The development of school libraries in the United States has been largely a concern of the twentieth century, and the need for librarians specially prepared to render service in the schools was slow to be recognized. When Katharine L. Sharp, then the Director of the Department of Library Science at Armour Institute, summarized the laws pertaining to school libraries which were in effect in 1895, she found some legal provision for their establishment and financial support, and for the book collection in twenty-two states, but none anywhere for staff. So for granted did she take the lack of trained librarians in the schools that she offered suggestions for promoting the use of the library “to the librarian... who is supposed to be a teacher with no knowledge of library work.”

Twenty years later, in her study of school libraries, Mary E. Hall reported the appointment of but fifty trained librarians to schools from 1905 to 1915, and in that same year C. C. Certain described the deplorable state of southern school libraries and attributed the dissipation of their resources to the failure of school administrators to place them under the supervision of trained librarians.

Although the establishment of school libraries was slow throughout the first two decades of the century, the quality of the work of the pioneer school librarians, the interest and support of many public librarians, and the vigorous attack on the problem by teachers and school administrators gained recognition for school libraries and for school librarianship and prepared the way for the rapid development that was to follow. Not until standards for school libraries and certification for school librarians were developed was the pressure for special preparation for school librarianship sufficiently strong to influence, to any appreciable extent, the curricula of library schools, and to interest the normal schools and teachers colleges in assuming responsibility for the preparation of library personnel as well as teachers. The docu-
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ment entitled, *Standard Library Organization and Equipment for Secondary Schools of Different Sizes*, which was produced first as a report of the Committee on High School Libraries of the North Central Association in 1918, and later sponsored by the National Education Association and the American Library Association, marked a turning point in the development of school libraries and had tremendous effect upon education for school librarianship.

The implications of the Certain Standards for library education were recognized immediately. Officers of the School Library Section of the American Library Association, foreseeing a need for school librarians that the library schools could not meet, called a meeting in New York on May 22, 1920, to consider the question of preparing them. A committee was set up to investigate the problem and to consider such questions as: "Does school library work require specialized training? If so, what differences should be made from the usual library school training courses? To what extent do school men feel the librarian needs courses in education or teaching?"

Following the lead of the North Central Association and the National Education Association, and spreading the pressure throughout the country, other regional associations and state departments set more or less similar standards, thus creating a market for school librarians to which neither the accredited library schools nor the programs in teacher-education institutions were adequate. The literature of the period makes frequent reference to the discrepancy between the supply and demand in the school library field. Mary E. Robbins, instructor in library science at Rhode Island State Normal School, recognizing that the schools must turn to the teacher-training institutions for a large part of their librarians, sent out a questionnaire to 125 normal schools and teachers colleges. Returns from these disclosed that in 1919 only a few gave courses designed to prepare school librarians. But by the early thirties many teacher-training institutions had entered the field, and the number has continued to grow until in 1952 more than 400 colleges and universities in the United States offer courses designed to fit school librarians for their prospective duties.

Throughout the twenties and into the thirties librarians resisted the trend toward the preparation of school librarians in the teacher-training institutions. In its second annual report the Board of Education for Librarianship recommended "That full-time school librarians should receive their library preparation in accredited library schools only; that part-time school librarians may receive their library prepa-
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deration by carrying an accredited curriculum in school library work in
a normal school, college, or university. . .” 7 However, the sheer
number required to meet the need in elementary and high school li-
braries defeated the effort to confine the educating of school librarians
to the accredited library schools, and to reserve to the teacher-training
institutions the fitting of teachers trained in the use of the library and
administrators conscious of its functions and value. It was inevitable
that library courses in teacher-training institutions would increase in
number and eventually come to supply the majority of school librar-
ians. A number of factors combined to cause this development, some
of which were:

1. The prevailing pattern of library education in the professional
library schools throughout the twenties, which provided a general cur-
criculum usually in the first post-graduate year and withheld specializa-
tion until the second post-graduate year, extended the education of
school librarians beyond that of classroom teachers.

2. The concentration of library schools in a few sections of the
country left great areas unserved by professional library schools.

3. The reluctance of library schools to offer summer courses and to
provide opportunity for specialization in school librarianship forced
schools to seek elsewhere for school library personnel.

4. The insistence of school administrators on instructional as well
as library qualifications set a requirement which many library school
students could not meet, and with which library schools were not
entirely in sympathy.

5. The tendency of the school administrator to turn for his librarians
to those institutions from which he was accustomed to secure his teach-
ers encouraged the offering of library education in teacher-education
institutions.

6. The large number of small schools which could not appoint, or
were not required by the standards under which they operated to ap-
point, full-time librarians created a demand for “teacher-librarians” who
were trained for service as teachers and as librarians, a type of train-
ing that the library schools of that period were not set up to offer as
part of their regular programs.

In retrospect it might seem strange that library schools should have
been so reluctant to provide special preparation for a field which gave
promise of so steady and large a market for their product. However,
instruction looking toward service to all special groups and in various
specific types of libraries was slow to enter the curricula of library schools. Williamson stressed the lack of such training and emphasized the need for it in his report to the Carnegie Corporation, which he based on a study of the fifteen accredited schools made during the 1920-21 academic year. Thirty-three years after the opening of the first school, he observed that "While library service has been growing more and more highly specialized, . . . the training afforded by the library schools has for the most part remained general. It is approximately accurate to say that the aim of the library schools at present is to fit every student to take up any branch of library work which may offer an opening." He was emphatic in his statement that "Probably the most important group for which specialized training should be provided at once are the school librarians, and particularly the high school librarians."

In spite of all that has been said it perhaps is not surprising that school libraries were neglected in the early development of library education. Library schools were following the lead of libraries rather than assuming leadership in library development. They had their origins in apprenticeship and in the in-service training classes offered by libraries for the preparation of their own staffs. The subject content and methods of these programs were reflected in the library schools throughout the pre-Williamson period of library education. So-called general programs were actually concerned with public and university libraries. Alice S. Tyler, in reviewing the first forty years of library education, stated that "Education for librarianship in America has naturally and primarily been evolved to meet the requirements of our most distinctive library achievement—the American public library." Even today this is to some extent true. That the subject of school libraries was introduced into the curriculum as early as it was, was due no doubt to the fact that public libraries were promoting school libraries, and many were supplying library service to schools. In various institutions, at that time, courses in library work with children were used for the preparation of the public librarian who was to work in the schools as well as for the training of the children's librarian. In 1917 the Carnegie Library School, Pittsburgh, differentiated between the duties and responsibilities of school and children's librarians to the extent of including a separate course in school library work, but this example was followed only slowly.

Actually little was done by the schools to alleviate the critical situation in the school library field until the thirties. The Board of Educa-
Training for School Librarianship showed great concern for the problem throughout its first fifteen years. Its very first report directed the attention of library schools to the need for school librarians, estimating that seven thousand would be wanted annually, a number almost double the total number of graduates of accredited library schools then engaged in library work.

In its second report, the Board recognized that “Specialization must be given its opportunity. Courses for school, children’s, and hospital librarians and other specialists in library work must be easily accessible to those desiring them.” It recommended further development of summer courses in more regions of the country, and the offering of these courses for degree credit. Encouragement of a geographic spread of opportunities for library education and the formulation of minimum standards for summer courses and minimum standards for a curriculum in school library work, were the Board’s contributions during the twenties to the solution of the problem.

While there was a steady increase throughout the twenties in number of school library electives and in summer opportunities for study, by 1927 only three of the regular accredited library schools offered summer session programs, and in 1929 the Board could report that only five had full curricula in school library work during the regular term, although others offered one course in the subject. It is small wonder then that teacher-education institutions sought to fill the gap, particularly with summer courses.

Alice Lohrer in her study of programs for the preparation of teacher-librarians designates the years 1919–1929 and 1930–1936 as periods of “Rapid Growth—Rise of Standards” and “Mushroom’ Growth—Depression—Oversupply.” Certainly these designations are descriptive not alone of teacher-librarian programs but of school library education in general. Fourteen schools came into existence during the twenties and eleven during the thirties. These had no antecedence in public libraries; several were in institutions existing primarily to train teachers, a number were placed at the undergraduate level, one was established in accordance with the standards of the Board of Education for Librarianship for a sixteen semester hour curriculum in school library work, and several were accredited by that same body for the training of school librarians only. The very nature of the organization of most of these schools and their location were such as to make them responsive to school library needs, the best training for which, as Munn pointed out, was still subject to dispute. Programs for the
preparation of teacher-librarians were also increasing in the teacher-training institutions, with the sympathetic encouragement of the library profession and the Board of Education for Librarianship. It might have seemed that the way was open to the solution of the problems created by the enormous demand for school librarians and by the need for large numbers of part-time librarians. Then came the depression. The unemployment of library school graduates threw out of balance the supply and demand of school librarians and brought about competition between the partially trained librarian and the library school graduate, resulting in antagonism toward the teacher-librarian programs.

At this juncture we find the Board undertaking to discourage the extension of teacher-librarian courses and expressing concern over their "undue increase . . . and their frequently undesirable effect on the employment of librarians with more complete professional training." In its report for 1935 the Board named as "the most serious immediate problem" in library education, "the training agencies other than library schools," reported the completion of its new "Minimum Requirements for Teacher-Librarian Training Agencies" and their adoption by the Council in 1934, and announced a Carnegie grant for a survey, which made the years 1935–1939 productive for the work of the Board in the field of school library education. A survey of representative training institutions which offered library education programs, followed by surveys of library personnel and training agencies in several states, did much to clarify needs and strengthen programs.

Other accomplishments in the field were the publication of the report of the Joint Committee of the American Library Association and the American Association of Teachers Colleges, How Shall We Educate Teachers and Librarians for Service in the Schools? and Fargo's study, Preparation for School Library Work. These efforts in the thirties resulted in a change from the acceptance or rejection of programs in preparation for school librarianship based upon expediencies, to the development of programs and standards resting on the identification of objectives, the analysis of functions and duties, and a study of the relationships between education for school librarianship and the whole fields of library education and teacher education. This opened a way toward the development of a system of education for librarianship into which programs in preparation for the special fields could fit. Although progress was slowed up by the war, as the shortages of personnel became increasingly acute and gave indication of continu-
Training for School Librarianship

ing beyond the war's duration, library education became the subject of major concern to the entire profession. In the general studies of library education made during the late forties, little attention was given to education for school librarianship. Even School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, produced by a committee of the American Library Association in 1944, made no startling recommendation for changes in the educational programs for the personnel designed to meet the high standards of service it set. It remained for the middle of the century to propose any innovations in the patterns of education for school librarianship.

What of the present situation, and what can be expected of the future? In the fifty-two years since the appointment of the first trained school librarian, have the problems been identified, and is progress being made toward their solution?

Certainly school librarians are a very vocal group within the body of librarianship, and they are making their needs known. Furthermore, they have been giving much thought and study to the problems of education for their work. The outstanding effort to arrive at a definitive statement of educational needs for any area of librarianship is that made by the Education Committee of the A.L.A. Division of Libraries for Children and Young People, working under the chairmanship of Frances Henne. Growing out of the efforts of that committee and forming part of its project was the master's dissertation entitled The Education of School Librarians, submitted by Ruth Ersted to the faculty of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago in 1951. Like others before her, Ersted based her proposed curriculum on a job analysis; but to avoid mere perpetuation of the status quo she asked her respondents to state the objectives of their schools and libraries and to evaluate their general and professional education and the success of their performance in the light of these objectives. The hypotheses which she set out to prove or disprove have much meaning for library education and must be taken into consideration by all who would plan library education for school personnel, whether in professional library schools or in the teacher education institutions. The hypotheses are:

1. That all school librarians need to have a knowledge of the purposes and functions of both the elementary and secondary school library.
2. That school librarians need training in the fields of educational objectives and methods, educational and social psychology, curriculum...
development, reading and other related content in the area of education.

3. That the existing dichotomy of training for teacher-librarians (part-time librarians) and for professional school librarians (full-time librarians) should be discontinued.

4. That professional education for school librarians should begin in the undergraduate college or university program, (similar to the subject specialization in the preparation of teachers).28

Ersted found evidence in support of the first two hypotheses, but unfortunately her sample contained too few teacher-librarians to give conclusive support of the third, and evidence was not gathered which would test the validity of the fourth. The first two hypotheses represent no ideas that are highly controversial. While the literature of the subject shows that little attention has been given to the subject of preparation for elementary school librarianship, many school library curricula are based upon the assumption that the school librarian should be acquainted with both elementary and secondary school purposes and functions, and certainly with materials for both levels. The curriculum worked out by the Third Southern Library Planning Conference on Training for School Librarianship 29 in 1946 stresses this concept.

The second hypothesis has general acceptance in theory if not in practice, and recognition of the need for educational as well as library study can be noted in the literature throughout the past twenty-five or more years. Mary E. Robbins 6 in 1919 spoke of the need to supply “not any trained librarian, but a trained librarian fitted to do school library work.” Della Northey,30 when school library supervisor of the Indiana Public Library Commission, emphasized the need thus in 1923: “Just as the librarian of the public library must understand and appreciate the needs of the club woman and the business man, so must the librarian in charge of our high school library have a sympathetic knowledge of school problems and activities. Above all this librarian must be a teacher. . . . One thing is certain, if college or normal school education is necessary for the teacher, then educational background plus technical training is necessary for the high school librarian.” Various of the annual reports of the Board of Education for Librarianship point out this need for a dual professional preparation. The fourth annual report 31 puts that body on record in 1928 as recognizing the need for “an adequate supply of workers, who, in addition to their knowledge of technique, are versed in children’s
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literature and child psychology, understand the objectives of the school and are in full sympathy with them."

The third and fourth hypotheses are less generally accepted as yet, and their acceptance, when it comes, will have a more disturbing effect on library education and in particular upon the professional library schools. That the part-time librarian needs basically the same education as does the full-time librarian seems too obvious to need discussion. As Ersted points out, the objectives of the school library are the same, whether it is administered by one who devotes her full time to that responsibility or not. The very fact that the part-time librarian has less time to give to library service increases the pressures on her and calls for greater skill and ability if adequate service is to be rendered. The two parallel programs of education for service to children and young people in schools, which have functioned independently of each other for so long, cannot be justified educationally and can only be explained on the basis of expediency.

Created by economic pressures and stabilized and perpetuated by state and regional standards, this situation has outlived its usefulness. So long, however, as standards and certification regulations require a full year of preparation for service in the larger schools, that long will shorter courses for the part-time librarian exist to provide needed personnel for the small schools. If the objectives are the same for both small and large school libraries, if the same skills and understandings are required of the full and part-time librarian, and if a background of general education and of teacher education is necessary to the preparation of both, then a realistic approach to the preparatory needs of school librarians demands that the minimum professional education of all school librarians be the same. Since this cannot be accomplished by placing that minimum at a year of graduate study, some other solution must be found.

Ersted proposes as a solution a basic program limited to fifteen semester hours of education for school librarians, "planned to equip graduates of the four year college program to perform satisfactorily the services of a beginning school librarian." 32 She conceives it not as a terminal program but as one on which, in her estimate, a fifth year of study can be based.

This limitation on credit hours and undergraduate placement of beginning programs of professional library education for all school librarians, if accepted by the profession, will have serious consequences for both the professional library schools and the teacher-educ-
cation institutions which prepare for school librarianship. Large numbers of teacher-education institutions offer programs of less than fifteen hours. These will need to increase their curricula or withdraw from the field. Others have programs of approximately a year in length and will find it necessary to curtail their offerings. Since these programs are usually geared to state and regional certification requirements, revision of such standards will be required. Institutional complications arising with curricula that constitute less than an academic major, and a lessening of prestige for such limited programs, are feared by some who administer undergraduate programs.

In the professional library school still different but equally serious problems must be solved if education for school librarians is to follow the proposed pattern. Several recent developments in library education have created a situation, however, which may be favorable to this new concept of school library training. All accredited library schools, with the exception of five, are now at the graduate level, as are a number of the new schools which have not yet been evaluated for accreditation. With the adoption of the new “Standards for Accreditation”\textsuperscript{33} by the American Library Association on July 13, 1951, only five-year programs become eligible for accreditation or re-accreditation. The library schools which were accredited as Type III schools, by changing to graduate status, have virtually eliminated one complication which could have been serious. More than half of the schools now rest their graduate programs upon beginning programs at the undergraduate level. The new standards for accreditation provide for the acceptance of undergraduate library education insofar as it contributes to the objectives of the five-year programs. Can library schools which base their graduate programs on an undergraduate curriculum accept a program designed to prepare specifically for one type of service as meeting their undergraduate curriculum requirement, or must they insist upon general introductory courses? Will library schools whose entire programs are post-graduate consider that an undergraduate professional curriculum, even though limited to as little as fifteen hours, so cuts into general education that it will penalize the student who attempts to enter with such preparation? Will such programs be judged as contributing to the objectives of the five-year scheme? Will the schools find it possible to build graduate specialization for school libraries on these programs, or will they continue to parallel them more or less at the graduate level, as they have in the past? And finally, will library schools which place their entire offer-
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ings at the graduate level retire from the school library field entirely, revise their curricula to provide this undergraduate basic training for school librarianship, or limit their offerings in the school library field to advanced courses? These are questions to which library schools must find the answers soon. While library educators and school librarians may disagree over the exact length of the programs and the actual course content, there seems to be rather general agreement on the basic assumptions. Already some states have revised their certification laws to provide a single training requirement, rather than a series of requirements based upon size of schools in terms of enrollment. Library schools which stipulate previous library education for admission to their graduate programs already have begun to grapple with the problem of accepting school library curricula to meet this requirement. Admitting the fact that in the past, as Leigh puts it, "The most difficult library specialty to fit in as a part of a single year's general program is training for library work with children and in schools," perhaps now, with the five-year plan of library education, this difficulty will be eased.

The most serious handicaps under which library schools have operated in relation to the undergraduate curricula in teacher-education institutions have been the great variety in length, content, and quality of the various courses and the lack of accreditation or evaluation of the programs. The standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for library training programs and cooperatively evolved course outlines have been instrumental in securing some degree of uniformity in the states comprising that regional organization. Several states—Texas, Louisiana, Illinois, and Missouri, to name some—are working toward state-wide uniformity, but there has been nothing to bring about uniformity at the national level since the adoption by A.L.A. Council of the Minimum Requirements for Teacher Librarian Training Agencies in 1934, now long since inoperative. The Board of Education for Librarianship has never had the staff nor funds to make possible the accreditation of programs of less than library school proportions, and the Minimum Requirements were never used except for advisory purposes.

Now once more the Board has undertaken to formulate standards for undergraduate curricula of library science for teacher-education institutions, and it has done so at this time because it appears that accreditation of such programs may at last be feasible in cooperation with the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.
These standards were prepared by a special subcommittee appointed by the Board on which the American Association of School Librarians, the Association of College and Reference Libraries, and the State School Library Supervisors had representation. The Board of Education for Librarianship approved the standards at its midwinter meeting in 1952, and the A.A.C.T.E. accepted them in April for experimental use in its inter-visitation program.

Although worked out independently of the Ersted study, the standards in question have been drawn up with knowledge of that study. The final statement was prepared after criticisms and suggestions were secured from individual school librarians, school library supervisors, and faculties of both library schools and school library programs in teacher-education institutions, and after careful consideration of the tentative draft at the Workshop on the Professional Training of School Librarians held at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago on August 16-24, 1951. The points of agreement with the Ersted recommendations are most encouraging. Insofar as they parallel one another, the basic assumptions upon which the standards rest agree with those which Ersted sought to prove, and with the recommendations made in her study. They recognize the necessity for educational, as well as library, training for the school librarian. They consider as appropriate the undergraduate placement of basic education for school librarianship and provide both an upper and a lower limitation on such programs. They accept the concept of education for school librarianship which would require the same basic preparation for the part-time as for the full-time librarian, and they insist upon the articulation between undergraduate programs in library science and in the graduate library schools in the same area. Although no specific statement is made to that effect, the standard governing the curriculum implies that the education of a school librarian should prepare for service in both the elementary and secondary school. The one hypothesis of Ersted on which the standards are silent is that on which she gathered no evidence. It is that the professional education of the school librarian should begin in the undergraduate college or university program. Since the standards were designed for undergraduate programs in teacher-education institutions, such a stipulation, actually directed at the graduate library schools, would have been inappropriate. It might well be that the Board would not favor so rigid a restriction on library schools; and certainly the library schools might well expect more freedom of action in placing the basic
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elements in their programs for school library work as well as for other areas of librarianship.

The only other difference of any significance between the Ersted recommendations and the standards represents a point of view which needs considerable thought. Traditionally, the desirable academic preparation for all librarians has been conceived as including general education and subject specialization, and the standards rest upon this. Ersted's findings revealed a need for so wide a spread of subject knowledge on the part of school librarians as to cause her to conclude that several subject minors rather than one subject major would be preferable in their academic preparation, although she recognizes that this might be impossible in the light of institutional requirements.

With the strong backing of the American Association of School Librarians which can be expected for the Ersted study, with the acceptance of the corresponding standards developed by the Board of Education for Librarianship, and with the new patterns of library education which would appear to make such a program of education for school librarianship possible of articulation with graduate professional library education, the future looks hopeful. Not all library educators are convinced that undergraduate library education is desirable. Many who accept the concept of graduate library education based upon an undergraduate program of professional education oppose any specialization at the beginning level. Some would go so far as to provide no specialization even at the Master's level, and would depend entirely upon the subject specialization that the student brings to his general library education as preparing him for service in special types of libraries.

A recent study of the place of elective courses in the various types of library work made at Columbia University, however, although not conclusive, supports the assumption that school librarians do need specialization in school library objectives and functions. And since it reports findings in evidence that preparation for school library service makes for successful performance in other types of libraries, it may even strengthen the belief that graduate programs of library education can be based upon undergraduate programs set up particularly to prepare the beginning librarian for service to children and young people in the elementary and secondary schools. Research that would prove or disprove such a position is the most serious need at this point in the development of library education. We must have the resulting knowledge to meet the question, "Shall graduate education for school
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librarianship be tied to library or to teacher education?" The answer to that query must come before further directions can be charted.
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