs been in building local capacity?
- Finally, what role should private Latter-day Saint formal and nonformal education initiatives and the Church play in support of each other's efforts to provide quality education in areas where members do not have access to adequate educational opportunities?

Doubtless, additional questions can and should be raised regarding PIEIs, globalization, and the Church. The descriptive research presented here is only a starting point for future consideration. The help and collaboration of all interested parties in clarifying and expanding these research efforts is welcomed and appreciated.

E. Vance Randall is a professor of educational leadership and foundations at Brigham Young University. Chris Wilson is a PhD candidate at Loyola University. This essay was presented at "Education, the Church, and Globalization," the International Society's twelfth annual conference, August 2001, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.