

## School for Administrators: The Rutgers Carnegie Project

LIBRARY SCHOOLS offer only limited training to students for administrative responsibility in libraries. Matteoti, who had a penchant for classifying things academic, had he lived, would probably have arranged contemporary library administration courses in a most systematic manner. There would have emerged in his scheme the "cover-all" variety offered in a vacuum by instructors whose actual administrative experience occurred sometime between the Spanish-American War and the Bull-Moose campaign. Or, contrarily, the dynamic, human-relations oriented course taught by the scholar-teacher whose contacts with current administrative needs and practices are maintained through the medium of visits with the professional elite in hotel corridors at library conventions, gleaned by attendance at work-shops, or are painstakingly distilled from the latest treatise on "scientific" management. Generally, the educational background and lack of experience and maturity of the students prohibits full profit even of the most superlatively organized and conducted library school course. Traditionally, library administrative talent has been drawn from the ranks—from personnel whose opportunity for additional training beyond the degree stage has been largely limited to the on-the-job variety. This practice has led to what may be called a nose-to-the-grindstone philosophy of library management that is characteristically visionless, haphazard,

and entirely unsuited for the missile age. A lamentable state, a condition that has caused real concern to those in the profession who take the long and reflective look into the future when more and larger libraries will demand greater numbers of highly skilled administrators.

Lowell A. Martin, then dean of the Graduate School of Library Service at Rutgers, showed concern over the problem. His interest in the educational aspects of library administration is well known and of long standing. Under his direction the library school at Rutgers experimented with several types of realistic management training programs for practicing librarians. The educational theory supporting this Rutgers movement seems to rest on the belief that librarians serving in administrative positions, and still resilient enough to learn, benefit not only themselves but the profession generally by participating in a program tailored to cover intensively current library administrative problems, practices, and theories. There is conviction that the growth and development of libraries in the last thirty years and the resulting fragmentation of services has brought a host of problems the solutions of which call for enlightened and more informed management at every level within the profession. One of these experiments was reported by William B. Ready in his "The Rutgers Seminar for Library Administrators" (*CRL*, XVIII (1957), 281-83).

This is an informal report on the most recent "school for administrators" or executive training program conducted by

---

*Dr. Byrd is Associate Director of Libraries, Indiana University.*

Rutgers, March to June, 1958. It was described in the literature available to the participants as the Carnegie Project in Advanced Library Administration. The Rutgers registrar labeled it as "Field Course—Library Administration, 702." This program differed in many respects from the one reported by Mr. Ready: It was financed by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation; there were only eight students; all came from libraries which are members of the Association of Research Libraries; the curricular emphasis was primarily, but not wholly, on individual field work.

More specifically the experiment was a combined seminar and internship affair of twelve weeks: three of seminar, seven of field work, and two devoted to field trips. With the cooperation of the libraries of Rutgers, Princeton, Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins, New York Public, Columbia, Harvard, and Yale, a mutually agreed upon topic, broad in scope and generally relating to common problems in other research libraries, was assigned to each student for intensive study and reporting in one of the eight libraries.

The following librarians were selected to participate and were inducted as fellows at New Brunswick on March 3, 1958 for additional training: Cecil K. Byrd, associate director, Indiana University Libraries; William Harkins, associate director, University of Florida Libraries; Gustave A. Harrer, assistant director, Stanford University Libraries; John McDonald, assistant to the director, Washington University (St. Louis) Libraries; Natalie Nicholson, executive assistant to the director of libraries, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; William Pullen, then assistant librarian for technical processes, University of North Carolina Library; Richard Shoemaker, librarian, Dana Library, Rutgers University; James Skipper, assistant director, Michigan State University Library.

The first week, March 3-8, was spent at Rutgers in what might be termed briefing or indoctrination sessions. Librarians and staff members from the cooperating institutions appeared to describe each institution's libraries in general, and to discuss in full the study to be made by the fellow assigned there. In between these appearances in seminar and in informal conclave, meal times and evenings, the group discussed, argued, debated, and, occasionally, vehemently disagreed on the major problems confronting contemporary research libraries: buildings, use of space, staff, acquisitions, cataloging, public service, finance, growth, and interlibrary cooperation. At times these discussions almost reached the intellectual breadth and emotional intensity of those that characterize ARL meetings; for a few seconds, in charting future developments, the stratosphere of the Council on Library Resources was reached. While the student of "scientific" administration might aver the discussions related mostly to operations and hardly at all to management theory they were beneficial and the topics discussed are primary problems to be faced and solved by library management, now and tomorrow. Thus indoctrinated and buttressed with what one fellow described as "the best year's course in administration ever compressed into a one hundred and twenty hour work-week," the fellows departed to their assigned libraries for field work.

For one month the staffs of eight great eastern libraries patiently answered questions, supplied reams of data, conducted tours, and acted as social hosts to the fellows while they viewed, contemplated, questioned, surveyed and, sometimes, meditated. Byrd labored at Columbia on space requirements for books, readers, and staff for Columbia libraries for the next generation. Harkins reviewed the building program of the University of Pennsylvania. Harrer battled with relo-

cation, storage, and rejection of materials at Harvard. McDonald scrutinized the problems of library organization and service in a decentralized university—Rutgers. Nicholson worried and fretted over centralization of science libraries at Johns Hopkins. Pullen studied and puzzled through selective acquisitions at Yale. Shoemaker demonstrated what impact cataloging at the source would make on technical processes at Princeton. Skipper investigated interlibrary cooperation in the New York metropolitan area. (If Professors Metcalf and Martin decide the reports in final form are genuinely provocative and have general relevancy they will be published as a volume at a later date.)

Although the topics assigned to the fellows for study represented a concentration on a particular, and sometimes pressing, library problem of one of the eight institutions, and though most were approached from an applied rather than a theoretical avenue, all related in some degree to administration as it is currently practiced in research libraries. It can be quickly noted by reviewing the topics that none dealt with narrow segments of library operations. All demanded a fairly comprehensive grasp of the library complex at each institution. Problem solving of this type seems, to this reporter, the best possible training for library management.

At the end of one month in the field the fellows gathered at Harvard, April 7, for the beginning of a tour of each of the cooperating libraries. Beginning with Harvard two days were spent at each of the libraries in the following order: Yale, Columbia, New York Public, Princeton, Rutgers, Pennsylvania, and Johns Hopkins. These visits or inspection trips served a three-fold purpose. The resident fellow was given an opportunity to discuss his special study in detail both with the group and key members of the library staff and to hear

it criticized and enlarged upon. Staff members at each library most familiar with the subject matter of each fellow's study were available freely for lengthy and helpful consultation. Finally the opportunity to roam, question, and discuss administration in the eight libraries was in itself educational. There are common management practices in all research libraries which, if made known and formalized, could and would be applicable in all types of libraries.

The demand made by these group visits on library time and energy must have been considerable. The librarians and staffs of the cooperating libraries never lost equilibrium and, indeed, were so gifted in the art of hospitality that they even appeared to enjoy the presence of Metcalf and entourage. All went beyond the normal professional courtesies and provided the touring fellows with lunches, dinners, and other forms of gastro-nomic entertainment that were enjoyable, convivial, and fattening.

Somewhat road-worn the fellows departed from Johns Hopkins on April 24 to return to their respective libraries for three weeks additional study and the task of putting reports in preliminary written form.

The period from May 16 to noon of May 29 at Rutgers was devoted to reporting and further seminar lectures and discussions on library administration. One full day was allowed for each report. The preliminary written report was read before the group and the chief librarian, usually the associate librarian as well, of the institution where the study was made. Librarians were given first opportunity to correct, amend, agree, or disagree with the reporter, after which the fellows and teacher commented freely. Following this rather formal session, a closed seminar was given over to discussing the strength and weakness of the report. The critical comments and suggestions for changes provoked by

these post-mortems proved helpful to the fellows in writing the final draft of their reports.

Any assessment of the program must, I presume, start with the leadership and in final analysis be somewhat subjective. Those who have known Keyes Metcalf as a librarian may have been impressed with his seriousness, devotion to duty, knowledge, and unflagging zeal for the profession. To have known him as a classroom teacher was a privilege granted to only a few—too few. As a teacher I like to think the real and hidden Metcalf was revealed. He brought to his latter-day profession all of his accumulated knowledge plus a genuine and contagious enthusiasm—a prime requisite for successful teaching. His method was a mixture of the Socratic generously laced with disarming sincerity, boyish charm, and a mischievous nimbleness that permitted him a frequent misquoting of a fellow's remark for the sake of argument—and the incidental enjoyment of at least seven fellows. Never dogmatic or doctrinaire, and only occasionally long-winded, he was the personification of the mature scholar, prodding, probing, pulling and pushing eight fellows into his orbit. The wisdom he dispensed on administration, based on a half century of library experience, was encyclopedic, applicable, and assimilable.

The replies to a one-query questionnaire (the seminar decided such instruments of fact-gathering were not per se obnoxious but quickly became so with the supplying of answers) soon after the completion of the course asking what benefits the fellows received from the program were typical, characteristic and, perhaps, revealing only to a small degree because they were written too soon after the event: "I made seven new friends, gained a very large amount of knowledge, got a good perspective on our own problems, and had a whale of a good time," wrote one fellow known for brev-

ity and a passion for good living. Another admitted to "An immensely broadened understanding of what I, as a librarian, am about and how to do it, gained from discussions with many top-flight librarians, from observation of other fine libraries, and in particular, from close association with one of the world's great librarians and the finest group of fellows (and one woman) I've ever met." A non-speculative but keenly realistic fellow "felt that I acquired much practical, valuable information. Certainly the seminar talks were a training in getting to the heart of problems and taking the long forward look."

The two humorists-laureates of the group described their reactions. One said: "As for what I did (or did not) get from the seminar; this is a different breed of cats. First, I learned that it is most difficult to act intelligent for a three-month stretch when you really aren't. This type of bluff can succeed up to and including four weeks, but after that the jig's up!" The other: "For my own part, I feel that the seminar will be most valuable to me. As the most stupid of the group, I, of course, had the most to learn. At least, I now realize that there is actually no right or wrong solution to any administrative problem, but there may be many sides."

One fellow, and not the self-assertive type, found there were casual benefits: "Almost of equal importance was the knowledge gained daily from discussing mutual interest problems with my colleagues and in learning the practices regarding such problems at other institutions. There is much to be said also for the opportunities of having sat in conferences with the directors and some staff members of eight top research libraries, both on their home grounds and away from their libraries. . . ."

A most serious and diffident fellow found justification for his profession: "I

*(Continued on page 153)*

# The Harassed Humanities

(Continued from page 110)

preserved and extinction—the real extremity where only another kind of intelligence can effectively work. Military security can no longer be preserved by military or by scientific means. There is only one other means. We need the thinking of humanistic scientists, or, if you will, of humanists; we need the humanities. We need the man who speaks not only his own language, but the universal language of creative responsibility. And how simply one can illustrate: while the Russian embassy, seat of political power, was the scene of violent rioting in Washington, the Moiseyev dancers were performing before packed auditoriums throughout the country and young Van Cliburn had just returned from his spectacular triumph in Moscow; again, just after Richard Nixon was stoned by indignant mobs in Caracas, the San Francisco Ballet Company repeatedly performed, in that same city, to overflow audiences whose enthusiastic demands it could not meet because of a touring schedule. There is a language, a greater

language than that of politics or statistics or cold but killing formulae, a language that all men speak and understand: it is the language of human culture. We have never needed to hear that language so desperately as we need to hear it today in the councils of power. But to give it voice, we must first supply Mr. Nixon, Mr. Dulles, and many others, with an education in the humanities. If any one of you wishes to suggest a curriculum, you can reach these worthies at either Number One Madison Avenue or Number One Main Street. The addresses designate the same place.

How beautifully W. B. Yeats put it: "The artist loves above all life at peace with itself." It could not be otherwise, for his function, after all, is the creation of harmonies and unities, those monuments of unaging intellect that comprise the order of civilization and preserve it for us to carry on. In the last analysis, what other study is worth our time? William Blake told us why: "Where Man Is Not, Nature Is Barren."

## The Book in the USSR

It can safely be said that the book has played an outstanding part in the cultural revolution accomplished in the USSR. Being accessible to the people, becoming part and parcel of the Soviet man's everyday life, the book is now a thing of prime necessity.

Statistics on book publishing and sales are usually a fairly reliable index of the cultural, and even of the scientific, development of a nation. One may guess that there is a correlation of considerable significance between the large circulation of books and so advanced a scientific achievement as the launching of the first earth satellites.—Yuri Gvosdev, Assistant Commercial Counselor of the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in *Iron Curtains and Scholarship: The Exchange of Knowledge in a Divided World, Papers Presented before the Twenty-Third Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, July 7-9, 1958*, ed. by Howard W. Winger (Chicago: 1958), p.43.