A search through professional literature brings to light a wealth of material on the administration of school libraries. This points to problems which educators and librarians alike find unsolved, as they continue to investigate methods of providing adequate library service to schools efficiently and economically. The present trend toward consolidation in government is directing the thoughts of some authorities toward unification of all local education, both formal and informal, under one board. However, "While contractual arrangements for cooperative library service offer a promising means of securing more adequate opportunities than most communities now provide, the device should be considered as a step toward ultimate unification of educational resources, rather than as an end in itself." Such arrangements are not likely to be widespread for many years, and the immediate problem of reaching all children and young people with books and library service calls for serious attention and a thorough understanding of the potentialities of the school library.

The distinction between the terms "school library" and "library service to schools" is not always sharply drawn, and the two are apt to be used interchangeably. Any evaluation of library service to children and young people in schools, and any consideration of the administrative control of school library service, must distinguish clearly between them. They may supplement each other, but they are neither identical nor comparable. According to the definition presented in School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, three elements are essential in the school library: "(1) the librarian, (2) the book collection, and (3) the library quarters." The collection of materials must be organized to meet the needs of the faculty and pupils of a given school on a permanent basis. Yet many book collections referred to in the literature as school libraries are really centers for the distribution of books, with one or the other of the above essentials missing.
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In contrast, "library service to schools" implies temporary loans of books and other materials provided from some central source, with the personnel shared by a number of schools or provided by a central agency. Often school libraries, both elementary and secondary, have evolved through a series of stages from temporary teachers' loans, to classroom collections, and finally to centralized school libraries. In Schools and Public Libraries Working Together in School Library Service, a statement of principles for school library service is made. These principles are based on the premise that both elementary and secondary schools need libraries to carry out their responsibilities to their pupils, and that adequate library service is not provided "through classroom collections alone." Even the "establishment of self-contained classrooms in elementary schools" will require a centralized library if adequate service is to be provided.

The present patterns of school library organization are legion. There are libraries operating with well-equipped quarters and book collections under the administration of a full-time staff in schools at all levels and of various types—elementary, junior high, and senior high schools and various combinations of the three, and likewise in vocational and technical schools. Lucile Fargo has presented a clear picture of the varieties of school library service in The Library in the School, including that for rural schools. It is also pointed out that variations of the pattern may exist in the same systems, with some schools having adequate libraries and others depending on service through temporary or permanent classroom collections. Even where there is centralization of materials there may be no professional staff, and service must be provided by teachers or by a student staff. Another pattern appears in the consolidated school, which may have a centralized library supplemented by loans from a county library. Bookmobile service from either the county library or the office of the county superintendent may provide the classroom collections or supplement the reading program of the school.

As concerns secondary institutions, "Most high school administrators and trustees agree that the secondary school library is an essential if specialized type of educational service." Stimulated further by the standards of accrediting bodies and more largely by the expanding secondary curriculum, school boards in most communities have developed centralized and organized libraries in secondary schools having an enrollment of over two hundred.

The elementary school library also is now gradually coming into
its own, less because of accrediting bodies than from conviction of its value in the education of children. The thirtieth yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association, which was published in 1951, was devoted entirely to the status of elementary school libraries. The Foreword states that "Elementary-school principals and classroom teachers in recent years have become increasingly alert to the vast potentialities of their school libraries. Well-organized, adequately equipped, and properly staffed instructional materials centers are now considered essential to the type of educational program that extends beyond the textbook and the classroom." This is the second yearbook of that body to be concentrated on the subject of school libraries, the twelfth in 1933 having also been comprised entirely of papers on their new development. Its preface included a brief survey of the school library movement in relation to the National Education Association, and pointed out the scant attention given to elementary school libraries in previous issues.

Examination of administrative practices as represented in these two yearbooks shows that there is still a long way to go before the ideal of a "well-organized, adequately equipped, and properly staffed instructional materials center" is found in every elementary school, although much progress was made in the eighteen years between them. Almost every conceivable form of library service is discussed in the two publications, which are significant even though the 1951 Editorial Committee states: "the pages which follow contain opinions and practices which, in some cases, are in direct opposition to each other. The Editorial Committee is inclined to believe that as yet there is no single right way, no one best answer to many of the problems evolving from this relatively new field."

To fully understand the reasons for a lack of uniformity in the administrative control of school libraries, one needs to delve into the development of this department of the school. Cecil and Heaps, in School Library Service in the United States, give a rather thorough historical survey of the school library, and Carleton Jocikel in The Government of the American Public Library, devotes considerable space to the early laws which laid the foundation for the subsequent "school-district" library, the forerunner of the public library. Had the school-district library law which was passed in New York State in 1835 been based on the demands of the school curriculum rather than on theoretical and legislative planning, school libraries might have
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developed rapidly. But the types of libraries born of this law were not conducive to enrichment of the curriculum, nor were schools yet ready for "materials centers." The "school-district" libraries formed the nucleus of the town library, out of which the public library movement grew, rather than of the modern school library.

In consequence, the school library, or rather, school library service, has long been associated in varying degrees with an educational agency which, in its popular aspect, is a more recent institution than the school, namely, the public library. In its early days the public library devoted attention to the development of technical skills and practices and built up personnel adept in methods of distribution and stimulation of interest in books among people of all ages. Early leaders in the public library were concerned about the lack of books in schools. As a result the earliest form of library service in schools was that provided by public libraries. Both institutions needed each other; the school required personnel trained to organize and make widest use of book collections in the interest of the school's objectives, and the public library sought the potential readers found in the school. However, with the increasing support and rapid growth of the tax-supported public library, the modern concept of the library profession evolved with emphasis on the individual and on service. Imbued with the desire to reach all potential readers, the public library often extended its service to the schools as the most direct channels to youth, so that an "outside" agency developed a service essential to the effective school curriculum.

The two institutions have also been closely related legally; in some cases, both have been administered by one board. In some states at present the responsibility for public library development rests in the state department of education, while in others it is the responsibility of a separate body. Studies show that "In . . . the rise and development of school library service, two divergent points of view regarding the final responsibility for this service were clearly discernible, one that it belongs to the public library, the other that it belongs to the school. These viewpoints . . . rested upon two fundamentally different conceptions of public library administration. According to one conception, the district public school library idea, the administration of the public library is a function of the public school. From another point of view, the public library is not a subordinate agency, but a coordinate one, also concerned with education, and in 'bringing to all people the books that belong to them'." 12
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Even though the public library in most cities is an agency "outside" the control of the schools, the schools and public libraries have long been closely associated professionally. The first department of the National Education Association devoted to the study of the school library was the Library Department, created through the instigation of Melvil Dewey in 1896. That interest in the subject was also felt in public library circles was evident in a symposium on cooperation between libraries and schools, reported in 1897. Librarians of a number of large public libraries, such as those at Cleveland, Worcester, Dayton, and Milwaukee, presented the methods followed in their respective libraries for bringing books and children together.

Other ties are evidenced in joint publications and in the development of school library standards, as well as in professional organizations. Evaluation of school library practices and the drawing up of standards for improvement of library service have been carried on by the professional organizations of both educators and librarians. The first norms for school libraries were popularly known as the Certain Standards, because C. C. Certain headed the joint committee of the Department of Secondary Education of the National Education Association and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools which defined them. Combined activity of librarians and educators is seen in the 1940 edition of How to Evaluate a Secondary School Library, which was sponsored by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards and the American Library Association; and also in School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, prepared by a joint committee of the American Association of School Librarians, a section of the American Library Association, and the Division of Libraries for Children and Young People of that same body.

Although we have seen that the initiative for the administration of school library services has often been taken by the public library, in many cities school libraries thus established finally became school departments fully supported by the boards of education. In a smaller number of cases school libraries came to be administered jointly by the board of education and the library board. In a comparatively few cities where the public library is operating under the "school-district" library law, the board of education is responsible for both the public and the school library. There remain a few instances where the public library alone provides school library service. Cecil and Heaps mention such a possibility as one of three important types of administrative control. The California library law allowed for this
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type of organization in permitting school boards to contract with county libraries for school library service, although since 1945 the law has permitted the school districts to establish their own centralized libraries, from which service to the rural schools can be extended.21

In no other department of the school is there a comparable situation with regard to external control by an "outside" agency. The athletic program is not directed by the city recreation department. Other special departments such as art, home economics, and music are considered to be entirely the responsibility of the school, with only informal cooperative activities with related city institutions.

Regarding cooperative administration by the board of education and by the library board, it has been said that "Cooperative arrangements for support are so varied that no identical plan could be found." 22 In some cities such cooperative plans apply only to the elementary schools, with the board of education solely responsible for libraries in the high schools; in other cities the entire system of school libraries is provided through an agreement with library boards.23 The agreement is sometimes a written contract, with clearly defined responsibilities for each institution, and in other cases it is merely an informal arrangement. The most common type of cooperative administration is that in which the board of education provides the quarters, equipment, janitor service, and a portion of the book funds. The library board contributes personnel, book funds, supervision, and technical processing. A study of the general practice under the varying forms of cooperative administration reveals that the public library usually retains administrative responsibility.24 In Pittsburgh, however, the school library supervisor is a member of the supervisory staff of the schools, is paid and selected by the board of education, and has two offices—one in the board of education administration building and one in the public library, where she serves as head of the "schools department." 25 It is in this area of agreement and allocation of definite responsibility that the success of cooperative administration lies, according to Krarup. Notable examples of well-developed systems of cooperative administration are found in Cleveland,26 Cleveland Heights,27 and Lakewood, Ohio,28 Madison, Wisconsin, 27 and a number of other cities where the public library and the schools are administered either by one board or by a committee appointed by the board of education.

Cooperative administration is very commonly found in rural areas
where county library branches have been placed in school buildings or where the schools are regular bookmobile stops. Often this bookmobile service is partially financed through the pooling of school funds allocated to the county library. In reference to establishment of public library branches in school buildings to be operated as school libraries, Leigh comments, “This practice has created a unified system of libraries for children in the community and has made full use of the reservoirs of experience possessed by children’s librarians in building the school collections. But it has frequently created some serious administrative problems.” Among the advantages of joint administration that have been cited are economy of operation through centralization of technical processes, professional supervision, accessibility to a large reservoir of materials, and ease of transition from the use of school libraries to that of public libraries as young people leave school. On the other hand, a number of disadvantages have also been noted, such as “divided supervision,” “less interest in school curriculum” and the fact that “school authorities do not have as much control over the library program as if they had it alone.” Leigh also refers to the discrepancy in salaries, working hours, and vacations between the school librarian and the teacher in the same building, pointing out as one problem of joint administration the fact that “It puts into a school service unit, which for effectiveness needs to be an integral part of curriculum planning and operations, a person whose primary allegiance administratively is to an organization outside school.” Willett also implies there may be inequities such as those mentioned above when the school librarian is a member of the public library staff and also a staff member of the school, but indicates that Lakewood has reached a compromise solution of this problem.

In Schools and Public Libraries Working Together in School Library Service a number of instances of informal and voluntary cooperative arrangements are noted, under which expenses are shared in some communities and not in others. Such arrangements can be ended at any time on the initiative of either the school or the public library. There have been situations when cooperative agreements had to be terminated, as in the case of Portland, Oregon, where the public library found its service to the general public hampered because of increasing demands from schools without proportionate financial support for the public library. Miles and Martin point out that economy is a strong argument in favor of joint administration, but warn against allowing it to endanger educational efficiency. Furthermore, a tend-
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cency to delay the development of an adequate library program, especially in the elementary schools, is noted by both Mae Graham and Helen Sattley when the public library provides an extensive reading service program in schools. An excellent example of voluntary cooperation between the two independent institutions is that found in Baltimore, however, where unnecessary duplication of activities is avoided through establishment of a Joint Administrative Committee, with representation of school, children’s, and youth librarians on the supervisory staff of both schools and public libraries.

Present practice reveals a vast majority of school libraries, over 95 per cent, administered and controlled by boards of education. The literature on the subject reflects the policy that school libraries, both elementary and secondary, should be the responsibility of boards of education, just as are other essential departments of the school. Two of the advantages of joint administration appear to be equally attainable when the board of education establishes and controls school libraries, namely, the centralization of technical processes and supervision. Los Angeles, Detroit, and Denver are representative of the large cities in which well-developed school library departments exist as part of the general school system. Chicago has recently developed a similar department, described by Dilla MacBean.

A trend toward some degree of state administration of school libraries is observed through the increasing number of state supervisory positions in this field. Both Pennsylvania and California have recently made requests for a state supervisor for school libraries, each stipulating that the position should be in the state department of education on the same basis as that of supervisors of other subjects. Moreover, it is recommended in School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow that “a program of school library supervision with qualified personnel be included in every state department of education.” Such a plan provides a clearing house of information for all concerned with curriculum building. Coordination of school library activities on a state-wide basis can thus be achieved. That the state supervisor or consultant can increase local library development along efficient lines is evident in reports from individual states. For instance, in Tennessee, Louise Meredith states that within the past few years there have been appointed in five city and county systems a library supervisor “to promote and coordinate the library program.”

Recognition that adequate school library service is least easily and commonly provided for the small school, either urban or rural,
is widely evident. It is general for city schools systems to have well-developed libraries in large high schools and to secure service to small schools and to the elementary schools through the public library, either on a formal or informal basis. It is becoming more common to make provision for service to rural schools on a state-wide basis, through the county library or through centralization under the direct supervision of county boards of education. California’s cooperative arrangement with the county libraries is described by Mildred Batchelder; 43 and a more recent plan in the same state, which permits school districts to organize their own centralized library service, is described by Ziebold.21 In Illinois the “Community Unit District” has been created through the consolidation of small school districts, which forms the basis for an experimental school library service to those schools thus reorganized. Viola James 44 reports that the variation of grade combinations has brought about a need for changes in the existing patterns of library service. She cites resulting developments, such as the need for a library coordinator in each district; centralization of materials and technical processes; the supplementing of materials from the resources of the public, county, or state library; the interchange of materials between schools; and the introduction of summer library programs. The gains for the small school district are much the same as those in the consolidation of schools.

Wilma Bennett’s 45 study of a possible regional library service for the school libraries of Indiana points the way toward a similar unifying of service in a unit large enough to insure adequate support, supervision, and efficiency. The “Parish Materials Center” 46 established in Webster Parish of Louisiana is another example of a method of aiding a number of small schools more efficiently and economically than they can serve themselves by maintaining a completely independent organization. In all of these large unit plans, stress is laid on maintenance of local administration.

Recent literature 47 has introduced a proposal to offer library service to children and youth entirely through the school library. Any prediction that the school library will supplant the children’s room in the public library in the near future seems premature in the light of the status of school libraries in elementary schools at present.48 Leigh 49 in the Public Library Inquiry observed little indication of the school’s ability or readiness to provide the whole function of library service to children and youth.

In spite of the many excellent school libraries reported under co-
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operative administration, the trend of thought as reflected in the professional literature is toward the school library administered, supported, and controlled through the board of education. It seems to be strongly felt that "The library most closely integrated with a school's educational program and best serving its needs is the one that develops from within the school." 50
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