

# THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Volume 37

APRIL 1967

Number 2

## THE CARNEGIE LIBRARY SCHOOL OF ATLANTA (1905-25)

BETTY E. CALLAHAM<sup>1</sup>

THE Carnegie Library School of Atlanta grew from the needs of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta for trained librarians. The apprentice program established by the library to meet those needs soon found itself supplying librarians for other southern libraries. Miss Anne Wallace, the librarian who was so instrumental in establishing the Carnegie Library, was equally effective in promoting and giving early direction to the library school. Consequently, a history of the library school must begin with some consideration of the state of public libraries in the South before 1900 and with the career of Anne Wallace.

Although sizable book collections existed in many southern cities, there was no free public library service anywhere in the southeastern states before 1895.<sup>2</sup> There are many reasons to explain this lag behind the rest of the nation, but

the reporting of the fact alone suffices for this discussion. Like the rest of the South, the city of Atlanta, Georgia, lacked public library service until the turn of the century. At the close of the Civil War there were neither libraries nor booksellers in Atlanta, but peace had hardly been restored before a group of local men set about rectifying the situation. On December 28, 1866, a letter published in the *Atlanta Daily New Era* proposed that a reading room be established for the young men of Atlanta. Credit for the idea is generally attributed to Darwin G. Jones, who was at that time a local bank teller and later a trustee of the Carnegie Library. The suggestion bore fruit, for on July 30, 1867, a meeting of twelve young men voted to form a library association.<sup>3</sup> Shortly afterward, a constitution was adopted which stated that the purpose of the organization was "facilitation of mutual intercourse, extension of information, the promotion of a spirit of useful inquiry and the qualification of its

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from a Master's paper prepared for Librarianship 397, Division of Librarianship, Emory University, June, 1961.

<sup>2</sup> Mary Edna Anders, "The Development of Public Library Service in the Southeastern States, 1895-1950" (microfilmed D.L.S. dissertation, School of Library Service, Columbia University, 1958), pp. 2-43; and Anne Wallace, "The Southern Library Movement," *ALA Bulletin* (July, 1907), 1:62-63.

<sup>3</sup> Alma H. Jamison, "Development of the Library in Atlanta," *Atlanta Historical Bulletin* (April, 1939), 4:98-99; and James R. Nutting, "The Carnegie Library of Atlanta, Its Early History and Present Proud Position," *City Builder* (November, 1924), 8:7.

members for proper discharge of their duties and the furtherance of every means of mutual improvement."<sup>4</sup>

The new organization was the Young Men's Library Association of Atlanta, usually referred to as the YMLA. Soon membership "came to be considered the hallmark of a young man's prominence and standing in the community."<sup>5</sup> Forty-seven members signed the original constitution, but by 1868 their number had increased to 150 and by 1869 to 250. In 1873, membership was opened to young women, and growth continued to be rapid.<sup>6</sup> Although each member paid semiannual dues of two dollars and gifts were frequently received, YMLA supplemented this meager income by sponsoring fairs, bazaars, lectures, spelling bees, dramatic performances, excursions, and other forms of entertainment.<sup>7</sup> All of the proceeds went to finance the association's library. Yet the book fund was inadequate, and the collection remained small.

From the beginning, the YMLA employed a librarian to supervise the reading room and administer the book collection. The first six librarians were men, several of whom were disabled Confederate veterans. One held the position for seven years, but each of the others served for only a year or two. In 1882, the YMLA members decided to engage a woman for librarian.<sup>8</sup> Little is to be said about the first female incumbent, but the second woman to be employed was Miss Fanny Wallace, the daughter of a pioneer Atlantan. When

she resigned to be married in 1892, her younger sister, Anne Wallace, was recommended as her successor. It was argued that she was too young for the position; but, perhaps for lack of a more suitable candidate, she was employed.<sup>9</sup> Thus, in a rather casual fashion, the YMLA secured the services of the woman who was to be the leader in the development of library service and library education in the South.

Although the YMLA was performing a valuable service, its resources were inadequate to meet the requirements of a growing city. Public attention was focused upon the South's library needs by the Cotton States and International Exposition held in Atlanta in 1895. During the exposition, a model library was on exhibit, and a Congress of Women Librarians was held on November 29 and 30 under the direction of Anne Wallace. Its report helped to awaken Atlantans to the potentialities of good library service.<sup>10</sup> Two years later, at Miss Wallace's invitation, a group of Georgia librarians met at the Young Men's Library and organized the Georgia Library Association "for the purpose of stimulating library growth in the State, encouraging cooperation among the libraries of the State, and promoting the modern library spirit."<sup>11</sup> In the same year, the state legislature established the Georgia Library Commission.

Stimulated by these events and spurred on by their indomitable librarian, the YMLA members reassessed

<sup>4</sup> Jamison, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

<sup>5</sup> Nutting, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Franklin M. Garrett, *Atlanta and Environs, a Chronicle of Its People and Events* (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1954), 1:760.

<sup>7</sup> Nutting, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Jamison, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

<sup>9</sup> "Librarian's Report," *Minutes of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta*, Vol. 1 (June 4, 1901). Cited hereafter as *Trustees' Minutes*.

<sup>10</sup> Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64; Anders, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-46.

<sup>11</sup> Carnegie Library of Atlanta, *Bulletin* (November, 1902), 1:8. Title varies; cited hereafter as C.L.A., *Bulletin*.

their position. "Without endowment and without municipal aid, the association was crippled in its endeavors. . . . Realizing that the day of the subscription library was over, the directors tried to devise some plan to make the library free to the citizens of Atlanta."<sup>12</sup>

Eugene Mitchell, the president of YMLA in 1898-99, had read of Andrew Carnegie's gifts of libraries to other cities and conceived the idea of securing such a grant for Atlanta. Andrew Carnegie's southern representative was Walter M. Kelly, an Atlanta resident. Kelly was invited to become a member and then a director of YMLA. After a short interval, the other directors prevailed upon him to present Atlanta's case to Carnegie.<sup>13</sup>

Through the efforts of Kelly, Carnegie was persuaded to grant \$100,000 to the city of Atlanta for a new library building, on the condition that YMLA furnish a site for the building and merge its resources with those of the new library. The city of Atlanta was expected to provide an annual income of \$5,000. Mitchell, Kelly, F. J. Paxson, and James R. Nutting undertook to see that the conditions were met. The offer was made public on February 8, 1899; on March 2, the city council accepted the terms. A conservative group within YMLA opposed the merger, so its supporters inducted thirty-six new members pledged to support consolidation. A favorable vote was obtained, and on May 6, 1899, the Carnegie Library of Atlanta was officially organized.<sup>14</sup>

Before the Carnegie Library could be opened to the public, a site had to be

purchased, architectural designs approved, and contracts for construction granted. Disputes with the contractors and labor problems delayed construction. Funds were exhausted before the building was completed, and twice the trustees dispatched Anne Wallace to New York to solicit additional aid from Andrew Carnegie. Two more grants, totaling \$45,000, were received. But in three years the new building was ready for use. The basement was occupied after March 4, 1902, and the completed building was opened to the public on May 29.<sup>15</sup> This was a milestone in southern library history. Atlanta was the first city of the South to provide a free municipally supported library. Its success soon encouraged other cities to follow its example and thus contributed to the spread of library service throughout the South.

After this step toward the improvement of library facilities, Atlanta and the South would soon feel the need for trained librarians, leading to recognition of the need for a program of library education. In the next phase of development, Anne Wallace was to emerge as pioneer and leader. She had already played an important part in the creation of the Georgia Library Association and Georgia Library Commission and in the establishment of the Carnegie Library. Now she turned her attention to training librarians.

Anne Wallace was both persuasive and dedicated to libraries. In 1899, when the American Library Association met in Atlanta, John Temple Graves introduced her to the assembled librarians as "the girl in the pink shirt-waist, Atlanta's Henry Grady in petticoats, the leader and guardian of the li-

<sup>12</sup> Carnegie Library of Atlanta, *First Annual Report, 1899*, p. 9. Cited hereafter as C.L.A., *First Annual Report*.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>15</sup> Nutting, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

brary."<sup>16</sup> Her feminine charm and her stubborn determination to achieve her goals were put to the service of the library cause. The pink shirtwaist was apparently her hallmark, for it is a part of library school legend. Contemporaries attributed Miss Wallace's success in enticing funds from Andrew Carnegie to the shirtwaist, pink cheeks, and Scottish name.<sup>17</sup> Whatever the reasons, she succeeded in establishing the Carnegie Library School upon a sound basis, and through the medium of the school her influence extended over the South.

Anne Wallace served as librarian of the Carnegie Library and director of the Library School until 1908 when she resigned to be married. That event did not end her services to the library profession, however. In 1922, after the death of her husband, Miss Wallace (or Mrs. Howland) became the librarian of the Drexel Institute in Philadelphia. There she re-established and reorganized the Drexel Institute Library School which had been discontinued several years earlier. She continued as dean of the school until her retirement in 1937. The University of Georgia recognized her services to the South by conferring upon her an honorary degree, Doctor of Library Science, in 1929.<sup>18</sup> Her successors also acknowledged and paid tribute to her successful leadership.

#### THE BEGINNING

The librarian and trustees of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta encountered a shortage of librarians even before the new institution opened. As soon as the

Carnegie grant was received, plans were made to enlarge the staff. A graduate of the Pratt Institute School of Library Science in Brooklyn was employed as cataloger, but the small salaries the library offered could not attract other trained librarians from distant sections of the country.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, Miss Wallace determined to recruit and train her own staff of local residents, and the library trustees approved the establishment of an apprenticeship class.<sup>20</sup> The class was to be organized according to the plan developed at the Dayton (Ohio) Public Library, which, in turn, was modeled on a program established at the Los Angeles Public Library.<sup>21</sup>

According to the plan adopted in 1899, applicants for library positions were required to take a competitive examination. Successful candidates served a six-month apprenticeship without pay. Although the trustees stipulated that they were not obligated to employ the apprentices at the end of their training, it was understood that library vacancies would be filled from the apprentice class.<sup>22</sup> From the fourteen applicants who took the examination in 1899, four apprentices were selected to begin their training on October 7. Julie Toombs Rankin, the cataloger, was placed in charge of the group. The first apprentices spent five hours per day in the library, the time being divided equally between instruction and work in the library. Apparently most of their working time was devoted to preparing the

<sup>19</sup> C.L.A., *Fourth Annual Report, 1902*, p. 15; *Fifth Annual Report, 1903*, p. 11.

<sup>20</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 1 (September 15, 1899).

<sup>21</sup> Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 66; Tommie Dora Barker, "The Atlanta Library School," *Library Journal* (December 15, 1921), 46:1025.

<sup>22</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 1 (September 15, 1899).

<sup>16</sup> "Conference of Librarians, Atlanta, Ga., May 9-13, 1899," *Library Journal* (July, 1899), 24:119.

<sup>17</sup> Jamison, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

<sup>18</sup> C. C. Williamson and Alice L. Jewett (eds.), *Who's Who in Library Service* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1933), pp. 225-26.

YMLA collection for transfer to the Carnegie Library, for the librarian reported that in less than five months they marked, classified, cataloged, and shelf-listed 2,700 volumes.<sup>23</sup>

When the first class of apprentices completed the six months of training, all four were employed by the library. The project was considered successful, and the apprenticeship program continued. Four was set as the maximum number of apprentices to be accepted at one time, but in most years there were only two. By 1901 the apprentices were spending seven hours per day in the library, giving one hour of service for each hour of instruction. They received systematic training in each department of the library, always working under the close supervision of Miss Wallace or Miss Rankin. When their apprenticeship ended they were employed by the library on an hourly basis. Only after a year's satisfactory service were they accepted as regular members of the staff.<sup>24</sup> Before being given full-time employment as an assistant, each apprentice was required to sign a pledge promising to remain in the Carnegie Library for at least six months.<sup>25</sup>

The Carnegie Library appeared to have solved its staff problems by means of the apprenticeship program, but neighboring libraries soon began requesting help.<sup>26</sup> By the end of 1904, four of the first nine apprentices had accepted positions elsewhere,<sup>27</sup> and requests continued to come in. In 1907,

Anne Wallace gave the following spirited description of events to the Asheville Conference of the American Library Association:

By the time the Carnegie Library was finished a competent staff was trained. But here our troubles began. No sooner had we a model workshop, than our neighboring cities began to call on us for trained assistants. Other Carnegie libraries were in process of erection, institutional and private libraries were being reorganized and a steady demand for better library service was created. Early in this demand were the libraries of Montgomery, Charlotte and Chattanooga. Their librarians came to study methods and each returned with one of our assistants tucked under her arm. Assistants were lent to the libraries of the Georgia school of technology, Agnes Scott college, and to the University of Georgia; to the public libraries of Dublin, Newnan, and Albany, Georgia; to Ensley, Selma, and Gadsden, Alabama. Assistance was claimed by the State libraries of Mississippi and Georgia, and by the projectors of newly planned buildings not yet erected. It is impossible to see how we did it so as not to cripple our own library, but finally the demand reached even the limit of inter-municipal courtesy, and Mr. Carnegie was appealed to.<sup>28</sup>

To Anne Wallace, the mounting requests for trained librarians were adequate proof of the need for a library training school in the South. She believed that the established libraries should accept the responsibility for leadership in southern library development as long as state aid was lacking and state library commissions were ineffective.<sup>29</sup> An apprenticeship program being inadequate to meet the need, the only solution was a library school. This was not a recent conviction on Miss Wallace's part. In October, 1899, she had informed the Georgia Library Association that "The most pressing need in Georgia—in the South—today is a li-

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, November 7, 1899.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, September 20, 1901.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, November 5, 1901.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, October 2, 1900, and January 1, 1901.

<sup>27</sup> C.L.A., *Sixth Annual Report, 1904*, p. 12.

<sup>28</sup> Wallace, *loc. cit.*

<sup>29</sup> C.L.A., *Sixth Annual Report, 1904*, p. 22.

brary training school."<sup>30</sup> Five years later she presented the same argument to the Carnegie Library Trustees: "We know of nothing that would advance library interests in the South as much as a good training school for Southern librarians. Each graduate would become a library organizer and carry enthusiasm to sections entirely without library facilities at present."<sup>31</sup>

The trustees approved her ideas, and she turned to the more difficult problem of finding financial support for a library school. In April, 1905, she traveled to New York to seek aid from Andrew Carnegie. Armed with evidence of the need for librarians, she argued for the creation of a library school to sustain the libraries created through his benevolence. Miss Wallace had already won Carnegie's liking and respect,<sup>32</sup> and her appeal was effective. On April 6, she received the following letter:

MY DEAR MISS WALLACE,

I enjoyed my interview this morning. Having great faith in you and knowing the work of benefitting the South is in your heart as a true Southern woman, it will give me pleasure to contribute say Four Thousand Dollars per year for three years to experiment with your idea of a technical school for librarians in connection with the Public Library of Atlanta. Its cooperation I think, will be a highly creditable extension of its field.

Always very truly yours,

[Signed] ANDREW CARNEGIE<sup>33</sup>

After this official consent and financial backing were won, the next step was to plan the organization of the library school. Little guidance was to be

<sup>30</sup> "Georgia Library Association," *Library Journal* (November, 1899), 24:630.

<sup>31</sup> C.L.A., *Sixth Annual Report, 1904*, p. 22.

<sup>32</sup> Interview with Tommie Dora Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>33</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 2 (April 13, 1905).

had. The American Library Association was even then discussing the formulation of standards for library training, but no concrete results had yet emerged. The most promising source of aid appeared to be the library schools already in existence. Anne Wallace turned to the Pratt Institute School of Library Science for help. She was in close contact with Mary W. Plummer, the Pratt director; and the association was encouraged by Julia Rankin, who was a Pratt graduate.<sup>34</sup> The Pratt school was the second library school in the country, having been established as a training class in 1890 and reorganized as a school in 1895. Under the direction of Miss Plummer it had emerged as one of the chief agencies for the training of public librarians.<sup>35</sup> The new library school was modeled upon the program developed at Pratt.<sup>36</sup>

The school opened on September 20, 1905, under the name of Southern Library School, with Anne Wallace as director. Quarters for the school had been prepared in the Carnegie Library, including a large classroom and a lunchroom.<sup>37</sup> Members of the library staff, usually the department heads, were to serve as the faculty. For the first year, the faculty consisted of Miss Wallace, Miss Rankin, and three other instructors who were graduates of the apprenticeship program. The regular faculty was to be supplemented by visiting lecturers to give instruction in the areas

<sup>34</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>35</sup> Josephine A. Rathbone, "The Pratt Institute School of Library Science," *Library Journal* (1921), 46:935-36.

<sup>36</sup> Southern Library School, *Circular of Information, 1906-1907* (Atlanta, Ga.: Carnegie Library, 1906), p. 9. Title and name of issuing agency vary. Cited hereafter as *Circular of Information*.

<sup>37</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 2 (June 6, 1905).

of their special competence.<sup>38</sup> The school's close relationship with the Carnegie Library, which continued for many years, was a source of both strength and weakness. It gave the students the advantage of observation and experience in an actual library situation, but it tended to limit their training to the techniques and methods employed by the parent library.

Students were admitted to the school by examination, and ten were accepted for the first class. The school year was to consist of three terms of three months each. The first term began with two weeks of practical work in the library to familiarize the students with techniques and terminology. Thereafter, the program was a combination of classroom instruction and practical work.<sup>39</sup> According to the first announcement of the school: "The course at first will be strictly elementary. Effort will be made to extend the course each year. Especial attention will be given to organization work and preparing the students to organize new libraries and to create a sentiment in their favor in localities not enjoying library privileges."<sup>40</sup> The announcement promised "to return each student a library enthusiast, well equipped to carry on library propaganda."<sup>41</sup>

Ten "library enthusiasts" completed the course the first year and were granted certificates for their work. The second session began with twelve stu-

dents and one additional instructor.<sup>42</sup> With the school's work well under way it was time to insure its permanent status. In April, 1907, the trustees and librarian of the Carnegie Library petitioned the Superior Court of Fulton County, Georgia, for the incorporation of the library school. The petition, which was granted on April 9, stated that the object of the school was "to teach the art of conducting libraries and to disseminate knowledge concerning the proper conduct of a public library, and to train persons for the practical operating and conduct of a public library. . . ."<sup>43</sup>

In the process of incorporation, the name Southern Library School was discontinued, and the school was officially named the Carnegie Library Training School of Atlanta. The word "Training" was soon dropped, and the school was usually called the Carnegie Library School. Outsiders sometimes used the name Atlanta Library School, perhaps because of the existence of another Carnegie Library School in Pittsburgh.<sup>44</sup> In the present account, the name Carnegie Library School is used because that was the most common usage locally.

According to bylaws adopted at the time of incorporation, the Carnegie Library School was to have its own Board of Trustees of twelve members. Membership of the school's board was virtually the same as the board of the Carnegie Library. Consequently, on January 20, 1908, the former voted itself out of existence, and the Library School was placed in the charge of the

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* This information, as in many other cases, is verifiable in the C.L.A. *Annual Report* and the *Circular of Information* as well as in the *Trustees' Minutes*. Such different sources are cited in the Master's paper from which this article has been adapted, but in this publication only the source closest to the event is cited.

<sup>39</sup> C.L.A., *Seventh Annual Report, 1905*, p. 17.

<sup>40</sup> *Circular of Information, 1905-1906*, p. 4.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> C.L.A., *Eighth Annual Report, 1906*, p. 13.

<sup>43</sup> "Petition for Incorporation," *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 3 (April 12, 1907).

<sup>44</sup> The variations in name are revealed by the official records and correspondence of the school over a period of years.

trustees of the Carnegie Library.<sup>45</sup> On February 8, the library's bylaws were amended to provide for the administration of the school. Management of the library school was vested in the Administration Committee of the Board of Trustees, and the school's funds were placed in the hands of the board's treasurer. The director of the library school (who was also librarian of the Carnegie Library) was responsible to the Administration Committee.<sup>46</sup> Most of these provisions merely formalized existing practices.

When Andrew Carnegie agreed in 1905 to subsidize the library school, his grant was made provisionally for three years. The school's survival depended upon securing a permanent grant. In December, 1907, Miss Wallace visited Carnegie again to plead for the school's support. She marshaled her arguments in a five-page letter sent prior to her interview, pointing out that the school had opened a new field of employment to southern women and had improved library service throughout the South. She asked that he consider five points before making a decision:

*First:* The constant and growing demand for trained library assistants in the Southeast . . .

*Second:* That it is impossible to supply this demand from the training schools of the East owing to our geographical isolation . . .

*Third:* The ample quarters supplied to the school by the Carnegie Library of Atlanta, with its ideal equipment . . .

*Fourth:* A corps of trained instructors . . .

*Fifth:* The reputation of the school from the first has been sound technically and so recognized by library authorities North, East and West.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>45</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 3 (January 20, 1908).

<sup>46</sup> "By-Laws of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta," C.L.A., *Bulletin* (February, 1908), 5:3-4.

<sup>47</sup> Anne Wallace to Andrew Carnegie, December 3, 1907, in *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 3 (December 10, 1907).

To continue the Carnegie Library School, Miss Wallace concluded, would make it possible in a few years "to raise the standard of library service in the South to a high degree of efficiency, thus doubling the educational capacity of the Carnegie investment in the South."<sup>48</sup>

Carnegie assented to the request. On December 7, 1907, he agreed to support the library school permanently and to increase his grant to \$4,500 annually.<sup>49</sup> By this action, the future of the Carnegie Library School was assured. Shortly afterward, Anne Wallace resigned her positions as librarian and director in order to be married.<sup>50</sup> Together the two events symbolized the end of the library school's probationary period. The initial test had been passed successfully. The establishment of the Carnegie Library School marked the beginning of a new era in southern library history, and its graduates were already aiding in the organization of new libraries throughout the area.

#### ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, AND STUDENTS

The success or failure of any venture depends to a large degree upon the individuals who share in the undertaking. The support of the library trustees and the financial backing of Andrew Carnegie were of great importance; but the actual accomplishments of the Carnegie Library School were the work of the women who translated plans into action. For that reason, attention is directed next to the administrators and instructors of the school. Likewise, the students and alumnae of a school contrib-

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> R. A. Franks to Anne Wallace, December 16, 1907, in *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 3 (December 20, 1907).

<sup>50</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 3 (January 20, 1908).



ute to the reputation and achievements of the institution; due consideration is given to these groups also.

The work of Anne Wallace, founder and first director of the Carnegie Library School, has already been noted. Her executive ability and indefatigable labor were largely responsible for the establishment and initial success of the library school. When she resigned in 1908, she recommended Julia Toombs Rankin as her successor.<sup>51</sup> Employed as the cataloger of the new Carnegie Library in 1899, Miss Rankin became assistant librarian soon afterward. It was to her that the task of training the apprentice classes was entrusted.<sup>52</sup> When the library school opened in 1905, she became the head instructor and shared the responsibility for the organization of the course of study. As director of the Carnegie Library School, she consolidated and continued the work of Anne Wallace.<sup>53</sup>

After three years as librarian and director, Julia Rankin resigned in 1911 to be married. She was succeeded as librarian by Katharine H. Wootten. Although Miss Wootten had been a member of the first apprentice class and had served as secretary to Miss Wallace and Miss Rankin for twelve years,<sup>54</sup> she had not been closely associated with the work of the library school. Therefore, she requested that she not be required to undertake the active direction of the school. With the growth of the Carnegie Library, the combined administration of the library and school had become an increasingly burdensome

task. Consequently the trustees agreed to a division of responsibility, and Mrs. Percival Sneed was made principal of the school. Miss Wootten became director ex officio.<sup>55</sup>

Delia Foreacre Sneed was one of the dominant figures in the early years of the Carnegie Library School. While plans for the school were developing, Anne Wallace realized that not enough trained instructors were available and asked a recently widowed friend to take the necessary training. As a result, Mrs. Sneed enrolled at the Pratt Library School for a two-year course, returning in 1906 to aid in the development of the school in Atlanta. For most of the next decade she was the only full-time instructor in the school, since she was not a member of the library staff. She helped to formulate the curriculum and was largely responsible for the nature and content of the individual courses. She had primary responsibility for the school's direction under Miss Rankin; and, with the advent of Miss Wootten, she was charged with the entire task of administration. Mrs. Sneed has been described by a fellow worker as "a person of forceful personality and brilliant intellect who gave a unique flavor to anything with which she was associated."<sup>56</sup>

In addition to her duties at the library school, Mrs. Sneed acted as secretary of the moneyless State Library Commission. In this position she was influential in obtaining a number of library grants for Georgia cities from the Carnegie Corporation.<sup>57</sup> When Miss Wootten resigned as librarian in Oc-

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> C.L.A., *Thirteenth Annual Report, 1911*, p. 18.

<sup>53</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>54</sup> C.L.A., *First Annual Report, 1899*, p. 4; C.L.A., *Thirteenth Annual Report, 1911*, p. 19.

<sup>55</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 3 (September 9, 1911); and interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>56</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

tober, 1914, Mrs. Sneed was already planning her own resignation because of impending matrimony. Nevertheless, she consented to assume the dual role of librarian and director until a permanent appointment could be made. It was agreed that she might leave as soon as a transition could be effected without damage to the library or the school.<sup>58</sup> In April, 1915, Miss Tommie Dora Barker was appointed assistant librarian. On July 19, she was made librarian and director, and Mrs. Sneed's resignation was accepted.<sup>59</sup>

Tommie Dora Barker was student, instructor, and director of the Carnegie Library School. She came to the school first as a student in the class of 1909. She returned as reference librarian and instructor in 1911. The 1915 appointment was followed by fifteen years of service as librarian of the Carnegie Library and director of the library school. In 1930, as recognition of her achievements, she became the first woman to be granted an honorary doctorate by Emory University. In the same year, Miss Barker resigned to become the regional field agent for the American Library Association. During the next few years she worked to promote library growth throughout the South. An outgrowth of her work was *Libraries of the South*, a volume which reported the development of southern library resources in the 1930's and previewed future trends. In 1936, Miss Barker again became director of the library school (by then a part of Emory University). Upon her retirement in 1954, she was made director emerita.<sup>60</sup>

Miss Barker's part in the develop-

ment of the Carnegie Library School will be treated more fully in a later chapter. It is sufficient to note here that it was under her direction that the school joined the Association of American Library Schools, affiliated with Emory University, developed a program of graduate instruction, and was accredited by the ALA Board of Education for Librarianship.<sup>61</sup> In the words of one library school graduate, "the whole library world throughout the Southeast and beyond has felt her shaping hand in a broad and effective library renaissance."<sup>62</sup>

At the time of Miss Barker's succession as librarian and director, the duties of the two positions were combined once again. For a brief period (1916-18) there was a vice-director to aid in administering the school, but it was not until 1921 that a more equitable distribution of responsibility was arranged. At that time, the director recommended to the trustees that the positions of assistant librarian and chief instructor be separated. In accordance with her recommendation, Miss Susie Lee Crumley, who had previously filled both posts, was made principal of the school.<sup>63</sup> Miss Crumley, a graduate of 1912, gave her full time to the school thereafter, and Miss Barker called her "the real head of the School," giving her much of the credit for the advances made in the 1920's.<sup>64</sup> Miss Crumley also

<sup>58</sup> Dorothy E. Cole (ed.), *Who's Who in Library Service* (3d ed.; New York: Grolier Society, 1955), p. 23.

<sup>59</sup> Henry Morton Bullock, *A History of Emory University* (Nashville, Tenn.: Parthenon Press, 1936), pp. 35-55.

<sup>60</sup> *Library Journal* (February 1, 1931), 56:134.

<sup>61</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 5 (May 10, 1921).

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 5 (May 10, 1921); and Vol. 6 (July 30, 1925).

<sup>58</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 4 (October 23, 1914; July 19, 1915).

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, April 13, 1915; July 19, 1915.

continued Mrs. Sneed's work with the Georgia Library Commission and served as president of the Association of American Library Schools in 1924-25. She resigned to be married shortly after the affiliation with Emory University was arranged in 1925.<sup>65</sup>

The Carnegie Library School was fortunate in the women who directed its growth, but most of the administrators labored under a sizable handicap. Their time and energies had to be divided between the Carnegie Library and the library school. The situation improved during the periods when Mrs. Sneed and Miss Crumley acted as principal, but no director was ever entirely free of the dual burden. When the Board of Education for Librarianship sent a committee to examine the school in 1924, the report stressed that it was "advisable that the executive officer of a library school should give her full time to the school."<sup>66</sup>

Next to the directors and principals, the instructors exerted the greatest influence over the growth and development of the school. The faculty was never large. The school opened in 1905 with five instructors; in 1925 there were ten.<sup>67</sup> In each case, the number includes the director and a majority of part-time instructors. Apparently only Mrs. Sneed (1906-15) and Miss Crumley (1921-25) gave their full time to the school for a lengthy period, and much of their work was administrative in nature. Throughout the period under

consideration, most of the faculty was drawn from the staff of the Carnegie Library. An examination of the *Circulars of Information* reveals thirty-four names listed as directors, instructors, or secretaries of the school between 1905 and 1925. Of this number, twenty-four were employees of the Carnegie Library. Of the remaining ten, eight were visiting lecturers who came to the school to give a brief course.<sup>68</sup> Another count of the staff reveals that of the thirty-four persons mentioned, twenty were graduates of the Carnegie Library School. Among the other fourteen were three directors and six visiting lecturers.<sup>69</sup>

The composition of the faculty brought criticism when the school sought recognition from various professional bodies. Usually the critics focused upon three points: the academic training, the professional training, or the size of the faculty. When the school sought to become a charter member of the Association of American Library Schools (AALS) in 1915, membership was at first denied because of "the character and training of [the] faculty and the amount of time given by it to the school."<sup>70</sup> The AALS reported that (at the time) no instructor had had college training and that all of the faculty were graduates of the school. It charged that "No other library school has a faculty which represents so little training or experience outside its own locality."<sup>71</sup> The AALS also criticized the size of the faculty

<sup>65</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>66</sup> American Library Association, Board of Education for Librarianship, "Report on Library Schools, Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta," 1925 (in the files of the Division of Librarianship, Emory University). Cited hereafter as B.E.L., "Report on Library Schools."

<sup>67</sup> *Circular of Information, 1905-1906*, p. 2; and *1924-1925*, pp. 4-5.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 1905-1906 through 1924-1925.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> James I. Wyer, Jr., to Tommie Dora Barker, December 20, 1915 (in the Division files).

<sup>71</sup> "Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta" (tabulation of data by AALS committee, 1915) (in the Division files).

as not equivalent to the two full-time instructors required for membership.<sup>72</sup>

Similar views were expressed by the Carnegie Corporation in 1920 and by the Board of Education for Librarianship in 1924. An observer from the Carnegie Corporation criticized the school for "inbreeding" and questioned whether the faculty was qualified to give more than "a brief technical training to a few routine or clerical workers."<sup>73</sup> The report of the Board of Education for Librarianship stressed that the instructional staff was small and more full-time instructors were needed. It noted that "dependence on the local library for teaching staff operates against coordination in the presentation of subjects." The report conceded, however, that "The instructors endeavor to vitalize their teaching and to mingle practical application with theory."<sup>74</sup>

The continuing criticisms were indicative of a real problem. Yet, in fairness to the library school, several extenuating factors should be noted. First, this was a period of development and of struggle for the attainment of higher standards for all library schools. The conditions that prevailed in the Carnegie Library School existed to some degree in even the older schools.<sup>75</sup> In addition, the school's problems were attributable in considerable measure to lack of adequate financial support. The Carnegie grant was never adequate to cover a full salary budget, and the school survived only because a large part of the

staff's salaries was paid by the library. Even so the salaries remained low. Again and again Miss Barker urged the trustees to increase the budget allotment to make it possible for her to get and hold staff members, but the need was never satisfactorily met during this period.<sup>76</sup>

Library school directors made a conscious effort to supplement the work of the faculty by bringing competent professional people to the school as visiting lecturers. Although some of the lecturers were chosen for reasons of availability or personal acquaintance, most were well qualified to give instruction in their field.<sup>77</sup> A few of these persons were accorded faculty status; most came by special invitation. Among those who came regularly over a period of years were Miss Mary W. Plummer, director of the Pratt Institute Library School; Miss Lutie E. Stearns of the Wisconsin Library Commission; Miss Alice Tyler of the Iowa Library Commission; Miss Gertrude Stiles of the Cleveland Public Library; Mr. Arthur E. Bostwick of the St. Louis Public Library; Miss Edna Lynam of Oak Park, Illinois; Mr. Henry E. Legler of the Chicago Public Library; and Miss Charlotte Templeton of the Nebraska Public Library Commission.<sup>78</sup> Notable names that appeared occasionally in the list of lecturers were Miss Josephine Rathbone, Mr. George B. Utley, Mr. Adam Strohm, Dr. Azariah Root, Miss Sarah Bogle, Miss Mary E. Ahern, Dr. C. C. Williamson, Dr. R. R. Bowker, Mr. James I. Wyer, and Dr. Louis R.

<sup>72</sup> Florence R. Curtis to Tommie Dora Barker, December 9, 1915 (in the Division files).

<sup>73</sup> "Memorandum" inclosed in letter from James Bertram to Tommie Dora Barker, October 27, 1918 (in the Division files).

<sup>74</sup> B.E.L., "Report on Library Schools."

<sup>75</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>76</sup> C.L.A., *Annual Report, 1919*, pp. 3-4; *1920*, pp. 3-4; *1921*, pp. 2-4; *1925*, p. 2.

<sup>77</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>78</sup> *Circular of Information, 1905-1906* through *1924-1925*.

Wilson.<sup>79</sup> These visiting lecturers helped to fill gaps in the school's curriculum and brought the students into contact with the leaders of their profession.

From 1905 through 1925, 205 persons were granted certificates by the school.<sup>80</sup> A number of students who enrolled did not graduate, and there were a few special students. No figures are available for these groups. All of the graduates were women, no male students having enrolled during this time. The requirement for admission was a high school education or its equivalent. Twenty was the minimum age for admission. An entrance examination was required, but in later years college graduates were excused from this requirement. The examination, given each June, included history, literature, science, art, current events, and a modern language (French being preferred). Students were selected from applicants presenting college degrees or making high percentages on the examination, provided their training, experience, and personality seemed to fit them for library work.<sup>81</sup>

Of the 205 graduates, one offered a graduate degree and thirty-four presented baccalaureate degrees for admission. Among the others were nineteen junior college graduates and fifteen alumnae of "professional" schools (apparently normal schools). The remaining students were graduates of public high schools or of private schools.<sup>82</sup> Initially, the enrolment was limited to twelve students; but, begin-

ning with the session of 1922/23, the number was raised to twenty. No tuition was charged until 1923, when a nominal fee of fifty dollars was set.<sup>83</sup> Perhaps because of these circumstances and also because the school offered a new vocational opportunity to southern women, there was seldom any difficulty in securing an adequate enrolment. Only during the war years of 1917-19 did the number of students decrease noticeably.<sup>84</sup>

Only a few comments about the students are available from outside observers. An AALS committee noted in 1923 that the individuals admitted to the school were "somewhat less mature than might well be sought."<sup>85</sup> On the other hand, a 1924 report of the Board of Education for Librarianship commented, "The student body included capable and mature members and appeared alert and interested in the School and in library service."<sup>86</sup> It seems fair to conclude that the educational background of the students was fairly creditable when weighed against the general level of education in the South at the time. If compared with the five library schools already requiring a baccalaureate degree as a prerequisite, the school's record naturally appeared unfavorable. But the Carnegie Library School compared surprisingly well with schools of a similar na-

<sup>79</sup> "Memorandum, Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta," January 28, 1925 (in the Division files).

<sup>80</sup> "Report Showing Operations, 1921-1922," p. 5.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, "1921-1922," p. 5; and "1918-1919," p. 5.

<sup>82</sup> "Re-examination by Executive Committee of Association of American Library Schools, 1922-1923. Library School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta" (in the Division files). Cited hereafter as AALS, "Re-examination . . . 1922-1923."

<sup>83</sup> B.E.L. "Report on Library Schools."

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> "Report Showing Operations of the Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, September 1924-September 1925," p. 3 (in the Division files). Cited hereafter as "Report Showing Operations."

<sup>81</sup> *Circular of Information, 1905-1906*, p. 5; and *1920-1921*, pp. 5-7.

ture in other sections of the country.<sup>87</sup>

Whatever the criticisms of examining committees, the school's graduates were eagerly sought by the libraries of the South. The school acted as an informal placement bureau; and, from the time the first class graduated, demand always exceeded supply. Year

after year, fifty-one had married and retired, ten were in other work, seven were "at home," and two were deceased.<sup>89</sup>

The positions held by the graduates in 1925, summarized by type, are shown in Table 2. Both the geographical distribution and the position classification indicate that the graduates of the Carnegie Library School, like its administrators and faculty, helped to spread its influence and reputation throughout the region it served.

TABLE 1  
GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION  
OF GRADUATES, 1925\*

Alabama.....	7
Bermuda.....	1
D.C.....	6
Florida.....	2
France.....	1
Georgia.....	47
Illinois.....	1
Kentucky.....	1
Massachusetts.....	1
Michigan.....	4
Mississippi.....	2
New Jersey.....	1
New York.....	10
North Carolina.....	21
Ohio.....	2
Pennsylvania.....	1
South Carolina.....	13
Tennessee.....	4
Texas.....	2
Virginia.....	8

\*"Report Showing Operations, 1924-1925," p. 3 (in the Division files).

after year, pleas for librarians outnumbered the candidates. In 1924, by way of example, the school was able to fill only twenty-seven of ninety requests.<sup>88</sup> Most of the graduates were placed in libraries of the southern states, but representatives were found in many eastern states. In the fall of 1925, 135 graduates were engaged in library work. The geographical distribution is shown in Table 1. Of the seventy graduates not employed in libraries at that time,

<sup>87</sup> See Table V in B.E.L., [First] *Annual Report* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1925), p. 42.

<sup>88</sup> C.L.A., *Annual Report, 1909*, p. 19; *1912*, p. 19; *1914*, p. 18; *1917*, p. 23; *et al.*; and "Summary of Data," 1924 (in the Division files).

TABLE 2  
EMPLOYMENT OF GRADUATES BY  
TYPES OF LIBRARIES, 1925\*

Public libraries:	
Librarians.....	9
Assistant librarians.....	4
Heads of departments.....	9
Branch librarians.....	8
Assistants.....	31
College and normal school libraries:	
Librarians.....	15
Assistants.....	23
State library commissions:	
Secretaries.....	4
Assistants.....	4
Special libraries.....	8
Organization work.....	2
State libraries.....	4
High school libraries.....	4
Library school instructors.....	1
Government libraries.....	9

\*"Report Showing Operations, 1924-1925," p. 3 (in the Division files).

#### TRAINING LIBRARIANS

Throughout the history of the Carnegie Library School, the most basic and enduring problem related to the program of instruction. The need to broaden and enrich the curriculum and the desire to develop an accredited program of professional education underlay problems of finance, personnel, administration, and standards. Progress was slow, irregular, and difficult. The school opened with a rudimentary pro-

<sup>89</sup> "Report Showing Operations, 1924-1925," p. 3.

gram, the limitations of which were recognized. The first *Circular of Information* described the course as "strictly elementary," but promised that improvements would be made each year.<sup>90</sup> As late as 1912, Mrs. Sneed wrote, "The course is aimed entirely at the training of technical workers. . . . [It] is practical and bent to the end in view."<sup>91</sup>

A description given in the *Circular* for 1913-14 was applicable for at least the first fifteen years of the school's history:

The course of study in the Library School has been planned to prepare students as librarians for small libraries and as assistants for other libraries. Technical training is given in methods of library management, and especial attention is given to the course in administrative work, including the study of plans for small buildings and the details of organization of new libraries, in order to meet the demand which the increased activity of the library movement of the South frequently makes on the graduates of the school.<sup>92</sup>

The original program of instruction was modeled upon the practices of older schools. It consisted of classroom instruction, practical work, and field trips. The basic courses dealt with organization and administration, technical processes, book selection, reference work, and bibliography. All courses were required, and each student followed the same program. Courses were fragmented, and topics that might have been units within broader courses were often treated as separate subjects.<sup>93</sup> Such a practice made it difficult for the students to absorb and synthesize information presented to them. A great

<sup>90</sup> *Circular of Information, 1905-1906*, p. 4.

<sup>91</sup> "Memorandum," 1912 (?) (in the Division files).

<sup>92</sup> *Circular of Information, 1913-1914*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 1905-1906 through 1924-1925.

TABLE 3

## COURSE OF STUDY (1908-9)\*

	No. of Hours of Instruction
Administrative:	
Library buildings . . . . .	} 60
Library legislation . . . . .	
Library organization . . . . .	
Library reports and statistics . . . . .	
Library rules . . . . .	
Book selection . . . . .	
Book buying . . . . .	
ALA handbook . . . . .	
Work with children . . . . .	
Indexing . . . . .	5
Maps . . . . .	2
Editions . . . . .	3
Library rules, forms, etc. . . . .	1
Bibliographic:	
Bibliography, general . . . . .	} 63
Bibliography, trade . . . . .	
Reference work . . . . .	
Public documents . . . . .	17
Historical:	
History of libraries . . . . .	6
History of printing . . . . .	4
Literary:	
Development of the novel . . . . .	46
Current periodicals . . . . .	3
Current topics . . . . .	40
Study of children's books . . . . .	4
Technical French . . . . .	10
Technical German . . . . .	13
Technical:	
Classification, Decimal . . . . .	34
Classification, Expansive . . . . .	4
Cataloguing, Principles of . . . . .	73
Cataloguing, Dictionary . . . . .	68
Preparation of books for the shelves	9
Accessioning . . . . .	2
Alphabetizing . . . . .	7
Shelf-listing . . . . .	2
Book numbers . . . . .	5
Order work . . . . .	4
Note taking . . . . .	1
Library hand . . . . .	9
Circulating department routine . . . . .	9
Loan systems . . . . .	2
Binding and rebinding . . . . .	5
Statistics . . . . .	1
Discards . . . . .	2
Miscellaneous:	
Bulletin work . . . . .	3
Typewriting . . . . .	39
Practical work . . . . .	464

\* *Circular of Information, 1908-1909*, pp. 9-10.

deal of time was spent on technical and routine procedures, such as preparation of books for the shelves. The chief emphasis was placed upon administrative and technical processes, since it was expected that many graduates would go into recently organized libraries lacking other trained staff members.<sup>94</sup> Table 3 shows the early course of study, indicating the courses taught and the hours devoted to each.

Changes in the curriculum were slow to occur in spite of the stimulus of need

emphasis on cataloging and on historical and literary subjects. The latter were designed to acquaint the students with the history of libraries and books and to provide a broader foundation in literature.<sup>96</sup> After 1921 the stress on the organization of small libraries was lessened, since more graduates were going into larger, well-established libraries.<sup>97</sup> Another reorganization in 1923 redistributed the course hours. The most noticeable change was the reduction of cataloging from 111 to 73 hours.<sup>98</sup>

TABLE 4  
COURSE OF STUDY (1923-24)\*

Administrative . . . . .		44 hours
Library buildings . . . . .	6 hours	
Library organization . . . . .	25 hours	
Special types of libraries and of library work . . . . .	13 hours	
Bibliographic . . . . .		234 hours
Reference work, trade bibliography, and subject bibliography . . . . .	71 hours	
Public documents . . . . .	26 hours	
Book selection . . . . .	64 hours	
History of books and libraries . . . . .	17 hours	
Current events, periodicals, survey of the library field . . . . .	30 hours	
Children's work . . . . .	26 hours	
Technical . . . . .		218 hours
Classification, subject headings . . . . .	71 hours	
Cataloging . . . . .	73 hours	
Library economy . . . . .	47 hours	
Miscellaneous . . . . .	27 hours	
Special lectures and library visits . . . . .		21 hours
Practical work . . . . .		322 hours

\* *Circular of Information, 1924-1925*, pp. 9-10.

and criticism. The time given to each subject varied slightly from year to year. Gradually a tendency toward the consolidation of small units into more comprehensive courses appeared. From time to time a new course was inaugurated, usually when a new staff member came to the library or when another outside lecturer became available.<sup>95</sup> A reorganization affected in 1916 reduced the time devoted to administrative courses and increased the

Table 4 shows the course of study as it appeared at the end of the second decade. A comparison with the earlier outline reveals little change in content but a number of differences in organization and emphasis.

The weaknesses of the school's program of instruction were due less to subject content than to teaching methods and materials. The methods of instruction were traditional in nature.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 1916-1917, pp. 10-11.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 1921-1922, p. 8.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 1923-1924, p. 11.

<sup>94</sup> Barker, "The Atlanta Library School," *loc. cit.*

<sup>95</sup> *Circular of Information, 1908-1909*, pp. 9-10.



The sixty-minute class periods were devoted to lectures by the teacher and recitations by the students.<sup>99</sup> Theory was not entirely absent from the lectures, but the practical aspect was stressed. Much time was spent in slow dictation of information that the students laboriously copied verbatim into their notebooks. Problems were assigned in each subject, and students were expected to spend from one to two hours in preparation for each lecture period.<sup>100</sup> The dependence upon lectures and problems was partially due to the lack of textbooks and the inadequacy of supplementary materials. Textbooks in librarianship were almost unknown until AALS began working on the problem after 1915. A few ALA pamphlets were available along with the professional journals, *Public Libraries* and *Library Journal*. Other than these there was little to be assigned as professional reading.<sup>101</sup>

Closely related to this problem was the weakness of the library school's bibliographic and reference resources. The core of the collection was \$300 worth of bibliographical material purchased in 1905 with part of the first Carnegie grant.<sup>102</sup> Funds were scarce and growth slow thereafter. In preparation for the AALS re-examination in 1922-23, the school made a report on its collections. The categories and numbers of pieces were:

Bibliography—110 books, 133 pamphlets  
 Library economy—114 books, 201 pamphlets  
 Periodicals—160 bound volumes, 9 current pub-

<sup>99</sup> "Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta," 1916 (?) (in the Division files).

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*; and interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>101</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>102</sup> C.L.A., *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 2 (June, 6, 1905).

lications, plus access to 265 periodicals subscribed to by the Carnegie Library  
 Model collections—juvenile, 113 volumes; fiction, 407 volumes  
 Practice collections—classification, 150 volumes; cataloging, 390 volumes  
 Samples and forms—from 30 libraries and 3 supply houses  
 Miscellaneous (criticism, history of printing)—76 volumes  
 Publications of 14 library commissions, 113 public libraries, 16 special libraries, 6 college and university libraries.<sup>103</sup>

By present-day standards this collection seems quite small; and, even at the time, AALS recommended strengthening the holdings, especially in bibliography and library economy.<sup>104</sup> However, the school did not claim or intend to have a complete collection. From the beginning, the Carnegie Library was considered to be the laboratory of the school, which drew upon its resources freely.<sup>105</sup> At the time of the school's opening, the library had a collection of some 31,000 volumes; by 1926 it contained more than 125,000 volumes. The library was also a depository for government documents, which made it possible to teach a documents course.<sup>106</sup> Unquestionably the Carnegie Library provided the basic necessities for the use of the library school, but greater resources in specialized and professional materials were needed if the school's ambitions were to be realized. The 1924 report of the Board of Education for Librarianship summarized

<sup>103</sup> AALS, "Re-examination . . . 1922-1923," p. 10.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>105</sup> Tommie Dora Barker to James I. Wyer, Jr., December 24, 1915 (in the Division files).

<sup>106</sup> C.L.A., *Seventh Annual Report, 1905*, p. 19; C.L.A., *Twenty-eighth Annual Report, 1926*, p. 5.

conditions with a one-word comment, "Inadequate."<sup>107</sup>

The second important element in the Carnegie Library School's program of instruction was the practical work through which students were given experience in a real library situation. The practical work was essentially a survival from the era of apprenticeship training. It was assumed that the practice would help demonstrate what was taught in class and "would fix the details of the lecture in the mind of the student."<sup>108</sup> All library schools placed great emphasis upon practical work in their early years. At the Carnegie Library School, the time devoted to it varied from 464 hours in the early years to 322 hours in 1924-25.<sup>109</sup> An effort was made to provide experience in all departments. A typical schedule of work in 1920-21 was: Loan Department, 87 hours; Children's Room, 6 hours; Catalog Department, 72 hours; Reference Department, 16 hours; Reading Room, 2 hours; Mending Room, 8 hours; branch work, 34 hours; shelf work, 156 hours.<sup>110</sup> The distribution of time raises the question of whether students were assigned where they needed experience or where the library needed workers.

Initially, all practical work was done within the Carnegie Library. It was extended to the branch libraries as they were established. In later years, students were also assigned to the Georgia Library Commission and to the libraries of neighboring institutions, such as the Commercial High School and Emory University.<sup>111</sup> The work was super-

<sup>107</sup> B.E.L., "Report on Library Schools."

<sup>108</sup> *Circular of Information, 1924-1925*, p. 19.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13; and *1908-1909*, p. 10.

<sup>110</sup> Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, "Practice Work," 1920 (in the Division files).

vised by the department heads or branch librarians, regular reports were required, and the quality of work done was considered in grading students.<sup>112</sup> The assumption upon which practical work was based was a sound one. Practical experience was beneficial; but as Miss Barker pointed out, there was an "inordinate amount" of it at the Carnegie Library School.<sup>113</sup> Dr. C. C. Williamson, in his famous report of 1923, noted that practical work was generally unsatisfactory and of doubtful value. Writing of library schools in general, he reported that the reasons for practical work were not clearly expressed, there were no well-defined objectives, and programs were ineffectively implemented and inadequately supervised.<sup>114</sup> A shift in professional thinking soon led to a drastic reduction in practical work, but the reduction did not occur at the Carnegie Library School until after the affiliation with Emory University.

The library school's program of instruction included (in addition to classes and practical work) field trips, theses or problems, examinations, and the special lectures discussed in the preceding section. Each year a number of visits was made to nearby libraries, binderies, and printing firms. Students were also expected to attend meetings of the Georgia Library Association and other important professional meetings in the South, such as the Asheville Con-

<sup>111</sup> *Circular of Information, 1913-1914*, p. 8; *1921-1922*, p. 8; *1923-1924*, p. 8.

<sup>112</sup> AALS, "Re-examination . . . 1922-1923," p. 12.

<sup>113</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>114</sup> Charles C. Williamson, *Training for Library Service* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1923), pp. 60-67.

ference of ALA in 1907.<sup>115</sup> A requirement for graduation was the submission of a thesis on the organization and administration of a small public library. The thesis was not based on original research but was more in the nature of a summary of the course on administration.<sup>116</sup> Beginning in 1923, students were permitted to substitute for the thesis a community survey problem. This required a first-hand study of the library resources and needs of a Georgia community.<sup>117</sup> The work of the students was checked by periodic tests and by examinations at the close of each of the three terms that made up the school year. If work was unsatisfactory at any time, a student was immediately advised to withdraw. At the end of the session, certificates were awarded to the students who had completed the prescribed course satisfactorily and who had shown "ability and fitness for library work."<sup>118</sup>

One aspect of the Carnegie Library School's work remains to be considered. Not only did the school train its own students, it also carried on an active program of extension work and in-service training. In the early years it acted as a clearinghouse for library activities of many kinds. Miss Barker has described this work:

The work of this school has been peculiar in that it has engaged in many activities ordinarily outside the limits of a professional training agency owing to the special conditions that have existed in the South. When the school was first started few southern states had library

commissions, so that it became a bureau of information in regard to library matters for communities seeking help and advice in establishing libraries. It was called on to select architects, plan buildings, compile book lists, and, in fact, to perform all the functions of a library commission in addition to maintaining a ready supply of trained workers. With the establishment of library commissions in most of the southern states these more or less extraneous activities have become fewer from year to year and with the [re]organization of the Georgia Library Commission in 1920, the school was finally relieved of the demand for this form of service. However, it was an important contribution that the school made in these formative years by furnishing expert advice on library technique.<sup>119</sup>

The school also attempted to improve library service by offering courses to practicing librarians. Many librarians attended regular classes for limited periods of time as special students. After 1920, emphasis shifted to this activity, and more formal programs were developed. In April, 1921, an institute was held which was designed to aid the untrained librarian. Six well-known instructors were brought to Atlanta to teach a two-week course which included lectures on library administration, children's work, the binding and mending of books, and county libraries. The institute was open to anyone engaged in library work in the Southeast.<sup>120</sup> The success of the institute led the University of Georgia to inaugurate a six-week summer course in library methods in 1922. For a number of years the principal or other instructors from the Carnegie Library School conducted this course.<sup>121</sup> Later the school resumed its own institutes in Atlanta. Beginning in 1922, the school also co-operated with the Atlanta Normal School by giving a special course on school libraries. Lec-

<sup>115</sup> *Library Journal* (April, 1913), 38:231; (May, 1917), 62:395; (June, 1918), 63:440; *Circular of Information, 1905-1906*, p. 8.

<sup>116</sup> *Circular of Information, 1905-1906*, p. 8; 1916-1917, p. 9.

<sup>117</sup> *Public Libraries* (May, 1923), 28:256.

<sup>118</sup> *Circular of Information, 1905-1906*, p. 8; 1918-1919, p. 10.

<sup>119</sup> Barker, "The Atlanta Library School," *loc. cit.*

<sup>120</sup> "Report Showing Operations, 1920-1921," p. 4.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, "1921-1922," pp. 4-5.

tures were followed up by problems and practice work done by the normal school students under the supervision of library school students.<sup>122</sup> Although these activities have received less attention than the regular work of the school, they too contributed to the improvement of library service in the South.

#### PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS

Periodically from 1905 to 1925, the Carnegie Library School faced the necessity of demonstrating its effectiveness or even justifying its existence. Effectiveness had to be proved to professional bodies concerned with standards and accreditation, including the Association of American Library Schools and ALA agencies, such as the Committee on Library Training, the Temporary Library Training Board, and the Board of Education for Librarianship. Existence had to be justified to Andrew Carnegie and later to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, for the school's financial support depended upon their continued approval. The school's relations with these bodies revealed much about the problems it encountered and the progress it made during the first two decades of its existence.

There were neither accrediting agencies nor standards of evaluation for library schools at the time the Carnegie Library School was created, but both were in the process of evolution. The need for standards and accreditation was recognized by leaders of the library profession long before any effective action was taken. The American Library Association was the logical group to take the initiative, but it was slow to act. Finally, at the urging of men like

Dewey, ALA created a temporary committee on training for librarianship in 1889. In 1890, it became the Committee on Library Training, a standing committee of ALA.<sup>123</sup> For several years the committee produced no noticeable results other than rather obscure annual reports on the number of library schools in existence and the kind of training they offered. Then, in 1905, the committee presented an outline of tentative standards for library training to the ALA Portland Conference.<sup>124</sup> The standards dealt with entrance requirements, faculty, and instruction. The committee had been unable to reach agreement, and each section consisted of a number of alternative proposals.<sup>125</sup> The first effort having been unsuccessful, the committee continued its labors and produced a revised set of standards in 1906. The committee's report, which was presented to the Narragansett Pier Conference, constituted the first recognized code of standards for library training.<sup>126</sup>

Eleven schools were examined by the Committee on Library Training, and five were found to meet all of the standards of 1906.<sup>127</sup> The Southern (i.e., Carnegie) Library School was one of the five approved, but no record of the committee's report on the school has been found during this investigation. How-

<sup>122</sup> Mary W. Plummer, *Training for Librarianship*, rev. by Frank K. Walter (3d ed.; Chicago: American Library Association, 1923), p. 17.

<sup>124</sup> American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report on Standards of Library Training," *Library Journal* (September, 1905), 30:121-23.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>126</sup> American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report," *Library Journal* (August, 1906), 31:175-77.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 176.

<sup>122</sup> *Public Libraries* (January, 1922), 27:55; (April, 1922), 27:247.

ever, Miss Wallace stated in 1907 that "The course of study, hours, instructors, length of term, and other details are now in accordance with the rules prescribed by the special committee of the A.L.A., on library training."<sup>128</sup> Thus the 1906 standards may be considered as indicative of the school's status at the end of the second year of operation. According to the standards, entrance requirements should be either three years of education beyond high school or an entrance examination (the latter being the case at the Atlanta school). Concerning instruction, the standards specified that at least one-third of the instructors should be graduates of a recognized library school; that one-third should be experienced in libraries other than the ones associated with the school; that some of the instructors should have library duties; that there should be one instructor to every ten students in laboratory work; that one-sixth of the students' time should be given to supervised practical work; and that a certificate should be granted certifying to the completion of the course, but not to fitness for library work.<sup>129</sup>

The Committee on Library Training continued to inspect library schools as they were established and encouraged the raising of standards in existing schools. In 1912 plans began for the evaluation of schools by a series of "efficiency tests." The evaluation was to be based upon an inspection of the schools by Miss Mary E. Robbins, formerly of Simmons College Library School, and upon the results of a questionnaire sent to library school graduates.<sup>130</sup> The inspection was carried out in 1914, and

Miss Robbins visited the Carnegie Library School from November 29 to December 2.<sup>131</sup> Unfortunately, Miss Robbins' findings are unknown, for the conclusions of this abortive attempt at evaluation were never released. In 1916, the Committee on Library Training transferred the materials of the study to Harold O. Rugg of the School of Education at the University of Chicago. The study proposed by Rugg was apparently never undertaken.<sup>132</sup>

In the meantime, a new body concerned with standards and evaluation had been established. The Association of American Library Schools grew out of a series of informal meetings of library school instructors eventually known as the Round Table of Library School Faculties. The Round Table voted on January 1, 1915, to form a more permanent organization. The first meeting of the new association was held in June, 1915, at which time a constitution was adopted.<sup>133</sup> Prior to the June meeting, the draft constitution limited membership in the association to schools which required a high school course for entrance, offered an academic course of not less than thirty-four weeks, and had a faculty of at least two full-time or four half-time instructors. The executive committee responsible for examining applications for membership ruled

<sup>128</sup> Azariah S. Root to Mrs. Percival Sneed, March 5, 1914 (in the Division files).

<sup>129</sup> Mary E. Robbins to Mrs. Percival Sneed, November 22, 1914 (in the Division files).

<sup>130</sup> Sarah K. Vann, "Training for Librarianship before 1923 or Prior to the Publication of Williamson's Report on *Training for Library Service*" (microfilmed Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, 1959), pp. 307-8.

<sup>131</sup> Marion James and Margaret E. Kalp, "The Association of American Library Schools, 1915-1924," *AALS Newsletter* (January, 1957), 9:8.

<sup>128</sup> Wallace, "The Southern Library Movement," *op. cit.*, 1:66.

<sup>129</sup> ALA, Committee on Library Training, *op. cit.*, p. 175 (see n. 126 above).

that the Carnegie Library School was ineligible on all three counts.<sup>134</sup>

The school required a high school diploma "or its equivalent" for admission. Because of holidays its session was five days short of the stipulated thirty-four weeks. The committee accepted the assurance that these conditions would be corrected the following year. The faculty became the chief issue.<sup>135</sup> The AALS criticisms of faculty *qualifications* have been noted previously. At this point, the problem centered on the *number* of instructors. Preparing to do battle for the school, Miss Barker pointed out that, in addition to one full-time and one three-quarters-time instructor, the director and the supervisor of practical work gave considerable time to the school. In her estimate, this was the equivalent of two full-time instructors.<sup>136</sup> The AALS committee discounted part of the time given by the two major instructors because of the routine nature of the work done.<sup>137</sup> The argument ended in anticlimax when the first meeting of the association voted to admit all of the schools that had formed the Round Table as original members of AALS. The constitution was changed to permit the admission of the four schools that had failed to meet the original requirements.<sup>138</sup>

The compromise that brought the Association of American Library Schools

into being was prophetic of AALS history in its early years. It was not strong enough and did not have enough confidence in itself or the profession to provide the kind of leadership that was needed.<sup>139</sup> The judgment of Louis R. Wilson was that "The importance of the organization derives from its potentialities rather than its past accomplishments."<sup>140</sup> Having lowered its standards for the original members, AALS found it difficult to enforce them thereafter. Nevertheless, the association did make members of the profession more conscious of the need for meeting standards, and it "came to be accepted as the accrediting agency for library schools."<sup>141</sup> At intervals, AALS inspected library schools to determine if they were maintaining the accepted standards. When the Carnegie Library School was re-examined in 1923 it was found to meet the requirements, but suggestions were made for strengthening the faculty, the administration, and the instruction program.<sup>142</sup> The activities of AALS closely paralleled the work of the ALA Committee on Library Training, and in many areas their interests overlapped.<sup>143</sup> Until authority for accreditation was definitely granted to one body, some confusion would necessarily exist.

The next important development in the field of library education was a report by which all library training agencies were weighed and found lack-

<sup>134</sup> Florence R. Curtis to Tommie Dora Barker, December 9, 1915 (in the Division files).

<sup>135</sup> James I. Wyer, Jr., to Tommie Dora Barker, December 20, 1915 (in the Division files).

<sup>136</sup> Tommie Dora Barker to Florence R. Curtis, December 11, 1915 (in the Division files).

<sup>137</sup> "Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta," *op. cit.* (see n. 71 above).

<sup>138</sup> Association of American Library Schools, "Minutes, Albany, N.Y., June 29-30, 1915" (in the Division files).

<sup>139</sup> Interview with Miss Barker, April 3, 1961.

<sup>140</sup> Louis R. Wilson, "Historical Development of Education for Librarianship in the United States," in Bernard Berelson (ed.), *Education for Librarianship* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1949), p. 46.

<sup>141</sup> James and Kalp, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>142</sup> AALS, "Re-examination . . . 1922-23."

<sup>143</sup> James and Kalp, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

ing. In 1919, the Carnegie Corporation of New York engaged Dr. Charles C. Williamson of the New York Public Library to survey existing conditions in library education.<sup>144</sup> Williamson visited all of the library schools in the United States, including the Carnegie Library School, in 1920-21 and issued his report in 1923. Intended to aid the corporation in its efforts to improve library training, the Williamson report became a stimulus and a blueprint for library school development. Williamson was unflatteringly critical of the library schools regarding quality of training, entrance requirements, curricula, faculty, teaching methods, finances, and organization. Among other things, he recommended that a distinction be made between professional and clerical training, that library schools confine themselves to professional training, that the first year of training be general and basic, that the second and third years be specialized, that the qualifications of faculty members be raised, that financial support be increased, that a college degree be required for admission, that the library schools be affiliated with universities, and that a national certification board be established.<sup>145</sup>

The effects of the Williamson report were far reaching and varied. Each school found it necessary, in Miss Barker's words, to consider the report "in terms of its own environment and in relation to the conditions which each must meet in its own 'sphere of influence.'"<sup>146</sup> For the Carnegie Library School, the most significant comments were the recommendations concerning

admission requirements and university affiliation concentrated on one page of the Williamson report: "Graduation from an accredited college . . . should now be recognized as the minimum of general education needed for successful professional library work of any kind;" a "fundamental conflict" existed in the conduct of a library school by a public library using municipal funds for the benefit of libraries in general; and "University boards and university officials [were] better fitted to supervise professional education for library work than [were] public library boards."<sup>147</sup> These ideas were not new to the school administrators, but the Williamson report helped stimulate their realization. Within two years, the Carnegie Library School had affiliated with a university, and admission was based upon a college degree.

Even as the library world was reacting to the Williamson report, new developments were occurring. In April, 1923, the Council of the American Library Association authorized the creation of a Temporary Library Training Board "to investigate the field of library training, to formulate tentative standards for all forms of library training agencies, and to devise a plan for accrediting such agencies."<sup>148</sup> During its investigation the board did not visit the Carnegie Library School, but the school was represented at meetings of the board by Mrs. Blewett Lee (the former Mrs. Sneed), who was then a resident of New York.<sup>149</sup> The findings of the

<sup>147</sup> Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>148</sup> American Library Association, *Report of the Temporary Library Training Board* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1924), pp. 5-6.

<sup>149</sup> Susie Lee Crumley to Harriet E. Howe, March 25, 1924; Adam Strohm to Susie Lee Crumley, May 7, 1924 (in the Division files).

<sup>144</sup> Williamson, *op. cit.*, Foreword.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136-46.

<sup>146</sup> *Library Journal* (November 1, 1923), 48:905.

Temporary Library Training Board were that existing agencies were inadequate to meet the increasing demand for trained librarians, that no standards had been evolved that applied to all agencies, and that no existing body had the authority to evaluate all library training agencies. Therefore, it recommended the creation of a permanent Board of Education for Librarianship, which, among other duties, would formulate minimum standards for library schools, classify schools in accordance with the standards adopted, and publish an annual list of accredited agencies. The board's report also included tentative proposals for standards of evaluation.<sup>150</sup>

As a result of this report, the Board of Education for Librarianship was formally organized in September, 1924. Its two primary tasks during the first year were the survey of existing library schools and the formulation of minimum standards for various types of schools.<sup>151</sup> The B.E.L. members visited each of the library schools, attending classes, meeting students, conferring with faculties, touring school quarters, and examining records.<sup>152</sup> The findings were discouraging, for the board reported that "No existing school offers instruction adequate to important developments in library work."<sup>153</sup> Four members of B.E.L. visited the Carnegie Library School on December 18 and 19, 1924. Their recommendations were that the administrative staff be enlarged, that the executive officer give full time

to the school, that the faculty be enlarged and strengthened, that the professional library be expanded, that equipment be improved, and that there should be a "substantial increase" in financial support. The Board also strongly encouraged exploring the possibility of affiliation with Emory University.<sup>154</sup>

When the Board of Education for Librarianship began developing standards for library schools, it recognized the necessity of formulating criteria "applicable to existing conditions" rather than ideal standards.<sup>155</sup> Accordingly, standards were evolved for four grades or classes of library training agencies to be known as junior undergraduate, senior undergraduate, graduate, and advanced graduate library schools.<sup>156</sup> For each type there were detailed requirements regarding organization, administration, instructional staff, financial status, equipment and quarters, admission requirements, and curricula. For the junior undergraduate library school, the basic requirements were that it should be affiliated with an approved library, college, or university; have four full-time teachers who met certain academic and professional qualifications; have adequate financial support; and grant only a certificate for completion of the curriculum.<sup>157</sup> Standards were progressively higher for each successive classification.

The standards proposed by the Board of Education for Librarianship were adopted by the American Library Association on July 7, 1925.<sup>158</sup> The

<sup>150</sup> ALA, *Report of the Temporary Library Training Board*, pp. 6-7, 11-27.

<sup>151</sup> B.E.L., [*First Annual Report*], p. 5.

<sup>152</sup> Harriet E. Howe to the Library Schools, October 6, 1924 (in the Division files).

<sup>153</sup> "A New Survey of Library Schools," *Library Journal* (July, 1925), 50:578.

<sup>154</sup> B.E.L., "Report on Library Schools."

<sup>155</sup> B.E.L., [*First Annual Report*], p. 14.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15. <sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>158</sup> American Library Association, Board of Education for Librarianship, *Second Annual Report* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1926), p. 16.



schools were already striving to meet the new criteria, and the following year B.E.L. issued its first list of accredited library schools. Looking beyond the time limits of this study, it is appropriate to note the results. No school qualified as an advanced graduate library school (the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago would be the first when it opened). Five were classified as graduate library schools, two as senior undergraduate library schools, and eight as junior undergraduate library schools. Included in the eight junior undergraduate library schools was the Carnegie Library School of Atlanta, the only southern school to be accredited.<sup>159</sup> Apparently this achievement served only to spur the school to greater efforts. To become a graduate library school was its goal. This necessitated affiliation with an approved degree-conferring institution and the requirement of a college degree for admission.<sup>160</sup> The initial steps toward this end had already been taken, and in 1927 the Carnegie Library School achieved the coveted status of graduate library school.<sup>161</sup>

The events described in the preceding pages have a twofold significance. Not only did they mark the progress of the Carnegie Library School toward the achievement of higher standards, but they also influenced the school's status as seen by its financial backers. In the beginning, Andrew Carnegie financed the library school personally. He contributed \$4,000 per year for the first three years and \$4,500 per year

thereafter.<sup>162</sup> Apparently the transactions were handled very informally by direct correspondence between Carnegie and the current administrator—Miss Wallace, Miss Rankin, or Mrs. Sneed. On one occasion, in April, 1906, Carnegie came to inspect the school,<sup>163</sup> and Miss Wallace conferred with him in New York a number of times. Otherwise there seemed to be little formal evaluation and supervision during the early years. In 1914, however, the support of the school was transferred to the Carnegie Corporation of New York.<sup>164</sup> From that time on, but especially after Carnegie's death in 1919, the school was required to give full and regular accountings for its work. Requests for continued financial support had to be renewed each year and accompanied by detailed annual reports.

Negotiations with the Carnegie Corporation were usually carried on through Mr. James Bertram, the executive secretary, or occasionally Mr. F. P. Keppel, the president. Bertram in particular was concerned about the returns from the Carnegie investment and continuously checked the effectiveness of the school's work. In 1918, for example, he noted that only eighty-six of the 127 graduates had remained in library work, that only half of the class of 1918 went into public libraries, and that all but one of those went into the Carnegie Library of Atlanta. Remarking that the net result was "pretty much to train librarians for your library," he reminded Miss Barker that "The primary purpose of subsidizing a library school by Mr. Carnegie or the Carnegie Corporation can only be to furnish librar-

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>160</sup> B.E.L. [First] *Annual Report*, pp. 22-23.

<sup>161</sup> American Library Association, Board of Education for Librarianship, *Third Annual Report* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1927), p. 20.

<sup>162</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 2 (April 13, 1905); Vol. 3 (January 20, 1908).

<sup>163</sup> *Library Journal* (May, 1906), 31:232.

<sup>164</sup> *Circular of Information, 1917-1918*, p. 5.

ians for public libraries."<sup>165</sup> Miss Barker replied with considerable warmth that only nine graduates had taken up other work, the others being out of the field for reasons of matrimony, ill health, or death, none of which the school could control. Neither could the school force its graduates into public libraries when they were offered better salaries in other types of libraries. As for the graduates employed by the Carnegie Library, all had replaced staff members who went to other libraries, so the result was the same.<sup>166</sup>

Such spirited exchanges recurred frequently, with Bertram weighing and testing, and Miss Barker defending and justifying. In 1920, an observer sent to the school again noted the percentage of graduates in library work. He reported that "it has cost on the average about \$800 to put each one of these workers in the field," and continued:

One wonders whether a school with less than 10 students can do the best work. . . . Possibly the donation from the Corporation could be used with better results by some other agency. . . . The important question seems to me to be whether the Atlanta Library School has been and is now meeting the need for trained leadership in the South. . . . This school should do a great deal more than give a brief technical training to a few routine or clerical workers. That the graduates may not be rising above the level of routine workers is at least suggested by the fact that . . . only 9 are head librarians. . . . Probably most of the 9 are heads of the smallest libraries.<sup>167</sup>

With this appraisal, the entire existence and service of the school were be-

<sup>165</sup> James Bertram to Tommie Dora Barker, October 27, 1918 (in the Division files).

<sup>166</sup> Tommie Dora Barker to James Bertram, October 30, 1918 (in the Division files).

<sup>167</sup> "Memorandum" in letter from James Bertram to Tommie Dora Barker, November 4, 1920 (in the Division files).

ing called into question. Miss Barker marshaled her defenses and replied to each criticism. The small enrolment of the two preceding years was largely due to the "abnormal conditions occasioned by the war" and the "effect on the social order" of the South. The cost of preparing each graduate in the field took no account of the years of service given by women no longer working. She cited cases to demonstrate that graduates were not in routine or clerical positions nor were they confined to the smallest libraries.<sup>168</sup> (Graduates were then working in the Library of Congress and the public libraries of New York, Boston, and Detroit, as well as the larger southern cities.<sup>169</sup>) The Carnegie Corporation did not withdraw its support from the school, but the threat stimulated the administrators to take the offensive. The next five years witnessed a strenuous campaign to expand the school's program and raise its standards. The criticisms of the corporation and of accrediting agencies were turned into weapons in the battle to win the increased support necessary for proposed improvements.

After a year of planning, the library school began its campaign with the announcement that the number of students admitted in 1922-23 would be raised from twelve to twenty. For the first year, the school carried the enlarged enrolment on an experimental basis without requesting additional support. In September, 1923, a tuition fee of fifty dollars was instituted with the intention of gradually increasing it to one hundred dollars. The tuition fee was not expected to meet the need for a

<sup>168</sup> Tommie Dora Barker to James Bertram, November 10, 1920 (in the Division files).

<sup>169</sup> *Circular of Information, 1921-1922*, pp. 16-21.

larger income, however.<sup>170</sup> On September 22, Miss Barker, in the name of the trustees, requested that the annual grant be increased from \$4,500 to \$10,000 and asked for an additional sum of \$2,372.50 to purchase needed equipment. She submitted a detailed statement on the need for expansion, the proposed plans, and the estimated cost.<sup>171</sup> Citing the AALS recommendations of 1922-23, she pointed out that a number of them could be put into effect by readjustments under existing

tenance fund be increased to \$12,500 annually and that \$2,500 be allotted for equipment.<sup>172</sup> The larger increase was asked because "in the light of further experience and in accordance with the recommended practice in library training, a complete re-organization seems desirable on the basis of a larger full-time faculty."<sup>174</sup> The budget for 1923-24, compared with the estimate of need, is shown in Table 5.

The trustees of the Carnegie Corporation decided that the request could

TABLE 5  
FINANCIAL PROSPECTUS, 1923-24\*

	Present Budget	Estimate of Need
Salaries . . . . .	\$3,722.50	\$10,560.00
Printing, stationery . . . . .	199.16	500.00
Lectures . . . . .	396.26	700.00
Traveling expenses . . . . .	425.38	600.00
Books and periodicals . . . . .	83.60	250.00
Incidentals . . . . .	360.28	440.00
Equipment . . . . .	.....	200.00
Total . . . . .	\$5,187.18	\$13,250.00
Received from Carnegie Corporation . . . . .	\$4,500.00	Estimated tuition . . . . . \$ 1,000.00
Tuition fees . . . . .	825.00	Needed annual income besides tuition . . . . . \$12,250.00
Income . . . . .	\$5,325.00	Needed for physical equipment . . \$ 2,500.00
Balance, Sept. 1, 1924 . . . . .	\$ 137.82	

\*"Data of the Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, September, 1924, p. 1 (in the Division files).

Pertaining to Request for Increase in Maintenance Fund,"

conditions, but "adoption of some of the most important recommendations, namely, those relating to faculty and equipment, depends upon having an increased maintenance fund."<sup>172</sup>

The first request having produced no response, Miss Barker renewed it a year later. This time she asked that the main-

not be granted,<sup>175</sup> but outside help was at hand. Early in 1925, the Board of Education for Librarianship recommended that the school's support be increased to \$7,500 annually. This the corporation agreed to do, provided the school would raise the additional funds

<sup>170</sup> "Financial Statistics of Library Schools," July, 1923 (report to the Temporary Library Training Board) (in the Division files).

<sup>171</sup> Tommie Dora Barker to James Bertram, September 22, 1923 (in the Division files).

<sup>172</sup> "Data Relative to Proposed Expansion of the Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta," September, 1923, p. 3 (in the Division files).

<sup>173</sup> Tommie Dora Barker to James Bertram, September 27, 1924 (in the Division files).

<sup>174</sup> "Data of the Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, Pertaining to Request for Increase in Maintenance Fund," September, 1924, p. 1 (in the Division files).

<sup>175</sup> F. P. Keppel to Tommie Dora Barker, October 24, 1924 (in the Division files).

needed to the amount of \$1,287.50 before September 30, 1926; \$2,825 for 1926-27; and \$4,750 for 1927-28.<sup>176</sup> To meet the conditions imposed by the corporation, the Carnegie Library School turned to the city of Atlanta for help. For years the city had supported the school by permitting the use of library space for its quarters and by paying a large portion of the salaries of staff members who served as instructors. This was the first time a direct appropriation had been requested, however. Miss Barker accompanied her petition by the reminder that the school's "presence here makes Atlanta the library center of the southeast and has placed the Atlanta library in a position of leadership."<sup>177</sup> The city council agreed and consented to pay the necessary amounts.<sup>178</sup> To supplement the annual income, the Graduates Association of the Carnegie Library School pledged itself to raise the sum needed for equipment. By June, 1926, \$1,060 had been given for that purpose.<sup>179</sup> With these developments, the financial situation was vastly improved. In the meantime, important developments had occurred in other areas.

#### AFFILIATION WITH EMORY UNIVERSITY

The development of higher professional standards and a broader concept of library education challenged the Carnegie Library School to meet the new

standards and concepts. Failure to act would mean eventual deterioration and eclipse. Therefore, Miss Barker, Miss Crumley, and the faculty sought for means by which the school might grow and expand. Before the library school opened for the first session, Anne Wallace told the Carnegie Library trustees that it would be to the school's advantage to be associated with an institution of higher education.<sup>180</sup> Although that idea had sometimes been obscured by events of the intervening years, recent events had given it new significance. In September, 1924, the school officials tentatively broached a suggestion for affiliation to the officials of Emory University. The university received the suggestion cordially, and a series of conferences followed.<sup>181</sup>

The proposed step involved a number of major problems, and both parties proceeded cautiously. The school sought the advice and suggestions of the Board of Education for Librarianship as well as those of other library schools associated with or recognized by universities.<sup>182</sup> Three alternatives emerged. The library school might strive to become a graduate school and let a year in residence qualify candidates for an advanced degree to be conferred by Emory University. It might become a senior undergraduate school with its program counting as the fourth year leading to the first baccalaureate degree. Or the school might operate as both a

<sup>176</sup> F. P. Keppel to Tommie Dora Barker, May 21, 1925 (in the Division files).

<sup>177</sup> "Facts Regarding the Library School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta," 1925 (information sheet presented to city council) (in the Division files).

<sup>178</sup> Atlanta City Council, "Resolution," July 20, 1925 (in the Division files).

<sup>179</sup> *Library Journal* (June 15, 1926), 51:562.

<sup>180</sup> *Trustees' Minutes*, Vol. 2 (June 6, 1905).

<sup>181</sup> "Plans for the Future Development of the Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta," January, 1925 (in the Division files). Cited hereafter as "Plans for the Future Development . . . 1925."

<sup>182</sup> See the correspondence of 1924-25 with the School of Library Science, Western Reserve University; the Library School of the Los Angeles Public Library; the Carnegie Library School of Pittsburgh (in the Division files).

junior and senior undergraduate school with students having less than three years' college preparation receiving a certificate, while those that fulfilled the Emory requirements received a degree.<sup>183</sup> The second proposal seemed likely to limit the school's source of supply to students who matriculated at Emory for prelibrary school training. It was unlikely that Emory officials would agree to the third alternative. Thus the decision was made; the Carnegie Library School would become a graduate school.

The decision was conveyed to the Carnegie Corporation with the explanation that "The school believes further that it can do more to put forward the development of libraries in the South by raising the standards of entrance and attracting to the work better equipped people, who have the foundation for developing qualities of leadership and who can bring to the work an understanding of the possibilities of the library in its broader social aspects."<sup>184</sup> Corporation officials expressed concern about the decision but acquiesced in the belief that school leaders had "not taken the step without full knowledge of the probable consequences."<sup>185</sup>

President Harvey W. Cox of Emory University submitted the plan to the university trustees in June, 1925, "asking for approval of the general idea, and requesting that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee with power to act as the situation develops."<sup>186</sup> A joint committee of the school

and university worked out plans for the affiliation. The committee recommendations were approved by the university trustees on October 11, 1925.<sup>187</sup> In announcing the affiliation to local reporters, Dr. Cox remarked:

The affiliation is in line with the desire of Emory University to serve the educational and professional needs of Atlanta and the South in every possible way. . . . The university trustees decided that this was an opportunity both to help Atlanta by making possible the continuance of the library school and at the same time to further the educational progress of the South by throwing Emory's influence back of the Atlanta school as a great training center for librarians.<sup>188</sup>

The major change entailed by the affiliation was the requirement of a college degree for admission to the school. In addition, the university required that the library school accept the standards, grading system, and length of school year then in effect at Emory.<sup>189</sup> The terms of the agreement were as follows:

*Entrance requirements:* Applicants for entrance into the Library School shall offer as a minimum of academic preparation a first degree from a college or university of recognized standing. . . .

Acceptance of applicants by the Library School will be further conditioned on satisfactory personality and college record. . . .

*Course of Study:* The school year shall consist of not less than thirty-four weeks, exclusive of holidays, with fifteen class hours of lectures each week. Credit shall be given for practice work on the basis of three hours of practice work being equivalent to one lecture hour. Each student shall have not less than forty-eight hours of practice work in the library of Emory

<sup>183</sup> "Summary of Data, 1924," p. 5.

<sup>184</sup> "Data Pertaining to the Present Condition of the Atlanta Library School, April 25, 1925," p. 2 (special report to the Carnegie Corporation) (in the Division files).

<sup>185</sup> Morse A. Cartwright to Tommie Dora Barker, February 17, 1926 (in the Division files).

<sup>186</sup> "Plans for the Future Development . . . 1925."

<sup>187</sup> Harvey W. Cox to Tommie Dora Barker, October 11, 1925 (in the Division files).

<sup>188</sup> "Atlanta Library School a Part of Emory," *Emory Alumnus* (February, 1926), 2:5

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*

University. Credit given for practice work shall not exceed two semester hours.

*Grading of students:* To assure uniformity of standards, the Library School shall adopt the same system of grading for students as in practice at Emory University. In addition to the academic grades of students, rating shall also be made of the personality and practical ability of each student. . . . A full and complete record of the work of each student shall be on file in the office of the Registrar of Emory University as well as in the office of the Library School.

*Certificate:* In recognition of the satisfactory completion by a student of the prescribed course of study in the Library School, Emory University will award a certificate.<sup>190</sup>

It was anticipated that a three-year period of transition would be necessary before all of the terms of the agreement were met. Although the minimum entrance requirements did not go into effect until September, 1926, the university was willing to let the agreement apply to any members of the class of 1925-26 who met the requirement. Accordingly, six graduates were awarded certificates by the university in June, 1926.<sup>191</sup> For the time being, the Carnegie Library School continued to be known by that name and remained in its quarters at the Carnegie Library. There was no overt change in the management of the school, and Miss Barker continued as director until 1930. It was planned that the administration of the school would be under the joint supervision of the Executive Board of Emory and the Administrative Committee of the Carnegie Library, but in actual practice Dr. Cox and Miss Barker acted for their respective institutions.<sup>192</sup> It was

expected that, "as conditions seemed to make such a step desirable, the complete integration of the School with the University would take place."<sup>193</sup>

The affiliation of the Carnegie Library School with Emory University symbolized a transition in library education. Up to 1925, the school was representative of the pioneer period of library school development. It was a time of trial and experimentation. Standards were primitive and often ambiguous. In the beginning, the schools were concerned primarily with technique rather than principles and theories. The public library was the dominant influence in the shaping of aims and curricula. The changes and growth of curricula closely paralleled changes and developments in library doctrine and practice.<sup>194</sup> In the words of a later library school director, the early schools "were more agencies for the propaganda of the library faith and the preparation of its missionaries . . . than they were educational institutions."<sup>195</sup> But as the library profession grew to maturity, so the library schools grew from vocational into professional agencies. By 1925, most of the schools were moving into a new era of development. Having established their right to existence they could go on to broaden and deepen their programs.

For the Carnegie Library School, the

<sup>190</sup> Tommie Dora Barker, "Program for the Development of the Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta" (1929?) (in the Division files). Cited hereafter as "Program for the Development of the Library School."

<sup>194</sup> Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 7; and Ernest J. Reece, *Some Possible Developments in Library Education* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1924), pp. 3-4.

<sup>195</sup> Sydney B. Mitchell, "Essentials in the Training of University Librarians—II," *College and Research Libraries* (December, 1939), 1:22.

<sup>190</sup> "Report of the Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, September 1925-September 1926," p. 2 (in the Division files).

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>192</sup> Susie Lee Crumley to Phineas L. Windsor, June 18, 1925; and interview with Miss Tommie Dora Barker, April 28, 1961.

first twenty years were far from being a period of uninterrupted progress. Rather, they were a time of trial and struggle. From a small beginning, it grew slowly, often encountering obstacles that seemed insurmountable. Only the persistent and unceasing effort of a few individuals made possible its continued existence. But by the affiliation with Emory University, the school acquired new strength and vigor. The accomplishments of the past were a challenge to continued achievement in the future. In succeeding years, many other significant events occurred. In 1928, Emory began conferring the Bachelor of Arts in Library Science, rather than a certificate for completion of the school's curriculum. In 1930, the total administration of the school was transferred to Emory University, the school moved to the university campus, and the Carnegie Corporation and the Rosenwald Fund gave \$50,000 each to the university for the support of the school for five years. A permanent endowment of \$100,000 was established for the school from funds provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1940. In 1948 the library school became the Division of Librarianship, with a revised program leading to a master's degree in place of the previous fifth-year bachelor's degree. The Division was accredited under the new standards of the Board of Education for Librarianship in 1954.<sup>196</sup>

The tracing of these events must be

<sup>196</sup> Emory University, *The Division of Librarianship, Bulletin of Emory University* (February 20, 1959), 45:9.

left to other writers. There is ample source material for one or more studies similar in nature to the present one. A survey of developments from 1925 through 1948 is possible now, and subsequent events may be traced at some future date. A curriculum study is also feasible, for courses of study, syllabi, problems, and lecture notes used in the Carnegie Library School have been preserved by the Division of Librarianship. An examination of the professional careers of the early graduates of the library school would aid in evaluating the school's achievements. Such studies would add not only to the story of the Carnegie Library School but to the history of library education in general.

It remains only to place the work of the Carnegie Library School in proper perspective. The past and future of the school are linked by a statement written by Miss Barker in 1929, summarizing its previous achievements and forecasting its future:

The Carnegie Library School's existence has been almost coincident with the development of the public library movement in the South, the history of the latter movement dating from the establishment of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta in 1899. It has made a distinct contribution to library progress in the South in the pioneer period of development both by furnishing a supply of trained librarians and by setting a standard of trained library service. With the first phase of the pioneer stage passed, there is every indication that library progress will go forward in a faster tempo in the next phase, and this Library School will have both a larger opportunity and a larger responsibility for making its contribution.<sup>197</sup>

<sup>197</sup> Barker, "Program for the Development of the Library School," p. 2.