From a Bishop to a King: Seventy-Five Years of Information Education at the University of Michigan

A Simple Chronology

1926	Regents create Department of Library Science with W. W. Bishop as chair (the first course in library science offered for academic credit by the University of Michigan was in 1882)
1927	First class (34 members) graduates with ABLS
1928	American Library Association (ALA) accredits program
1930	First alumni reunion in Ann Arbor. First alumni dinner at ALA in New Haven, Conn.
1936	Constitution adopted for an Alumni Society
1940	Rudolph Gjelsness succeeds Bishop as department chair
1948	AMLS replaces ABLS degree. Ph.D. program inaugurated. End of undergraduate program.
1964	Wallace J. Bonk becomes chair of department
1967	Russell Bidlack succeeds Bonk as acting chair and later, as Chair
1968	Department moves from General (now Hatcher) Library to Winchell House, West Quadrangle
1969	Library Science Department becomes School of Library Science. Russell Bidlack appointed Dean
1984	Bidlack retires as Dean. Richard M. Dougherty appointed Acting Dean
1985	Robert M. Warner appointed Dean
1986	Name changes to School of Information and Library Studies
1988	School moves to renovated quarters in West Hall
1991	School grants 8,000th degree
1992	Daniel F. Atkins appointed Dean; “post-library-

	school" era begins
1996	Name changes to School of Information; recasting of mission
1998	Gary M. Olson appointed Interim Dean
2000	John L. King becomes Dean

Introduction

The documents and works on librarianship and library education in the years before the Second World War—and indeed, well into the 1960s—initially strike a contemporary reader as representing a strangely distant social and cultural frame. First, one is struck at the small size and relatively homogenous group that dominated the library profession—the second generation of library leaders of which Michigan's group was a part remained intellectually Victorian. Unlike their direct generational forebears, the graduates of the 1890s cohort were trained in the curriculum of the modern university with its stress on social and natural sciences and humanities, rather than the older focus on theology, philosophy, Classics, and timeworn texts. Despite the curricular shift, however, the 1890s generation hewed very closely to a very linear, Western European-focused notion of historical progress and intellectual traditions. Viewing the scholarly life as the fruit of a tradition that began in Sumer and Egypt and moved through Greece, Rome, Paris, London, finally landing tentatively in Chicago for the 1893 Colombian Exposition, American librarians still felt a bit awed by their European counterparts. Though America was no longer

the home of Fennimore Cooper or Wild Bill Cody—Andrew Carnegie, Frederick Taylor, and Henry Ford were soon to their place in the public consciousness—American intellectuals still felt compelled to travel to Europe whenever possible to reënhance their portfolios of cultural capital assets. As a consequence, for example, book purchasing expeditions went to Paris, London, Rome, and Leipzig, not to Dakar, Tokyo, or Buenos Aries. In the minds of the library generation of the 1890s, the latter venues were at best derivatives of European culture (a bit like the US itself); at worst, they were simply backward.

This sort of cultural epistemology formed the foundation of the American Library Association's world-view from its origins in 1876 until the last third of the twentieth century. Yet the ALA's vision was tightly rooted in the Enlightenment tradition and thus constituted a fairly progressive perspective. That perspective viewed an informed citizenry as the basis for a democratic polity and, attentive to First Amendment concerns with free speech, the ALA has long fought against censorship and for broad public access. Igor Stravinsky's Rite of Spring elicited conservative, pro-censorship riots when it opened in Paris in 1912, but American librarians had few qualms about accessioning the score. Like the emergence of public zoos in the late nineteenth century and their way of turning the private

menageries of aristocrats into sites for broad public discovery and education, the public library played an important political role. In America, public libraries (and museums) eclipsed the private collections of bound volumes and cabinets of curiosities; knowledge once cordoned off for the elite became accessible to all citizens and residents. There was, of course, a rather condescending paternalism in this view—the unwashed masses could be “civilized” by exposure to the great books of western culture—but it was a liberal sort of paternalism, and one that was jealously guarded. In his self-published autobiography, Paul Wasserman, a 1960s Michigan Library Science Ph.D. (and later, the first Dean of the University of Maryland’s library school) recounts how he presented a statistical study of library users to an ALA committee, demonstrating that public libraries serve the already-reading public, not succeeding in expanding that reading public—and he was roundly cold-shouldered professionally.[1] Indeed, from the very start, library practitioners have encouraged a sort of missionary zeal for social and cultural improvement in their professional practice.

The ALA philosophy had considerable impact on how academic, research, public and school librarians have traditionally viewed their duties—and

---

[1] Paul Wasserman, *The Best of Times* (Detroit: Omnipress, 2000), 247.

many of those concerns have survived into the Information Age. Three basic functions fulfill that mission. First, librarians must be experts at amassing information via collection building, sensitive to their user populations' concerns. This perspective dictates, for example, that libraries need to be specialized into broad categories—a collection intended for biomedical professionals would have little traffic in a public library in Anniston, Alabama. For that reason, there has long been a categorization of library types, from academic/research, to school, public, and "special," the latter encompassing everything from IBM's in-house library to the Leo Baeck Institute. More subtly, collection-building is ideally a process of subtle negotiation between the librarian and local readers, with the librarian aware of what she thinks the reader should want and what actually gets read. In this post-custodial, digital age of distributed library resources, this role reflects in addition the amassing of (usually hypertext) pointers, but it remains a task of mobilizing information and knowledge resources.

Second, by cataloguing and classification, librarians systematically try to make some sense out of an otherwise disordered and burgeoning mass of information. The Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress cataloguing systems were designed to link conceptualized organizational hierarchies of

knowledge into a physical ordering of shelves, thereby facilitating browsing in the stacks. (In the often-closed stacks of European libraries, books are usually shelved by size and accession date, so that a gloss on Flaubert might sit next to a study of intestinal parasites.) Though most users ignore the classification systems used by Web portals and search engines such as Yahoo or Google, when used wisely such systems can uncover resources often not accessible by way of a typical brute-force keyword search. The content of the classifying task has certainly shifted in the digital age, but its social and intellectual function remains.

Finally, the reference function serves to connect users to resources. As experts in what is available and how it is stored and accessed, reference librarians and information professionals crucially make readers' investigations more, as it were, efficient. Again, after negotiations with users to discern their needs, librarians fence in and provide easy access to vast fields of knowledge. Whether that knowledge is held in bound volumes, printed maps, microfilms, or databases matters little: the function survives. Together, these three core functions of librarianship—collection-building, classification/cataloguing, and reference—have been constants in library and information practice from its origins as a quasi-gentleman's trade to the current age of electronically-stored bytes. For that reason, a

continuous thread of information practices ties the old and new, and talk of ruptures between an "LIS tradition" and the new information schools (whether at Michigan or the University of Washington) reflect more a shift in institutional frameworks and information media than in the conceptual frames and practices information professionals and educators use.

The characteristics and content of library practice in the above three activities have in large part helped to determine the gender composition of librarianship. Library and Information Science are service professions, certainly, but so are auto repair and anesthesiology—largely male trades. Much of the work of practicing librarians and their information professional cousins involves, as noted above, negotiation rather than dictation. Collection-building and reference work have to be sensitive not only to broad user-community needs and desires, they must also be attentive to individual user needs. Whether in an educational library, where the librarian must take care not to over-direct the student, or in a knowledge laboratory, where the information scientist must cull nuggets of knowledge from the dross of the Web, interaction is the key activity. Of course, in western culture, men tend to be more directive and commandist, while women are much more adept at sensing individual needs and negotiating. As a consequence, library practice tends to be a largely

feminine profession, and women have traditionally made up the vast majority of library studies students. As we shall see below, however, Michigan's library education has long had a much higher proportion of men than most other such schools, largely because of Michigan's leadership in training library administrators and research/scholarly librarians. Since the shift in the School's mission in the mid-1990s, the student body has become less feminine. This is a consequence of the addition of offerings in policy-making, economics, and interface design—traditionally male domains. Nonetheless, interface design ideally involves social negotiation with putative users, so at present, that area is evenly divided by gender.

A commonly espoused notion of information today is that each byte of information points to others: by this analysis knowledge is a seamless web of information. Classification systems are intended to make those matrices conceptually accessible, yet they remain ethereal, abstract, and disembodied. Knowledge, by contrast, is embodied. It is socially and culturally located and as a consequence, mobilizing knowledge resources is in part a social activity. Library education at Michigan has implicitly recognized this throughout its history, most notably in the international social networking pursued by the faculty. Just as Warner Bishop headed

the International Federation of Library Associations and catalogued manuscripts for the Vatican Library, Rudolf Gjelsness helped develop the Franklin Library in Mexico City, Robert Warner presided over the International Council on Archives, and John King…

Initial Conceptions and Practices in Library Education

Library education (as it was then known) began at the University of Michigan in 1882 to fulfill a simple purpose: to provide the University Library with a skilled staff for overseeing its own operations. Courses, such as they were, consisted of apprenticeships and workshops, followed by non-credit summer sessions increasingly open to non-University people. Generally termed, “Library Methods,” and taught by senior Library staff beginning in 1908, Michigan’s first library education efforts formed part of a national basis for a workshop-and-apprenticeship approach followed in a variety of venues ranging from the New York State Library, the Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh, and a set of Chautauqua programs in the Finger Lakes region of New York State. (Figure 1)

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/Archive/1900-1929/Photos/Methods_fac_1914.jpg>

Figure 1. University of Michigan Library Methods Faculty, 1914

Thanks to the efforts of Melvil Dewey, the first formal library schools emerged in New York—at Columbia University (founded by Dewey himself), the Pratt Institute and the New York State Library (also founded by Dewey)—in the late nineteenth century. By 1910, a prestigious, second-generation community of librarians and library educators had emerged, most of whom did not have formal library school training, if for no other reason than the paucity of credible Master's-level programs. Among that second generation was William Warner Bishop, employed (after a sojourn in Europe and various teaching positions) in 1908 as Supervisor of the Reading Room at the Library of Congress (LC). In that capacity, Bishop, a Michigan BA in Classics, led tours of LC for distinguished guests, one of whom, in 1914, turned out to be a Regent of the University of Michigan. Shortly thereafter, William Clemens (after whom and by whom the Clements Library was named and founded), an avid bibliophile and collector of manuscripts and Americana (as well as a Regent), dropped in

on Bishop in Washington. After a long, yet often obtuse conversation, Clemens returned to Michigan and successfully urged that the Regents "retire" the current Library Director, Theodore Koch, and offer the position to Bishop. Elated, Bishop moved to his alma mater in the Summer of 1915.

Providing library training and education as a basic function of the University was not immediately a part of Bishop's agenda. Rather, in close collaboration with the famed architect, Albert Kahn, Bishop's first priority was to oversee a massive expansion of the University Library (now Hatcher Library), its collection, and its staff. While Bishop was troubled by the lack of trained staff for the expanded library, he gave little priority to training librarians in-house apart from the existing Library Methods courses. In a letter to E. C. Richardson in 1918, Bishop wrote:

> I am in no way interested to maintain and direct an ordinary library school, after the type of Wisconsin and Western Reserve. I am very much in hopes that we may establish here certain advanced instruction, perhaps a bibliographic seminary. In order to do this we need, of course, an instructing force. …I want people who are distinctly of the grade of university instructors, and who can rank as Assistant or Associate Professors, as they work up; but I do not seem to have any success in finding them.[2]

[2] Claud G. Sparks, *William Warner Bishop: A Biography* (University of Michigan School of Library Science dissertation, 1967), 334.

There is little other evidence that Mr. Bishop wished to pursue the matter at that time, and whether his reluctance resided in not wanting to offer a second-rate program or in the inability to locate competent faculty is unclear.

Expanding the University Library included not only clearing a backlog of over 20,000 non-catalogued volumes (for which Bishop desperately needed trained cataloguers), it also meant beefing up the collection, particularly with books produced in Europe. Already competent in French, German, Italian, Latin, and Ancient Greek, and having already studied and bought books in Europe, Bishop looked across the sea—but, of course, there was a war going on, so he had to wait. In the interim and at the unanimous request of the Board of the American Library Association he stood for election as President in the summer of 1918, winning handily. From that vantage point he began to network with top-flight librarians worldwide, getting books to service personnel, setting up consolidated book orders, and planning for the postwar library world in Europe. It should also be noted that within the ALA debate was raging over the 1909 cataloguing rules; some favored replacing the code, while Bishop sought simply to revise it. Finding an ally in that approach was Margaret Mann, and bishop had Ms. Mann lead the committee for the ALA, starting a close relationship

that would last for decades to come. Margaret Mann, trained in a high-school level library training program at the Armour Institute (now part of the Illinois Institute of Technology, though with its library school moved to Champaign-Urbana) was already a world-renowned expert in cataloguing. By the late 1930s, her textbook on cataloguing had become the standard in most library schools in the Anglophone world.[3]

By taking on the ALA presidency, Warner Bishop (as he was called) initiated a practice of almost all directors of library education at the University of Michigan: to serve as heads of the peak professional organizations, whether of the ALA in the case of Bishop, Rudolf Gjelsness, and Russell Bidlack, or of the Society of American Archivists, as with Robert M. Warner. Indeed, one of the key activities of such leaders at Michigan was to stay on top of the intellectual activities and practices of the profession by presiding over professional organizations. In a field that for many years had little deeply scholarly or theoretical activity—most of the articles in Library Journal tended to be how-tos or reports—the center of intellectual action was in the ALA and its state affiliates. The strategy of providing leadership to the profession also facilitated powerful visibility

---

[3] The ALA published Ms Mann's the Classification and Cataloguing of Books in 1928.

for the University Library and (later) the program in library instruction, thereby assuring hiring access and attraction to the most competent practitioners and teachers in the field. Similarly, this enhanced student placements.

The initial curriculum was sited strategically between two different conceptions of library education. One approach stressed the destinations of the students by the type of libraries into which they would be hired, whether academic, public, school, or special. This trajectory assumed that user needs and internal procedures differed markedly among the various types of libraries. Alternatively, one could approach all libraries as having certain procedures and conceptual frameworks in common, including classification, cataloguing, reference, and (surprisingly) acquisitions and collection development. For decades, the choice between these two frameworks was implemented by teaching a common core knowledge, as outlined in the latter case, while being highly attuned to the needs of employers through a careful and active placement function. In addition, later courses in a student's program were specifically adapted to future sites of employment. By this means, all Library Methods (and later, Library and Information Science and School of Information) students shared a considerable body of core knowledge and, implicitly, they came to

constitute a cognitive community of sorts—a geographically dispersed yet conceptually coherent corps of Michigan-trained library and information professionals, a "virtual community" before the term was invented. This triumvirate of core courses (cataloguing/classification, reference, and acquisitions) remained at the center of library education until the early 1990s.

As Director of the University Library, Dr. Bishop was responsible for collection-building, an activity which required him to travel around the nation and to Europe to purchase books. In an effort spearheaded by FW Kelsey, a UM anthropologist (after whom the Kelsey Museum is named), Bishop helped to support the acquisition of numerous papyri from the Eastern Mediterranean in 1920, making UM (along with Yale) one of the key holders of such artifacts in the US. In a trip to Europe in 1921, Bishop deepened his professional relationship with Margaret Mann, then working at the École des bibliothèquaires in Paris.[4] Her position at the École was not permanent, per se; it was funded by private American foundations, particularly the Carnegie Corporation, in an effort to help revitalize European intellectual life after the Great War. With a modicum of

[4] At the École, Mann developed a lifelong friendship with Yvonne Oddone, a leading light of French librarianship and later, a decorated Resistance fighter.

prodding, Dr. Bishop managed to convince Margaret Mann to join the University of Michigan Department of Library Science—which at the time did not exist. The offer was, of course, contingent upon the University of Michigan Regents approving of such a program, something which they had been reluctant to do.

Upon his return to Michigan Dr. Bishop attempted anew to get his program approved, yet it was not until he was offered a position at Columbia University's Library School that the Regents approved the chartering of a library education program at the University of Michigan, in 1926. Initially, Dr. Bishop was offered the option of library education being located in its own school or placed under the aegis of the Literary College, as the College of Letters, Sciences, and Arts was then known. Dr. Bishop chose the latter course, apparently for two reasons. First, the rationale was intellectual: in Dr. Bishop's opinion, what made for a good librarian was a considerable store of general knowledge in the arts and sciences—today known as "cultural capital"—supplemented by professional knowledge of library theory and practice. To separate library education from the University's essential base in arts and sciences would, in Bishop's assessment, cut off the air supply to library education. Secondly, enjoying considerable intra-university support from John Effinger, the Dean of the

Literary College, Dr. Bishop no doubt sensed that the new program would be safer and more solidly supported there. This decision, carefully considered at the time, would have serious implications for the future. By the mid-1930s, Dr. Bishop, urged in part by the ALA and by the emergence of a formidable new library school at the University of Chicago, began to seek school status from the University and Regents—an effort that was successful only by a Regent's decision in the Summer of 1968.

The Department of Library Science's inaugural year was 1926-27, and the staffing and curriculum put forward unambiguously revealed Bishop's agenda. Sidney Mitchell, a top-flight library educator who was highly respected in collection development offered two courses in that area—though Mitchell left the following year to become the Dean of California University's (now University of California-Berkeley) library school, despite Bishop's pleas that he stay. Mitchell also taught two courses in Library Administration, underlining an early Department of Library Science (DLS) goal: to give as much attention to training library managers as to educating practitioners. Eunice Wead was brought over from the Clemens Library to teach courses in reference, as well as to assist Margaret Mann in her massive offerings in cataloguing and classification. Finally, Edith Thomas, curator of rare books in the University Library, taught courses in ephemera

and non-print materials as well as a course for high school librarians. Tellingly, of seventeen courses offered in DLS' first year, five were in cataloguing and classification, four were in reference and bibliography work, three covered library administration, and two addressed collection-building. While the offerings might appear banal for the twenty-first century, the choice to expend major resources teaching administration is obvious. DLS graduates were, even then, being primed to manage and lead the library profession.

The program requirements were a bit complicated, but they reflected a recognition to train both practitioners and leaders. The basic degree offered was a ABLS, a Bachelor's degree in Library Science, intended for practitioners. Students were admitted into this program after having completed 90 undergraduate credits, presumably at the end of the junior year. Most entering students had done the bulk of their undergraduate elective courses in English or History. ABLS holders were usually placed in public and high school libraries. DLS also offered a "second-year" program, offering a Master's degree (AMLS) for aspiring academic librarians and library administrators. Applicants had to have a bachelor's degree in hand, with a transcript showing 24 credits in library science. Indicative of the cultural presuppositions of Bishop and Dean Effinger, all

entering AMLS students had to have certifiable reading knowledge of French and German, with two years' of Latin "strongly recommended." Significantly, the AMLS degree required up to twelve credits in cognate courses; these cold cover any number of areas, from librarianship in chemistry (offered by that department), to a history of texts and topical history seminars offered by the History Department. The strategy of requiring cognates not only reinforced the reigning library philosophy that good librarians were well-trained generalists with technical skills, it also allowed for specialization in specific subject areas. On this latter vector, later AMLS students studied medical records, radio and video production, and European area studies. Within a short time, the division of goals among the three DLS tracks became much clearer: the BMLS was for practicing public, school, and special librarians, the AMLS served academic librarians and administrators, and the summer session courses helped to sharpen the skills and credentials of mid-career librarians.

In its first years, DLS was certainly a shoestring operation in a financial sense. During the 1926-27 academic year, only Mann, Wead, and Mitchell were paid full-time in the Department of Library Science. Bishop's salary was covered entirely by his continuing role as Director of the University Library. Total salaries paid by DLS to faculty and 1 1/2 staff people

amounted to $17,000 for 1926-27. Similarly, space for the department was carved out of the new, expanded University Library, adjacent to the back office area of the Library. Offices were small and often shared, but students could move easily from the hub of their world, the Library Science Study Hall (Figure 2) to the book-binding or cataloguing section of the Library for hands-on workshops (Figure 3).

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/Archive/1900-1929/Photos/Study_Hall_1927.jpg>

Figure 2. Library Science Study Hall, 1927.

This is the photo of the book-binding workshop circa 1920—can't find it at the moment…

Figure 3. Book-binding workshop.

From the earliest days graduates of DLS followed the largely feminine career tracks of their era. Like most working women in the US until the 1970s, DLS graduates at both the bachelor's and master's levels moved in and out of the labor force; many entered the program only after childbearing. For those who started in the program straight from college

(or, in the case of ABLS students, starting in college), professional life interruptions for marriage and childbearing were more the rule than the exception. Nonetheless, a surprising number of women graduates either never married or, if married, remained childless, thereby enabling themselves to enjoy full, uninterrupted careers.[5] This pattern was particularly pronounced for graduates of the 1920s and 1930s, as the first post-woman suffrage generation tended to be far less domesticated than their daughters—indeed, they followed career patterns not uncommon among graduates of the 1970s. Liberation was in the air in both eras and many DLS graduates were reluctant to leave careers for ostensibly halcyon lives of domesticity. As a consequence, the first decade of feminine graduates from DLS made a splash far beyond their numbers, significantly shaping prestigious college libraries such as the one at Swarthmore College, as well as high profile research libraries such as the John Crear in

---

[5] This is not to imply that the single lifestyle was necessarily affirmed happily. In response to a 1951 survey, an alumna of the Class of 1930 wrote:

Love came along
Paused
Peeped in the window
Fingered an arrow
Thrust it back
Turned with a grin
Tiptoed away
The rascal!

Chicago and public libraries such as Enoch Pratt in Baltimore and the Detroit Public Library.

Developing Momentum, with a Pause

As implied above, graduates of the program were in high demand, in no small part because of the combined prestige of the University of Michigan and the professional recognition and networks developed by Margaret Mann, Warner Bishop and shortly thereafter, Carlton Joeckel. Scrambling to replace Sydney Mitchell who had left to head the Library School at Berkeley, Bishop tried to lure J.I. Wyer of the New York State Library School in Albany, but Wyer would lose his New York pension were he to leave, so he demurred. Rudolf Gjelsness, Associate Librarian at UM, had replaced Mitchell briefly, but left after to summer session to go to Arizona State. Bishop discovered Joeckel, a librarian at Berkeley Public Library then doing his Master's at Berkeley (he'd already had two years' training at Albany), late in 1926 and, in February 1927, offered him a position as a temporary Associate Professor, contingent on rapid completion of his

---

From: School of Information, University of Michigan. Archives held at the Bentley Historical Library, call 87301 Bimu C26 2, Box 1 Fldr 3: Alumni Questionnaires of Classes of 1929 and 1930

degree. A highly skilled bibliographer and public library activist, Joeckel immediately became a star of the department. Outgoing and warm, he rapidly became a major center of innovation and attraction for DLS.

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/Archive/1900-1929/Photos/JoeckelPicnic1928.jpg>

Prof. Joeckel at a DLS picnic, 1928.

By 1930, Joeckel was already being courted for positions elsewhere, notably at the University of Denver Library School. As an effort to entice Joeckel to stay, Bishop wrote President Ruthven in the spring of 1930, urging that Joeckel be promoted to Full Professor, despite the fact that Joeckel lacked a Ph.D. This would have meant skipping over Margaret Mann for promotion, but Bishop surmised the effort would be worth the risk of alienating another star faculty member. The strategy led to naught, however, as Joeckel had contacted F.L.D. Goodrich (a former UM librarian) who was secretary of the ALA Fellowships Committee and secured a Carnegie Corporation-endowed scholarship to study for his Ph.D. at Chicago. Joeckel had attracted considerable attention in librarianship circles by publishing two breakthrough articles in Library Journal on public

library governance, stressing the need to meld the concerns of professionals with the needs of the community.[6] Back in 1927, George A. Works, former Dean of the then-infant Chicago Library School, had informed his friend, Bishop, of such a scholarship plan in the works and since that time, Bishop had been urging Joeckel to go to Chicago, get his Ph.D., then return as Bishop's ultimate replacement. Little did Bishop know that when Joeckel left, he would not return. Instead, Joeckel stayed on as a professor at Chicago and later migrated to Berkeley.

Apparently an ardent supporter of the New Deal, Carlton Joeckel expended considerable effort in moving the otherwise academically- and administratively-oriented DLS to look more closely at public libraries and commit itself to training line-level librarians for them. [Joeckel's position paper on the issue is in the imaged document folder, Public_Library_Policy]. In particular, Joeckel sought to commit DLS to a close education, training, and support relationship with Detroit Public Library, lest that hub of urban working-class readership be ignored by the ivory tower.

---

[6] [cite MIT volume on this]

By 1930, then, DLS was developing considerable momentum. It has graduated its first classes in 1927, with 29 ABLS and two AMLS degrees. As of May, 1931, DLS had already graduated 191 students—a small department with only three full-time faculty lines was showing its potential. Indeed, professional placements had been wildly successful in the first years and the scale of the operation allowed sufficient critical mass to develop a solid internal esprit de corps within the student body. In addition to being an academic department, DLS became a social circle, as evidenced by a bit of doggerel, a drinking song, writing for the 1930 graduates (Figure X).

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/Archive/1930s/imaged_docs/drinking_song_1931.tif>

Figure X. Doggerel written for the graduates of 1931.

Despite the reputation for dowdiness long attributed to librarians, students from the early 1930s seemed to have been surprisingly stylish (Figure X).

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/Archive/1930s/Photos/Class_of_1933.jpg>

Figure X. Class of 1933. Samuel McAllister, Associate University Librarian, a DLS student himself, is at the lower right with the Panama hat.

In the above photograph, one can also notice the surprising demographics of the DLS student body at the time: there are eleven women and six men—a high female-to-male ratio—and a nun. One should note, however, the lack of African-American students, an anomaly for the DLS classes of the era.

A surprising and laudable effort by Bishop and the DLS faculty was a dedication to training librarians and library administrators to serve the African-American community in the South. At the time, of course, though African-American citizens paid taxes to their communities for the support of public libraries, segregation laws barred their access to them. The ALA was attentive to the problem and in the 1930s released several reports bemoaning the lack of library access (and hence cultural and lifelong learning) for African-Americans, noting that among the hundreds of public

libraries in the South, only a handful allowed African-Americans to enter. Bishop and Joeckel thus took special efforts to develop liaisons and cooperative instructional links with the two extant “Negro” library schools, at Hampton Institute (Norfolk, Virginia) and Atlanta University (Georgia). These ties, financially supported by the Carnegie Corporation, demanded that Bishop and a small coterie of ALA leaders to tour historically African-American colleges and library schools in order to help broker arrangements for placements and resources. The Carnegie Corporation felt such efforts to be so important that, at the urging of Bishop and others, it set up a special program for African-American librarians in 1937. DLS had already taken its own initiative, and one of its stars in this regard was Wallace Van Johnson (AMLS 1935), who became Library Director of Texas State College for Negroes. An intermittent stream of correspondence between Johnson and DLS, particularly Bishop, indicates a warm professional relationship that lasted throughout his career. Finally, in the Summer of 1939, Bishop had Florence Curtis of the Hampton Institute Library School teach library administration.

Having worked for years with astute women and minority students, Warner Bishop came to respect them in ways far beyond the condescension and paternalism one would expect from a Victorian gentleman. In a letter

to Atlanta University President Rufus Clement, Bishop laid out his views of women in administration and the role of African-American librarians (remember, this is from 1940, not post-civil rights):

> You ask me whether I think it is better to have a man or a woman as director of the library school. I should reply that there is no basis for discrimination on the ground of sex in a position of this sort. A thoroughly capable woman will do just as good work as a thoroughly capable man, and vice-versa. I think a man is likely to fit more definitely in your administration. That is to say, a university president usually finds it a little easier to deal with a man as head of one of his units than with a woman. I presume that this is due to the fact that the president usually feels a bit of constraint in frank criticism of a woman's work, whereas the average man "can take it" without feeling a he is personally insulted when his work is criticized [sic]. There are, of course, certain hypersensitive individuals of both sexes. I feel quite strongly that you should not make up your mind in advance that you will have a man or a woman but that you should seek the best individual and then sum up the promise of success or failure which you can draw from the record and from personal interviews. I certainly feel that you must consider this in connection with the influence which the head of your library school is going to exert throughout the southeastern states and elsewhere in the country. You will want someone who is not only a good organizer and a thorough scholar but also a least a fair speaker, willing and able to make contacts which will have great influence in the development off library service to the colored race. This qualification demands quite definitely ability to get along with white people as well as Negroes. The development of branch libraries for colored people in the larger cities can be greatly advanced by the head of your library school if contact is made with the librarians of municipal libraries and if a favorable impression of the school is carried to such libraries. At present one of the great difficulties which my colleagues in southern municipal libraries is the scarcity of thoroughly qualified people to take care of branch libraries specifically designed for Negroes in those cities. The right kind of woman can make these contacts and exert this influence fully as successfully as the right kind of man. The success of Hampton Library School has been almost wholly in the direction of placing its graduates in colleges and

> schools for colored people. There is a large field, which is as yet but slightly developed, into which the graduates of Hampton have gone only in small numbers. I am quite sure that you will have this matter in mind in picking out the person to head your library school.[7]

Indeed, by dint of the enrollment of African-Americans, success at placing women as library administrators in prestigious colleges and libraries, and active engagement in recruitment and placement of women and minorities, DLS clearly committed itself to developing professional training for historically underrepresented groups, long before it became de rigeur or fashionable.

Lest one believe, however, that Bishop himself was some sort of arch left-winger, we have to recognize another major focus of his activity outside of the University: his relationship with the Vatican Library in Rome. At the dawn of the century Bishop had studied briefly at the Vatican Library, researching ancient manuscripts and as a patron, he was clearly awed. Two decades later, thanks to his activity as the ALA's director of international relations and to support from the Carnegie Endowment, he developed a long and rich relationship with the Vatican Library.[8] His major activity

---

[7] Letter, Bishop to Clement, November 11, 1940. School of Information, University of Michigan. Archives held at the Bentley Historical Library, call 87301 Bimu C26 2, Box 5, Folder: "Atlanta Library School".

[8] One should note that this is a bit of a SILS tradition: in the 1990s, Francis Blouin, School of Information faculty member and Director of the Bentley Library, spent

was the on-site development of a catalog of ancient manuscripts. In the process, he garnered the deep respect of Vatican officials, who then proceeded to send more than a dozen of their librarians for training at Michigan. The most noted of these individuals (though he did not earn a degree) was Eugène Tisserant, later a Cardinal and, it is rumored, runner-up for the papacy when John XXIII was named in 1959. In addition, over several decades, DLS had usually one or two Catholic clerics in each graduating class, including the beloved Sister Claudia (Figure X)

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/Archive/1970s/Photos/Sister_Claudia.jpg>

Figure X. Sister Claudia, circa 1973.

The 1930s were, of course, the decade of the Depression and, with the initial shrinkage of the public and academic sectors early in the decade, many librarians were put out of work and placements became increasingly

---

considerable time working on the Vatican archives, publishing a massive finding aid to the collection in 1998.

difficult. The ALA became deeply concerned about the issue, and though DLS, as a top-ranked program, had fewer placement problems than did its lower-ranked counterparts, the faculty redoubled its efforts. Indeed, placement services and career tracking of DLS graduates from that time forward became a major flagship operation, reaching their zenith in the second hiring crisis for librarians in the late 1970s, when Kenneth Vance masterfully operated placement services. DLS students seem not to have done badly: in December 1931, 0f 236 graduates, only twelve were out of work (and Bishop noted that only two male grads were unemployed[9]), yet no doubt, DLS strongly agreed with the sense of mission and urgency in an ALA declaration passed at its meetings in New Orleans in April, 1932:

> When millions of men and women, old and young, are attempting to equip themselves to get or to hold jobs, the library should not be allowed to decrease its effective service in technical, business and other vocational fields. When these and other millions are in greatest need of finding free library service the only recreation they can afford and one of the few opportunities for renewing their faith in organized society, the library should not fail to meet its obligations to the community.[10]

---

[9] Attachment to letter of December 4, 1931, Bishop to James Wyer, Chair of ALA Board of Education for Librarianship, SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 1 Folder 5.

[10] Loose document, “The Library in Time of Depression,” SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 7 Folder: “MU Dept. of Library Science, 1931.” Intriguingly, the document mentioned reading as recreation, not as a source of employment information. This was, of course, congruent with the thinking of the “edifying leisure” movement of the 1930s in the US and Europe.

Despite the relative lack of hard impact on DLS grads' employment picture, DLS agreed to pare down its enrollments to meet a fall in anticipated demand, as Joeckel advocated when he chaired an ALA committee on the supply and demand for librarians. At the same time, however, DLS knew that enrollments would fall on their own and that the program would be competing with other campuses for a smaller pool of applicants. The University of Chicago's library school had just started its Ph.D. program and though Bishop remained skeptical about the need for a doctoral program in Library Science—he continued to insist that if librarians got Ph.D.s, they should be in subject areas, not in a "professional" arena such as library science—he requested in the Spring of 1933 that DLS be elevated to the status of a school in order to gain more visibility and thus to attract more and better applicants. His request elicited no small amount of ire within the Literary College, as he routed it directly to the administration and Graduate School, bypassing the college.[11] In any case, the request went nowhere, as the University was certainly not going to expand a program at the height of the Depression. There were spotty rumors throughout the Depression about administration plans to dissolve

---

[11] Bishop was the target of a screed by the Chair of the Math Department, Louis C. Karpinski, who claimed that DLS was a rogue operation and that it wasted University funds that could be better spent on more legitimate programs. (Letter of Karpinski to Bishop, July 1, 1933; SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 7, Folder:"M.U. Library Science – 1932.")

the program, yet in reality only staff support and the hiring of adjuncts were reduced. Additionally, the Carnegie Corporation granted DLS $15,000 in 1935 to help alleviate institutional funding cuts.

Finally, as another tack for addressing issues of unemployment, DLS, particularly Joeckel, then Bishop, leaned on their friends in the Roosevelt Administration and in cooperation with the ALA managed to have the Works Progress Administration start a program to employ out-of-work librarians in underfunded public libraries. This program, administered by a DLS graduate, Edward Chapman, worked closely with public document surveys also funded by the WPA. The Society of American Archivists was founded in 1937—at almost the same moment as the WPA library and document programs and the founding of the National Archives—and one senses that the long and fruitful ties between archivists and librarians at DLS began at that time. In the Summer of 1941, DLS offered its first archives course, taught by Henry H. Peckham.

Meanwhile, after Joeckel left for Chicago, a replacement had to be found. After a couple of years searching, DLS unanimously decided to hire Rudolf H. Gjelsness. Gjelsness, a taciturn Norwegian from the North Dakota prairie had been and Head Classifier at UM in the mid-1920s and had

taught in a summer session, but had left to be Head of Cataloguing at the New York Public Library, then Head Librarian at the University of New Mexico. His return in 1937 made him the heir-apparent to Bishop as Chair (as Joeckel had been), and he acceded to that position in 1940. Cecil McHale and Mary Parsons were also hired at that time in the context of the upcoming retirements of Eunice Wead and Margaret Mann.

As the Second World War began, DLS was thus starting on its second generation of faculty. Bishop, Mann, and others had set a solid foundation of prestige for the department and upon that, one could build and develop momentum. The focus of the program on training academic librarians and library administrators remained solid, and while sizing up the Chicago program a few years earlier, Bishop had appreciated the marriage of social science, social action, and librarianship there (a sort of John Dewey meets Melvil Dewey program!), yet he insisted that DLS should continue on the more conservative, traditional tack. Under Bishop, DLS had never been particularly enthusiastic about training public or high school librarians and that practice would continue under Gjelsness. Many of the courses intended to serve those constituencies (courses in storytelling, for example) were often offered only in summer sessions and taught by temporary faculty, while the high-end academic courses were in the regular semesters

taught by permanent faculty. That strategy would prove to have been wise after the war, as the GI Bill vastly expanded the number of college students and hence, the demand for academic librarians. Nonetheless, after some prodding from the ALA and the University, DLS began to expand its offerings in public and school libraries. The growth in placements in special (read: private corporate) libraries burgeoned, yet remained largely unrecognized by DLS leaders. Library program graduates were starting to carve a new professional space, exercising their information searching and retrieval and records-management skills in the private sector.

Years of Expansion and Promise, 1948-1973.

By the end of the Second World War, the American library movement could claim over seventy-five years of almost exponential growth in terms of both collection sizes and circulation figures. With the exception of highly-targeted New Deal programs supporting libraries, the federal government had offered minimal funding either for libraries or library education. Indeed, DLS' only external funding of any size before 1945 came from the Carnegie Corporation in the form of a $150,000 endowment, the earnings of which were used to cover the expenses of Gjelsness' appointment. Other Carnegie funds had been used for student and faculty

fellowships, including sabbaticals for both Margaret Mann and Eunice Wead in Europe.

The advent of federal support for libraries would transform American librarianship, and for DLS, the timing was quite important. Federal support arrived in three phases. First, via the GI Bill, which offered free undergraduate tuition to WWII veterans, the government supported a vast influx of students and tuition monies into colleges and universities, thereby raising demand for and indirectly subsidizing the training of thousands of new academic librarians. Secondly, in 1956, federal subsidies began to flow to public libraries, thereby raising demand for that type of librarian. Finally, as part of the Great Society Programs under Lyndon Johnson in the 1960s, the US government provided a large number of minority scholarships for library education (Title II-B). The timing meant, for example, that Russell E. Bidlack, a WWII veteran and a graduate of Simpson College in Iowa, could enter the MALS program right after the war (and find housing in the structures built near Ypsilanti for the B-29 Flying Fortress plant), complete his training in the new doctoral program at DLS, join the faculty, and ultimately become Chair, then (after DLS' elevation to school status, thereby creating the School of Library Science, or SLS) Dean. Once the wave of GI Bill students subsided, federal aid to

public libraries and new requirements for school librarians to have Master's library degrees ensured large enrollments for the school. Finally, as federal support shifted under Nixon into the revenue-sharing system, Title II-B funding helped minority students attend SLS.

At the key conjuncture of the early postwar era, DLS decided to cast its fate ever more strongly toward academic librarianship and away from public and school libraries. In 1948, the BMLS—the Bachelor's in Library Science—degree was dropped and a Ph.D. program began. With lower-tier library programs emerging elsewhere in the state—notably at Western Michigan and Wayne State—pressure to train public and school librarians eased and demand for library educators and academic librarians rose. Indeed, the 1948 shift in the program made very good sense and it was entirely congruent with UM's mission and self-image at the top of the state's academic institutions—a very neat division of labor. DLS had no problems recruiting the requisite students and the wisdom of the approach was borne out almost immediately: in the Master's level graduating classes of June 1947 and 1948—even before the new régime was put in place—, of 33 students, 23 went into academic libraries or library education, 5 went into special libraries, 4 went to public libraries, and only one went to a

school library. With the inception of the Ph.D. program in 1949, three AMLS graduates (including Bidlack) went directly into the Ph.D. program.

At the same time, however, DLS did not entirely abandon its mission to offer training in librarianship to citizens of the state of Michigan. In order to handle a burgeoning demand for trained public and school librarians and in cooperation with UM Extension Services DLS set up extension programs in Grand Rapids, Detroit, and several other sites. As faculty salaries were relatively low at the time, such courses offered important income supplements while offering training to a much broader public. In addition, for students not otherwise covered by fellowships or scholarships, Extension courses offered a means of support during graduate training. The ALA's Committee on Accreditation (COA) warily viewed Extension as a potential danger for offering a substandard degree, but Gjelsness and later, Bidlack, assuaged those fears—not least because Bidlack himself chaired COA for a time. The consequence of offering extension courses on faculty teaching loads was considerable, despite the fact that they were optional for faculty, as four and five courses per term were not unusual for individual faculty members. In many cases, this left little time to do research and publication, then an emerging requirement for faculty status at UM. In short, the combination of upgrading the

resident program and expanding to Extension offered DLS an opportunity to be all things to all people in the library world: training at all levels above the bachelor's degree, albeit with the caveat that teaching tended to displace research time and effort. This latter aspect would return to haunt DLS in the 1970s and 1980s. Dropping the BMLS seems to have met with little opposition. The issue of moving back into "the undergraduate space" has been revived twice since, once in the mid-1980s and again at present in large part in recognition of the School's particular expertise which can benefit students at all levels in this Information Age.

The DLS curriculum, aside from new doctoral courses and adjustments to core required courses, evolved very slowly through the 1950s. In addition to the usual courses in collection development, cataloging/classification, and reference/bibliography (and their advanced counterparts), it was a bibliophile's paradise, with courses on library history, historical bibliography, the history of books and printing, and the like. Sarita Davis and Irene Hayner, librarians at the UM High School (located in the Frieze Building), occasionally taught courses for school librarians. More significantly, in the Summer of 1953, Cloyd Dake Gull (AMLS, 1939), long a member of the classification processing department at the Library of Congress, offered a course entitled, "The Logic of Mechanizing

Information," DLS' first course addressing computing technology and practice. Gull had spent his wartime service in the Navy's nascent computing branch and later made a career as a computing expert for what later became General Electric Information Systems. From the minutes of the faculty meeting where Gull was discussed, it is clear, however, that in the early 1950s, computing was an exciting yet esoteric area of expertise, not expected to affect librarianship except perhaps, one day, with automated catalogs.[12] Finally, the department made a stab at a "library and society" class as a required introductory, Master's-level course, titling it, "The Library as a Public Service Institution." The course was ostensibly intended to transmit the enthusiasm of the old ALA vision of the library as a public space for an informed, democratic citizenry, and to stress the service role of the library professional, but even as a long-required course it often lacked the large sense of purpose for which it was intended. When this author enthusiastically interviewed Russell Bidlack about the course—one that Bidlack had taught numerous times as a junior faculty member—he replied that he was never sure about the real purpose or content of the course, and that its content and focus varied according to who had to teach it.[13]

---

[12] Faculty Meeting Minutes of September 24, 1952, SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 5 Folder: "Faculty Meeting Minutes, 1951-1954."

[13] Interview by author with Russell Bidlack, November 28, 2000, at his home in Ann Arbor.

Nonetheless, it took years for the course, a bane for many students, to drop from the curriculum.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, while Gjelsness and others preferred to concentrate on DLS' traditional strengths in academic librarianship and library administration, the demand among students was otherwise. The majority of students preferred to focus on public and school libraries, and from her less-than-central position in the department Irene Hayner consistently argued that school librarianship was treated dismissively. An interesting foray into addressing the ALA's proud advocacy of public libraries was a course in the Summer of 1955, "The Librarian as a Community Leader," team-taught by an adult education specialist from Michigan state and a consultant to the School of Education at UM. Edmon Low, Library Director at Oklahoma State and a close associate of many of the SLS faculty, taught school librarianship every summer over a number of years and, when on sabbatical, sometimes taught during the academic year—despite the fact that his preferred area of expertise was in Library of Congress cataloguing.

The curriculum offered in the 1951-52 academic year elegantly revealed the intellectual and professional orientation of the department. Bidlack, still a

doctoral student, offered a course in the history of children's literature, while Eloise Rue, on loan from her post as the Chair of the Library Science Department at Chicago Teachers' College, and Sarita Davis, of the University High School, offered courses in school libraries. At the same time, permanent faculty members taught the usual courses associated with academic and research libraries. Sticking closely to Bishop's view that the overarching skills of librarianship—reference/bibliography, collection development, and cataloguing/classification—would sufficiently serve non-academic librarians, DLS offered almost no courses in public librarianship in the regular sessions.

An examination of dissertations written in DLS up to 1958 indicates the concerns of faculty advisers and students. Of eighteen dissertations, ten were on historical topics, three were bibliographic studies, and three were literary histories. Only three addressed contemporary library issues: Martha Boaz studied criticism of best-selling books, Donald MacVean looked at the use of curriculum laboratories in teacher-training schools, and Edna Ballard Mack examined the place of the school library in public education, performing a content analysis of periodicals in Education. The most frequent topics were histories of libraries, preferably university libraries. Of dissertations in progress as of February 1959, the distribution

was similar to a year earlier:eighteen were historical (including three histories of university libraries) or historical bibliographies, and only five were on relatively contemporary library issues, including Danny Bedsole's study of branch-library strategies used by corporate special libraries. In short, to look at doctoral research at DLS in the 1950s, one would be hard pressed to find much evidence of a massive public library movement or, for example, of the growing emergence of computing in the library and information-service professions. While the former was a tradition in which DLS was always a minimal player, the latter turned out to be the future.

This is not to imply that doctoral research and Masters'-level education at DLS was not rigorous or academically solid. Michigan's reputation as a top program not only solidified in the 1950s and 1960s, it grew. Placements remained strong, and DLS graduates often got the most sought-after positions. Among the Ph.D. graduates, five became library educators (with Martha Boaz becoming Dean of the USC Library School). Others became high-powered academic and research librarians and several worked for federal agencies. AMLS graduates could regularly expect to receive several job offers and be able to choose according to their needs and tastes.

Positive job prospects for the large number of upwardly-mobile DLS students no doubt contributed to an upbeat atmosphere in the program. The program's reputation was strong enough to assure a flow of highly qualified applicants and, with the emergence of other library schools in the region, there was no pressure to admit applicants who had no alternatives for library training. Many of the lower-level courses tended to be a bit overly focused pedagogically on memorization (especially in reference and bibliography), but students usually regarded such courses as necessary evils and rites of passage. There seem to have been few major internal conflicts among the faculty and what academic-political crises emerged seemed to focus largely upon squabbles with administration over funding—but such disagreements would pale by comparison to the budget crises of the 1970s. By the mid-1960s, Kenneth Vance had taken responsibility for placement and alumni relations, concerning himself not only with placing students just after graduation, but regularly polling them to find any who might want help with later employment changes. This assured a strong sense of loyalty to the program among alumni. Not uncommon among assessments of DLS' quality was the statement of a major university librarian—one who had hired many DLS graduates—in the early 1960s:

> It is incumbent on the school to keep track of its graduates, to know how they are doing, to recommend them for advancement as they are matured and seasoned. In my personal experience I know of only one school that does this well. It is no accident that its graduates move steadily into major posts.[14]

DLS made considerable use not only of its own graduate students to teach lower-level courses (though Martha Boaz taught weightier material), it often had adjuncts teach courses outside of areas considered DLS' mission. More troubling from the perspective of the ALA (which criticized the practice in two of its septennial accreditation reports) was a tendency to hire DLS' own graduates for permanent faculty positions. In the late 1950s, three faculty members of the department were DLS graduates: Russell Bidlack, Wallace Bonk, and Raymond Kilgour; Constance Rinehart, also a DLS graduate, later joined the faculty after a stint elsewhere. Finding qualified, Ph.D.-holding library education faculty was no easy task in that era of explosive growth in library school students and new library schools, so arm's-length hires were often the only workable strategy. Indeed, in the midst of success-by-the-numbers, few were apt to question an increasingly insular faculty's composition: it was doing its job very successfully, and that success usually quieted incipient critics. In fact, finally allowed by the

---

[14] Letter of Gjelsness to Dean Haber, February 21, 1964, p. 4; SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 14, Folder, "Budget 1963-64."

Regents to start offering a Ph.D. in 1948, DLS found had to search assiduously to find faculty candidates with Ph.D.s, a rare commodity at the time, as only a few schools offered them, and DLS soon became the largest. Teaching loads in terms of both numbers of credits and of students were abnormally high compared to other UM programs and to peer library programs, thereby creating an unremitting need to increase the faculty's size. Over time, however, DLS' web of contacts in the world of library educators—weakened a bit after Bishop's retirement in 1940—grew as a direct consequence of both activity in professional associations and by a wide range of placements, thereby making it possible to define talented library educators early in their careers. Like Carleton Joeckel before them, a large number of young Ph.D.s would spend some time on the DLS faculty and move on to leadership posts elsewhere in the profession.

DLS continued its laudable practice of active recruitment of students and (even if only part-time) faculty of color. The ALA had a bit of a cultural revolution in the early 1950s, adopting a stern anti-discrimination position in 1949 that essentially called for a boycott of all segregated venues for its massive meetings. This moved a step further than its earlier (1938) position outlawing all discrimination in the organization. Furthermore, in its renewed push for public library support, it paid special attention to

meeting the needs of the increasingly poor and African-American inner-city communities as well as those of people of color in the South. While much of this effort reasonably concentrated on the Extension program (given the greater accessibility of off-campus courses), DLS did systematically attempt to hire minority faculty members, but did not succeed until 1971, when it hired Gwendolyn Cruzat. Ironically, between 1965 and 1975, while the number of women faculty members rose, the percentage of women students in DLS and SLS fell: better opportunities for women meant that they had better chances of being hired as faculty, but also that women students had more opportunities outside of traditionally feminine profession such as library science.[15]

The middle years of DLS/SLS' history can thus be characterized as a bit of a calm before a storm. Like America itself from 1949 to 1967, the ambiance at DLS/SLS was deceptively stable, and growth and success lulled many into thinking that the endless intellectual and political crises of the first half of the twentieth century were over. The world-view of Bishop, modernized a little, of course, seemed triumphant. There was but one hierarchy of knowledge and there was a near-universal, unarticulated consensus on a

---

[15] From an informal history of SILS, 1965-1985, developed at a faculty retreat in 1985. Page 2 of this untitled document, SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 21, Folder: "SLS Dean's Files R.M.

rather monochromatic vision of high culture. This was the era—the last, it turned out—when literary, artistic, and historical canons seemed highly stable. Arguments about canons centered not on the legitimacy of canons, per se, but on border wars over inclusion: should Prokofiev be included despite his proximity to Stalin?, were there any American writers good enough to be lumped with Arnold, Byron, or Wordsworth? As a consequence, classification, description, cataloguing, and book selection could continue along the paths blazed one to two generations earlier. If anything, those paths and the implicit theories of knowledge and cultural worth became even stronger, as the great cultural lesson of World War Two seems to have been the vindication of most existing cultural and intellectual norms. It only looked stifling in retrospect, however, as memories of Depression despair and wartime tribulation—followed by the postwar boom—remained the common social grounding of most Americans.

Of course, DLS/SLS was as affected by the upheavals of the late 1960s as any other patinated American institution. Gjelsness' retirement and replacement as Chair by Wallace Bonk in 1964 was smooth and uneventful. Gjelsness could look back on a highly successful career as Chair, overseeing

---

Warner Dean-Elect 1984/85 Strategic Planning Retreat, 1985."

massive expansion in terms of both enrollments and faculty. The problems were minor. For example, as DLS/SLS' quarters in the University Library became tighter and tighter, enrollments had to be limited and classes and offices spilled over to Haven and Mason Halls. The program would soon move to dreadful digs in Winchell Hall, an aging section of West [dormitory] Quad. Years of relative stasis and quietude were to become years of questioning and upheaval.

The first rumblings of tension began over the apparently minor issue of the balance among library fields offered by DLS—the traditional eschewing of public librarianship. By 1963, state and university officials had received enough letters from library leaders across the state bemoaning DLS' apparent lack of interest in public libraries—the program was accused of not addressing even the base-line demand for trained public librarians in the state. These concerns ultimately ended up on the desk of Dean Haber, Dean of the College of Letters, Sciences, and the Arts. Haber then began to lean on Gjelsness, urging the latter's attention to the matter. As any astute chair would do, Gjelsness indicated that he'd be happy to increase educational resources for public librarianship, and that, of course, an additional faculty position would make that even more possible. At the same time, however, he noted that among the three major categories of

librarians—academic, public, and school—DLS graduates were distributed fairly evenly. This, of course, underlined the disjuncture between a curriculum based on overarching library functions (reference/bibliography, cataloguing/classification, and selection) and an array of venues of professional employment. DLS remained convinced of the wisdom of the function-based approach, though it offered venue-oriented courses in most areas except public libraries. Again, DLS did divert most of its concern for public libraries into the Extension curriculum and much of its school library attention to the summer sessions. As for school librarians, DLS developed a program in conjunction with the School of Education and that turned out a considerable number of graduates, certainly enough to meet regional needs. Gjelsness ranked his areas for new hires in 1964 as such:

1. someone to relieve the demands on faculty to teach introductory courses
2. a public librarian educator
3. a school librarian educator
4. a specialist in library automation and computing.

Gjelsness noted that Gull, by then working for GE Information Services, had taught the latter material in summer sessions for quite a while, yet needed to replaced by a full-time faculty member. Little came of that suggestion in the short term.

Wallace Bonk's chairmanship lasted only a short time, as health problems in 1967demanded that there be less pressure on him. Bonk himself was a very witty, often embarrassingly insouciant, professor who had a letter press in his basement at home—a device that he used, half-seriously and entirely amiably, to publish bits of personal poetry and doggerel. His language in intra-departmental memos often had an irony and bemused self-referentiality that the culture at large would come to admire in the 1990s.

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/Archive/1970s/Photos/Bonk_3_70.jpg>

Wallace Bonk, 1970

The relative quiescence of DLS ended decisively in 1967, just when (though not due to) Russell Bidlack became chair. Coincidentally, the ALA's Committee on Accreditation (COA) was scheduled to examine DLS that year, and the report, while not negative, was unexpectedly critical. First, on the positive side COA said in no uncertain terms that in order to retain its credibility, DLS had to become a school of its own. This reiterated the position of an on-campus Blue Ribbon Committee that had made the same recommendation. Given that all of the peer library education programs had their own deans reporting directly to the relevant Academic VPs or Provosts, the need for consistency was obvious. That would put DLS on a political par with other professional schools on campus. Over the years Gjelsness and Bonk had both repeatedly pleaded that DLS be made a school, but the COA report finally made it happen. The Department of Library Science became the School of Library Service in 1969. COA also noted that teaching loads for DLS faculty were about 50% greater than those at peer institutions. For that reason, COA worried that excessive teaching by faculty precluded professional service and research—a problem consistently cited by Gjelsness. Indeed, COA was deeply troubled by the lack of publication on the part of DLS faculty, though it recognized its source in the heavy teaching loads. Finally, COA noted that DLS salaries were below par, making faculty (and ultimately decanal) recruitment

difficult. Indeed, COA implied that one of DLS' greatest problems was its tendency to hire its own—in part a consequence of low salaries being a barrier to hiring non-DLS-trained faculty.

That was the most compelling negative aspect of the report: that in COA's term, the school was heavily "in-bred," making it less susceptible to innovation and differing views of the profession. In particular, COA found that the doctoral program, with its focus on historical and bibliographic dissertations, precluded doctoral research in "the fields of information science, systems analysis, an the organization and control of knowledge."[16] In a radical break from the Bishop tradition, COA questioned the wisdom of requiring two Master's degrees to enter the Ph.D. program: one in Library Science, another in a cognate field. This practice was rooted in Bishop's insistence that librarians not be technicians, that they be well-versed in a particular substantive academic discipline. So much for the librarian as gentleman scholar! COA deeply doubted the utility of this requirement, seeing it as yet another meaningless hurdle on the path to a Ph.D. (DLS had already dropped its requirement for reading

---

[16] American Library Association, Committee on Accreditation, "Report on the Department of Library Science, University of Michigan," typescript, p. 7. SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 14, Folder, "School Status."

knowledge of French and German a few years earlier). Finally, COA excoriated DLS' definition of doctoral fields. Ironically (in contrast to the teaching agenda for the AMLS degree), they were defined by venues of employment in terms of public, academic, school, and special libraries. Such fields, in COA's opinion, defined fields of practice (appropriate to an MLS program), not fields of research. As a consequence, COA recommended that DLS rethink what exactly it was trying to do in the doctoral program. In sum, with respect to the doctoral program, so tightly linked to the issue of inbreeding, COA found a paucity of philosophical reflection by faculty on what librarianship meant intellectually. Clearly, years of continuity at DLS had not generated the kind of crisis that in many institutions forces them to review and reassess their raison d'être. In the next couple of years, DLS was to use the opportunity of its elevation to school status to examine those long-neglected issues.

COA also found DLS to be a bit insular with respect to other programs at UM, that it had ample opportunity to develop joint and interdisciplinary programs with other units on campus, yet had not done so. (Two decades later, Marion Paris, in her study of Library School closings, would cite that sort of on-campus insularity as a major predictive factor in terms of which

library schools survived and which died[17]). Not only could DLS reach out to Public Administration, it could link as well with social scientists (as at Chicago) and to its own colleagues in Area Studies within LS&A. COA alleged that a rise to school status would make DLS more visible on campus and hence more attractive as a partner with other scholars on campus. In addition, to ease teaching loads, DLS had relied on doctoral students to teach a large number of AMLS courses, a practice criticized by both the COA and the federal Office of Education (which had been funding the Title II-B minority-support program and several research ventures). Finally, COA gave DLS high marks for the quality of its AMLS program and reiterated the consistent DLS complaints about lack of space.

The COA report, critical as it was on several points, marked a major turning point for the program. Its calls for new blood, additional space, and school status seemed to have been louder than its criticism of the doctoral program, and DLS was soon to be relatively satisfied in all three respects. Despite COA's implicit recommendation to the contrary, Russell Bidlack became Dean of the new School. The school then moved out of Hatcher

---

[17] Marion Paris, *Library School Closings: Four Case Studies*. (Metuchen, NJ, Scarecrow Press, 1988).

Library and into quarters in Winchell Hall, largely as a temporary measure until permanent quarters could be found.

Most significantly, in the wake of the COA report, DLS entered a period of searching self-examination, particularly with respect to its Ph.D. program. COA had claimed that DLS had a reputation for being an easy place to get a Ph.D. Paul Wasserman, who received his Ph.D. from DLS in 1964 and shortly thereafter became the Dean of the Library School at Maryland, managed to complete all of his Ph.D. requirements (including his dissertation) in a year plus two summers. At the same time, he taught several courses and wrote a bibliographic guide for Gale Publishing.[18] From his memoirs, it is clear that many of the requirements could be waived or finessed and he could return to his then-home in Ithaca. As a recent DLS Ph.D., he was an obvious person to ask about what he thought of the program during SLS' self-study. In a 1969 letter to Rose Vainstein (just then hired as a full professor), he said little of the ease in getting the Ph.D.; instead, he wrote:

> …the Michigan program is very much steeped in tradition and the consequence of this is that it is harder to shift to somewhat more contemporary terms. The reputation that the doctoral program at

[18] Wasserma, *The Best of Times*, Ch. 6.

> Michigan has is that if you are interested in obscure portions of library or publishing history, this is the place for you. Otherwise, there isn't too much that is offered the potential Ph.D. student.[19]

This sort of response was more trenchant than most, of course. More useful, however, was the survey, administered by the Curriculum Committee, chaired by Rose Vainstein, of other library science programs across the country. Particularly interesting was the response of Neal Harlow, Dean of the Library School at Rutgers. From his remarks, it appears that the apparent stasis at DLS was not unique, but that it was pervasive across the country:

> Practitioners in library schools—like practitioners in libraries—tend to be conservative, i.e., moderate, cautious, and disposed toward preserving existing conditions. Although some are less traditional than others, the weight of their influence at least seems to support a curriculum which, upon close inspection, looks very much like that upon which they were raised. A few new dishes have been added to the table to liven up the old menu, but for the most part the same courses persist which have been familiar for more than a generation.
>
> Meanwhile, outside the school the resources and uses of knowledge and information have increased in number, kind, and urgency, as have the necessity and means for their organization and communication. And the penalties for not keeping informed are steadily rising.[20]

---

[19] Wasserman to Vainstein, August 27, 1969. SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 12, Folder: "Curriculum Committee Jan 1968 - Sept 1969."

[20] Harlow to Vainstein, undated [1969]. SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 12, Folder: "Curriculum Committee Jan 1968 - Sept 1969."

Harlow went to the extreme for remedies, perhaps, claiming that traditional courses in cataloguing/classification, reference, administration, and the like were rooted in the era, 1900-1920, and were rife with outdated pedagogy and might therefore be considered candidates for abolition. One senses that Harlow was calling for the end of the library school institution as it was then known. His was perhaps the first announcement along such lines, and certainly not the last—and this at a moment when enrollments and funding for library schools nationwide were rising rapidly.

With DLS having spent a generation cultivating alumni and students, Vainstein wisely surmised that her most valuable interlocutors on curriculum reform would be past and present students. Two tracks were followed, a set of meetings between Vainstein's committee and the students, and an informal survey of alumni. While the latter responses tended to bear out Harlow's views on library conservatism, the former reflected changing demands from students. Atop their list of concerns was that faculty needed to sit down and compare syllabi systematically in order to avoid the accretions that made several courses address the same material. That was perhaps most irritating to students: that they spent only a limited time in the AMLS program and should better not waste it with redundancies across their classes. Secondly, students listed as their number

one priority for new courses a required course in computing and data processing for librarians. Other course considerations were minor, largely doing more and better of what was already being done.[21]

Finally, in 1969 the Curriculum Committee surveyed current students more systematically about their views on what is basic librarianship knowledge and what SLS should teach. As with any survey of that sort, the responses were sometimes contradictory, but several messages were clear. For example, while a small majority preferred a core set of courses oriented to practical rather than theoretical issues, a vast majority felt that the assumptions and theory behind the practical material needed to be exposed systematically. In addition, though most students acknowledged that the SLS program was probably less rigorous than other master's programs on campus, over half also felt that the training was sufficient for future professional activity. Students wanted more material in a "current controversies in library science" framework. This was also reflected in another prevailing sentiment, viz, that the AMLS degree was only a start to becoming a competent professional; that much of the essential training

---

[21] At least this is what Vainstein understood the students to be saying—the source here is her own meting notes, so we cannot be sure that she "heard" what they actually said.

happened in the first few years on the job, as with almost any profession. For that reason, there was very strong support for practica and internships beyond those offered by the University Library. While most students believed that there needed to be a solid set of core courses, they strongly agreed that the core at the time was not quite appropriate. Finally and perhaps most compellingly, students felt a dire need for courses oriented toward future venues of employment. This was, of course, congruent with the COA's recommendations and flew in the face of the old Bishop tradition of orienting teaching toward cross-venue functions (classification, reference, etc.) rather than focusing on the specifics of the various venues. A troubling aspect of the survey was perhaps its absence of any questions about what direction the program should go in terms of content: we will never know how much concrete support there was for moving toward such areas as information management, archives, or computing, for example.

In any event, the efforts of the Curriculum Committee bore fruit in a first-ever short statement of education objectives for both the AMLS and Ph.D. programs. Surprisingly (and perhaps worrisome), that October 1969 document largely codified existing practices as best practices. In particular, the focus toward historical and bibliographic topics for the Ph.D. was reiterated, as was implicitly the need for a second master's in a cognate

field—both areas in which the COA had expressed concern. The statement did agree, however, with COA on the need for more interdisciplinary work, especially with other professional schools. For the AMLS program, the only mention that the world of library work was rapidly changing was located in a statement on the need to consider non-traditional materials, advocating that courses "consider both the traditional methods and the newer devices of modern technology and information services."[22] Nonetheless, a broad range of new faculty hires in 1969 and after vastly extended the intellectual and professional terrain mastered by the school.

However, for all of the concern focused on curricular changes, SLS was riding high: enrollments were up, Russell Bidlack was a promising new Dean, and SLS had become a respectable School on campus. Within months of the completion of the curricular revamping, political events overtook the entire UM campus: African American students staged demonstrations and building occupations in the Spring of 1970 (simultaneous with similar activities at Wisconsin and Cornell, for example) and the administration responded favorably to a key demand. The University committed itself to attaining a 10% level of minority student enrollment in all campus

---

[22] Document: "Educational Objectives," October 1969. SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 12, Folder: "Curriculum Committee Oct - Dec 1969."

academic programs. Given years of concern for minority enrollments, SLS was quite well positioned to meet that goal. Indeed, in the aforementioned "Educational Objectives" document, the school had made clear that expanding access both to the program and to libraries generally was a top priority. In addition, the 1971 hiring of Gwen Cruzat, made her one of the first minority library educators at a top-ranked school. Finally, DLS had already been attentive to amassing federal funds to assist minority students through scholarships and fellowships. As a consequence, minority enrollments burgeoned, in large part thanks to Cruzat's unremitting recruitment efforts. Successful recruitments were particularly telling in the doctoral program, as SLS became a national leader in training minority Library Science doctorates. Within less than two years, SLS, alone among other UM academic units, had met and exceeded the ten percent goal. Bidlack and the faculty could point to their high overall enrollments, their success at minority recruitment and financial support and crow that they had succeeded at doing well by doing good.

Then the crisis. Thanks to an increasingly saturated job market for librarians, by 1973 enrollments began to drop, and by 1975, the number of AMLS degrees awarded began a decade-long, almost ceaseless slide. (One must recall, however, that the high enrollments of the 1964-79 era were

rather a historical anomaly—despite the fact that over half of all DLS/SLS students ever graduated in that period. See Figure X for the chart--the one, "SLS Degrees Awarded" [we need to figure out a naming convention for this]). Though from the budget perspective, the school was always in good shape—as in its period of growth, the school in a period of retraction continued to operate in the black—the program's credibility came under scrutiny from administration, and that watchful eye would not blink for nearly twenty years. It is in that context of crisis that SLS entered a long period of self-doubt, external criticism, and upheaval—a crisis that has largely abated by now (June 2001), but whose legacy has been astringent.

Years of Crisis and Renewal, 1973-2001

SLS was not alone in its crisis among library schools or even as a graduate-training destination for liberal arts undergraduates. The flush job market that early baby-boomers had taken for granted—one that nearly assured that highly-ranked Ph.D.s in almost any discipline and master's holders in professional domains—went quite cold in the early 1970s. Simply put, the period of massive economic and demographic growth that had fueled the postwar university shifted to stagnation almost overnight. Worse still for the University of Michigan, thanks to the two rounds of fuels crises in 1973 and 1979) made American-manufactured automobiles unattractive to

consumers, with grave implications for the State's and University's budgets. By 1975, university administrators were "taxing" the budgets of academic units, demanding that set percentages of previous budget allocations be returned. The mini-archipelago that SLS had rapidly become, enjoying several new assistant professors, multi-section core courses taught by an array of promising graduate students, and a successful Extension program, were all immediately in jeopardy. SLS shared this set of problems with other small academic and professional training units on campus. One suspects that, like SLS, other UM programs submitted long-term growth plans in 1973 (on the eve of the crisis) that cited New York Times projections of massive growth to indicate the need for further expansion.

SLS did have a set of its own unique problems. As universities nationwide suddenly began to compete with other institutions for upper-tier applicants from a smaller demographic pool, they began to do whatever they could to enhance their reputations and attractiveness. For Michigan, this meant a conscious and well-targeted concern that its standing as a Research I institution be reinforced and enhanced. Research and publication by faculty became an overriding concern in internal program reviews. That new concern struck SLS at its weakest point. Despite the COA's call for more effort by the school in that direction, little progress had been made.

Granted, the demographics of the faculty were not propitious in that respect—it was heavily weighted both toward senior scholars beyond their potential high-output years and very junior faculty not yet there—but it was hard to convince administration that all that would somehow turn around. This was especially so in that during the 1969-73 period, when numerous new faculty were hired, enrollments had risen proportionally, so teaching loads remained heavy, as usual precluding large the requisite levels of research and publication. Faculty were just as much engaged in professional organizations and professional service as they had always been, but such activities had far less political purchase than had once been the case on campus.

The financial crisis of the university also compelled it to raise tuition significantly, and while putative physicians, attorneys, and businesspersons could easily envision sufficiently high incomes to justify investing in high-priced training, that was not the case for librarians. The same problem affected social workers, educators, and pharmacists as well. Bidlack never ceased to complain to the administration that high tuition was reducing applicants and enrollments. He was undoubtedly correct. In a study following up on "no-shows,"—people admitted who did not attend—he discovered that the major reason for non-matriculation was,

indeed, high tuition. In addition, SLS discovered that when it did manage to secure fellowship or scholarship support to reduce tuition costs effectively to the levels prevailing at Illinois, Berkeley, Wisconsin, UCLA, or Indiana, potential no-shows became matriculators. Without some mitigation of high out-of-state tuition expenses, SLS stood in danger of becoming a service provider for Michigan residents, not a nationally-recruited, leading-edge school. This problem persists today in a differential fashion: while students in the Human-Computer Interaction and Information Economics, Policy, and Management (and to a lesser degree, Archives and Records Management) appear quite confident in recouping their tuition investments, students in Library and Information Studies often look ahead with dread toward years of debt.

The wave of hiring that had commenced with the attainment of school status flattened considerably with crisis, leading to a de facto retrenchment after 1975. In addition, Kenneth Vance, a full professor, was promoted to become Assistant Dean, allowing him to spend more time in placement and administration. The new faculty members showed a lot of promise, perhaps most notably Charles Davis, hired in 1973 to bring SLS up to speed in the Information Age. Davis rapidly began to offer an impressive array of information science courses and his enrollments were impressive.

Similarly, Cruzat and Edward Newren (hired in 1971) offered new courses in medical and special librarianship, George Whitbeck (1971) offered studies in social science bibliography, and Rose Mary Magrill (1971) focused on humanities bibliography. A new focus on venue-oriented training had led to the hiring of Thomas Downen (1971), Helen Lloyd (1969), Shirley Edsall (1973), and David Hessler (1969) to teach school librarianship, and Raymond Durrance (1975) to address public librarianship. Other new faculty hired in that era included Marilyn Searson-Lary (1975), Harry Whitmore (1973), Rose Vainstein (1969), Judith Hopkins (1973), and Constance Rinehart (1969). [The new hires made for a strong and impressive faculty, yet of fourteen hired at the assistant level, only six attained tenure at SLS. Several left for other places (Davis, Magrill, and Searson-Lary), but most were denied tenure. Decisions to deny tenure were often made by the Academic Vice-President's Office after candidates had passed muster with the school; this created considerable tension between the school and the administration and worse, gave the VP's Office grounds for claims that SLS was still not scholarly enough. Do we want to keep this, or is it too "insider"??]

The problem of job insecurity for SLS faculty came in part as what some saw as a change of faculty assessment criteria in the late 1970s. Harold

Shapiro became the Vice President for Academic Affairs in 1977 and he insisted more than ever that faculty have world-class records of research and publication in order to receive tenure. Many of the new hires seem to have been hired on the assumption that their primary task was instruction (secondarily, professional service) and that, of course, they needed to publish, but publication was not a high priority. After all, most SLS faculty past and [then-]present had scant publication records and one can well understand the discomfort among senior faculty at erecting more hurdles in front of their junior colleagues than they themselves had had to surmount. Increasingly, however, and particularly after Shapiro ascended to the presidency, research and publication was not only vital for tenure, it was essential for maintaining the legitimacy of the program within the new campus environment. In its 1975 report on SLS, COA noted the breath of experience and overall quality of the faculty, yet based on the faculty's own assessments, they spent on average less than 6% of their time on research. Placed on file in the administration building, this figure could later be used against the SLS faculty. As late as 1976, the SLS faculty tended to use its lack of publication not as a spur to action, but as a basis to seek more resources from the University. In a SLS report to UM administration of December 1976, entitled, "Trends and Objectives: School of Library Science"—a mini-self-study of sorts, they wrote:

> 1. Increased research productivity of the faculty cannot be achieved without significant reallocation of priorities and resources.
>
> 2. Research in librarianship is likely to take the form of action-oriented operations or applied research rather than pure or theoretical research.[23]

SLS' crisis of intellectual and academic legitimacy tended to be shared with the other second-rank professional schools (excluding Law and Medicine) on campus. The question was a deceptively simple one, though many people then and now consider it wrongly framed: are these units "academic" or "professional"? The often-condescending disdain that liberal arts faculty had long held toward business schools extended to other professional schools apace with restrictions in the university budget. To claim that a certain school was not sufficiently intellectually legitimate was often a first foray toward calling for their dissolution, with the budget savings (one hoped) going to the complainer. More substantively, given that "practical" training had long been the mission of SLS and other professional schools, often to the implicit exclusion of voluminous publication, such entities suddenly seemed out of place in the new régime. It was a problem nationwide after 1975, characterized by the closing of myriad schools of pharmacy, education, nursing, and librarianship. Only

business schools seemed to thrive, buoyed by wealthy alumni and copious endowments. SLS' first concrete effort in raising its curricular credibility was to raise the credits required for the degree from thirty to thirty-six as of the Fall Term 1976.

Many people, however, see the practical versus academic question quite differently. They cite a very coherent distinction between practitioners' degrees (MBA, MLS, MSN, MSSW, etc.) and academic degrees—the Ph.D. In addition, they argue persuasively (in contrast to Bishop) that it is impossible to have a credible practitioners' training program without it being deeply informed by scholarly research within the discipline. Just as the presence of a doctoral program is a strong foundation for excellence in undergraduate education, with doctoral training offering some assurance that faculty will stay abreast of developments in their fields, so too with practitioners' programs. It is this perspective that informed SLS' thinking on its future between 1977 and 1990.

Yet SLS was not asleep on issues of emerging information technologies. It heeded COA's twice-stated insistence that it engage more directly with

---

[23] "Phase I Summary: Trends and Objectives: School of Library Science, " October 6, 1970. SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 14, Folder: "Faculty Meeting Minutes, 1975-1978," page 2.

what was then known as Information Science (In 1972, COA's "Standards of Accreditation" insisted that library schools directly address information science). As a discipline Information Science had only recently emerged. Founded in 1937 as the American Documentation Institute, by way of a name and mission change in 1968, the American Society for Information Science (ASIS, now the American Society for Information Science and Technology, ASIST) became the key professional body for librarians moving into information technology. Through its organizational experience first with documentation strategies, then with search and retrieval systems (focusing initially on on-line catalogs), ASIS essentially became an association behind a discipline in which librarians, as it were, approached information technology on their terms rather than those of computer science or electrical/electronic engineering. Information science domesticated the computer for librarians' use and as such echoed the conceptual frameworks of librarians, with all of their virtues and shortcomings. It was through the lens of information science, therefore, that SLS grappled with computing issues, and Charles Davis sponsored the foundation of a student chapter of ASIS in the mid-1970s. One other, more minor, vector for computing work at SLS was in computer-assisted education. As early as 1970, Professor Slavens conducted a federally-funded study that used a mainframe computer and special language and

set of algorithms to train reference librarians. The project did not teach the students how to use the computer in reference work; rather, it used computing to evaluate teaching effectiveness and efficacy. While the study did demonstrate the power of computers as teaching aids, the technology remained cumbersome, even though SLS insisted that students spend from five to thirty hours in computer-aided instruction.

The ASIS perspective informed SLS' first long-range computing plan, authored in 1975. That strategy followed three trajectories: 1. an increased and increasing use of on-line library resources (including Medline and later Dialog, as well as OPACs—on-line public access catalogs), 2. computer-aided instruction akin to the Slavens project, and 3. administrative computing. One would have to look hard to find efforts to grapple with information theory, knowledge management, and the like. The plan stressed instead the value of "hands-on" experience, primarily in Whitbeck's Social Science Bibliography course. At the time, SLS was using a Lockheed Systems terminal and interface, and the OCLC (the Ohio College Library Center) service was just emerging as a meta-OPAC, "amazing" the students with its search and retrieval capacity and speed. In addition, students were increasingly encouraged to learn social science computing, running their analyses on the MTS mainframe system. As one

might expect, any presentation of future hopes for the use of computers were presented also as requests for more resources; the 1975 plan requested several more terminals on leased lines, keypunching and card-reading devices, and assistance from university programmers. One should note that the perspective in the plan presented librarians and library educators largely as end-users, not as architects of systems (that was then thought to be the task of computer scientists, in any case) or, more significantly, as designers of data bases or structured information systems. SLS obviously sought to keep library computing on its own terms, and when in 1978, Manfred Kochen, a faculty member in the Medical School proposed a multi-unit information science (IS) program, the faculty responded positively about the need to address IS issues, but said that they were already deeply engaged in IS and doing well on their own. In SLS' assessment, the proposal was "redundant."[24]

Charles Davis left UM in 1976, but SLS was determined to maintain a strong presence in IS, hiring Victor Rosenberg, an ASIS leader from Berkeley in 1977, as their answer. Rosenberg had had experience in computer-based reference systems and, with the emergence of personal

[24] "Response to Kochen Proposal," subsection of faculty meeting minutes of October 19, 1978, pp. 3-4. SILS Archives, Bentley Library, Box 13, Folder: "Faculty Meeting Minutes, 1978-1981."

computers circa 1980, he became an entrepreneur by starting a firm around Pro-Cite, the first PC-based bibliography handling software. At the same time, in an effort to buttress its research and publication agenda, SLS hired a highly promising African-American faculty member, Carolyn O. Frost, from the University of Chicago to address several IS issues, including the organization of information. In addition, SLS thoughtfully reached out to expand in a unique, previously untouched domain, that of archives and records management. UM was fortunate to have as its Director of the Bentley Library Robert M. Warner, one of the leading lights of the archival profession and a past president of the Society of American Archivists. Warner and his protégé, Francis X. Blouin (also of the Bentley), had taught occasional archives courses since 1970, but in the late 1970s, archival training became a key part of the over all SLS program and the school began to market its expertise in that area. Finally, for a brief period in the 1970s, SLS had enjoyed considerable prestige for its Knapp Foundation-funded school media program—Knapp funds had supported the hiring of Thomas Downen and Edward Newren—but the funds ran out and Downen and Newren left.

Search and retrieval rapidly became the crucial link between older library science traditions—bibliography, reference, and

cataloguing/classification—and the new information science, a sort of "boundary object" which either discipline could embrace and usefully exploit. The use of OPACs, searchable databases, and Research Libraries Group electronic resources very rapidly became a central part of SLS concerns for both traditional librarians and new information scientists. Better still, search and retrieval were activities to which the extant body of high-end professional librarian knowledge could contribute considerably—and could validate claims that library science was not the conservative backwater its critics claimed it to be. Moreover, the search and retrieval techniques of the late 1970s and even more, of the early 1980s, turned out to be quite conceptually scalable, even though they were technically far more complicated over time. Database linkage could and did morph into data base development and design, intelligent agent search bots, and intelligent filtering, arriving today at issues of metadata descriptors and information architecture.

Coincidentally, the new search and retrieval techniques undermined the long, hierarchically-based bibliographic and classification approached pioneered by the Bishop generation. While hierarchical constructions of knowledge and information had once provided shortcuts to finding specific information (at the cost of embedding strong cultural notions of the

relative worth of different varieties of knowledge), computer-based searching had sufficient power to approach flat, non-hierarchical databases using brute force. Politically and intellectually speaking, the hierarchies of knowledge once taken for granted by librarians and intellectuals in the 'teens and twenties came under intense fire in the 1970s, with the emergence of multiculturalism and cultural relativism. Happily for reference librarians, technical changes in search methods facilitated the implementation of more "democratic" or post-colonial conceptions of information and knowledge. In a flat, brute-force search, sources from Dakar were placed implicitly on the same level of importance as those sited in Paris.

Another very important and unique asset of librarianship that was elegantly brought into information science was a deep understanding of reference work and user needs analysis. By 1980, the reference interview became a standard part of the repertoire of library practice and from that time on, librarians became increasingly attentive to user-centeredness—that what the user wants to know, not what the librarian thinks is appropriate, forms the core of fruitful reference services. This notion of user centeredness evolved even further in the late 1980s and 1990s into a key notion of user-centered design, that human-information system

interfaces should be designed according to user needs, not according necessarily to the tastes of computer makers.

With the embrace of information science, SLS made remarkable strides toward self-modernization and greater intellectual legitimacy within the UM community. Nonetheless, pressure from the administration for deeper change was unrelenting: in the painful University budget crisis of the 1979-1983 period, SLS, like many of its peers elsewhere, teetered on the brink of extinction. Indeed, within a very short time, two of the top library schools in the country, those at Columbia University and the University of Chicago, abruptly closed.

At the beginning of the 1980s, then, morale within the school was at its nadir. The school had long prided itself on its placements, especially to other library school faculties and to high-powered academic and research libraries, but the measures of success slid in a glutted job market and with the gradual weakening of SLS' reputation in academic librarianship. The wave of tenure denials by the Academic Vice-President's Office seemed to SLS that its once-comfortable standing with administration was in deep jeopardy. Outside research funding was declining apace with cuts in federal research funding generally, the Title II-B funds for minorities were

clearly in danger (they would evaporate soon), and administration seemed always ready to demand a "tax" from the school, rolling back previously-committed money to administration. Dean Bidlack and others often noted that such taxes on SLS tended to be higher as a percentage of their budgets than they were on nearly all other academic units. In the midst of the University's budget crisis, administration set up two successive special processes in order to make the hard choices. First there was a Strategic Planning process and reporting regime demanded of all academic units, followed by a Budget Priorities Commission.

The purpose of both, as seen by SLS and other small academic/professional units was obvious: they had better justify their existence, lest they be scrubbed. The pinnacle of this sort of pressure was a visit to a SLS faculty meeting by Academic Vice-President Billy Frye in the early 1980s. In that venue, Frye could not have been more direct: snapping his fingers, he said that he could shut the school down, "like that!"[25] In the later consensus of SLS faculty, the school survived at that time in large part because of its high national ranking—though it is important to note that the programs at Chicago and Columbia were also highly ranked. In short, SLS

---

[25] *Op. cit.*, Informal history of SILS, p. 5. Shortly after, Frye left Michigan to be President of Emory University, where he closed their library school.

faculty felt they had done hard, journeyman's work to buttress the program over the previous decade, only to have their efforts ignored by administration. In 1985, there was a consensus that the school had been in a holding pattern for a number of years—waiting, waiting, waiting for the next COA report, for the next round of rankings, for the next memo from Frye's office. Life in a high-tension holding pattern was not easy.

When Russell Bidlack announced his intention to retire at the end of the 1983-84 academic year a national search commenced for his replacement. The ideal profile of a new Dean was that s/he be well accomplished as a fund-raiser, be of national repute in her/his field and be able to negotiate head-to-head with administration. The sort of librarian of information science educator he or she actually was mattered little: the agenda was to find a leader who could please both the SLS faculty and the administration and manage not only to save the school but to bring it back to prosperity. The top candidate turned out to be Robert M. Warner, a peripheral member of the school's faculty, longtime Director of the Bentley Library, and, at the time, Archivist of the United States. Warner had demonstrated years of political and fund-raising skills, taking the otherwise obscure Michigan Historical Collections out of the dim basement of Angell Hall and amassing sufficient political and financial capital to make it one of the nation's top

archival research libraries, complete with its own very well-equipped building and facilities. At the time, however, Warner was not available. He was extremely busy wrangling the Washington political establishment to make the National Archives an independent agency, fully separated from its old bureaucratic home in the monumentally inappropriate Government Services Administration. He managed to delay his appointment at SLS for a year, during which time Richard Dougherty, Director of University Libraries, served as Interim Dean.

SLS was certainly under considerable pressure for reform in the year of Dougherty's deanship. Despite the inevitable hanging-in-suspense that an interim deanship represented—a continuation of the waiting game—the faculty affirmed the challenge and held a thoroughgoing review of the school. Nothing was spared scrutiny in a set of retreats and self-study exercises, whether it be the mission, the personnel practices, the curriculum, or the name of the school. Warner participated in the process mostly from a distance in Washington, but his real and virtual presence was sufficient to lend guidance and direction to the process. In the self-study of 1984-85, SLS paid special attention the program at the University of Pittsburgh, where Tom Galvin was then Dean, because more than any other library science program, it had been the most successful in moving

fully toward information science. Galvin made a site visit to SLS in March 1985.

The curricular changes developed in the 1984-85 process were considerable, representing first a reconsideration of targeted professions and careers for students, and second, a reframing and retranslation of traditional library activities to information science analogues—a massive conceptual remapping. The result was a reengineering of the program from library science to information science as it was then understood. On redefining the intended careers, the list of January 1985 was impressive:

cataloguing/technical services
archival administration/records management
automation
data base design
instructional development
research
education/instruction
administration/management
information retrieval
networks
indexing/abstracting
information distributors and providers
commercial information product trainers
information brokers/consultants
media design/development

vendors of library systems
corporate data base management[26]

The list was, of course, impressive, though it is far from clear how the available faculty would find the expertise to teach in many of the newer areas, especially as recent hires (including Jeannette Mosey, Julie Todaro, and Margaret Taylor) were not prepared to do so and few new hires were in the offing. This did lead Warner later to propose that in order to pursue such a transformative agenda, administration could front-load several hires prematurely—something not allowed Warner, but given to his successor, Daniel Atkins, in 1993. Importantly, however, the new agenda for fields moved SLS away from a simple user orientation toward computing; rather, SLS graduates, it would hope could themselves become designers and developers of information systems. This implied an assiduous search for partners in other units—the Business School and Computer Science Department in particular—but that did not seem to have been suggested. Indeed, when Manfred Kochen again proposed a multi-unit interdisciplinary information science program the very next month (February 1985) SLS demurred.

---

[26] "Report of the Curriculum Task Force, Meeting of January 15 [1985]," SILS archives, Bentley Library, Box 21, Folder: "SLS Dean's Files RM Warner Dean-Elect 1984/85 Library School Planning 1985."

The second curricular task, remapping library science fields over to information science, required considerable reflection, and it was largely successful. The figure below indicates the outcome; some explanation is, however, in order.

<ftp://rfrost@ftp-novell.si.umich.edu///patty/media_services/75/other-images/1985_Curriculum_Diagram.AI> Frank: this is an Illustrator file, so you can rescale it easily.

The outer ring, "Information Resources," would once have been simply "Libraries." The next ring stresses new aspects of professional training. "Environments and Users" frames the context of professional training and concerns. Now, the remapping: traditional collection development and cataloguing and classification get rolled into "Collections and Organization," bibliographic work becomes "Access," and a new domain emerges, "Systems and Technologies," announcing SLS' commitment to training in the operational and developmental aspects of emerging information technology (IT). Halting and as perhaps as awkward as it might appear in retrospect, this remapping conceptually succeeded in reframing and modernizing the traditional domains of library practice. Joan Durrance, developer in large part of the new paradigm for SLS

successfully laid the conceptual foundation for a massive transition. Marking the change definitively, in 1986, the name of the school changed from the School of Library Science to the School of Information and Library Studies (SILS).

Meanwhile, Academic Vice President and Provost Billy Frye had a major campus IT crisis to address: how to modernize the University's physical infrastructure and instructional programs to address the emerging Information Age. The questions were many, including what the role of the Library should be, how the computing infrastructure should be interlinked with emerging new library services, and most relevant for SILS, what the role of the school should be in the research, development, and deployment of systems and procedures in the lacuna between computing and information systems. The latter query was significant for SILS, as it stressed an emerging consensus within the faculty that "hands-on" experience and research were far more useful than textbook-based lessons and practices. SILS had often been criticized in the past for its ostensible distaste for theory, yet following Bishop's reluctance to embrace internships and practica, the school's pedagogy had often gravitated toward a pairing of tried-and-true textbook learning allied with practical examples and problem-solving exercises. The implicit shift toward practice-based

learning and research with a strong focus on field experience offered a new, fresh pedagogical approach. In response to Frye's queries, Joan Durrance wrote in a memo to Dean Warner in January 1986:

> The research of the school will be strengthened if we work more closely with the University library and computer staff to design information systems that are more responsive to the users of information. Our faculty could also work more closely with library and computer staff to evaluate present systems.[27]

This approach clearly and elegantly validated SILS' by-then long standing preoccupation with user-oriented service provision.

Yet significant barriers remained, preventing SILS to attain the visions it and Frye sought.[28] In the same memo noted above, Durrance noted that there simply was not the critical mass of technical skills among the faculty to achieve the desired ends. She suggested that the long-ignored (by SILS) Institute for Social Research (ISR) might provide some of the requisite training. ISR had for decades been a globally recognized leader in data librarianship and had, through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), offered summer courses to faculty all

---

[27] Durrance memo to Warner, January 2, 1986, p. 1. SILS archives, Bentley Library, Box 22, Folder: "SILS Office Files Academic Affairs 1985-1990."

[28] One of the main participants in Frye's IT working group, Douglas van Houweling, then Vice Provost for Information Technology and a key figure in the making of the Internet, noted that though SILS was invited to participate in the work group because

over the world for training in social science data methods and analysis. (ISR and ICPSR had long been the crown jewels of Michigan's global leadership in computing, garnering millions of dollars in outside grants and unrelenting scholarly attention). In addition, SILS' doctoral students also lacked the skills, so the usual faculty practice of relegating "technical issues" to research assistants was not possible. Finally, Prof. Durrance noted the isolation of the school's faculty not only from the research agenda of potential partner units within the university, but also among faculty members within the school.[29]

The continuing problem, then, centered on a faculty that knew what it needed to do yet lacked the appropriate people to do it. That was far better than the mentality described in a well-known article by Pauline Wilson in The Journal of Academic Librarianship in May 1988, entitled, "Mission and Information: What Does a Librarian Do?," where the author essentially threw up her hands in despair over the profession's lack of direction. In recognition of the fact SILS finally did have a clear sense of mission, in the Spring of 1987 Dean Warner had his new Associate Dean, Carolyn Frost,

---

of its emerging expertise in electronic librarianship, it had little then to contibute due to its own lack of expertise. (E-mail exchange with author, July 2001).

[29] *Ibid.* p.3.

survey the faculty on what they considered to be an ideal profile of total faculty skills. The list reflected a combination of the old library science and the new information science perspectives:

1. bibliographic control; organization of materials
2. information production and dissemination; publishing and related areas
3. design of automated information systems
4. use of automated information systems; actual use in libraries
5. information science; theory of information retrieval and access
6. information sources
7. administration, management
8. empirical research methods
9. collection development and management; preservation
10. access
11. area in the cutting edge of system design theory; e.g., artificial intelligence
12. area in the cutting edge of system design implementation (actual system as opposed to theory)
13. cognate area in social sciences; e.g., psychology, sociology and its relation to the use of language and logic in information organization and access
14. cognate area in area such as linguistics/philosophy and its relation to the us of language and logic in information organization and access
15. university library administration
16. archive administration
17. medical libraries; special libraries
18. public libraries, law libraries
19. school libraries
20. information policy

This odd agglomeration of areas of expertise did not go as far as the visions of Frye or Durrance, yet they did not try to revert to the safe old agenda of traditional library science. It did try to revive areas in which SLS had once

provided leadership (university library administration; academic librarianship seems to be subsumed under other rubrics) and no longer did. The hiring the previous year of Miranda Pao and Karen Markey (now Drabenstott) boded well for the new, synthetic agenda of the school.

Dean Warner himself led the campaign for change, of course. As a first step toward an intellectual agenda the looked to the ALA's COA as the sole legitimator of the program, Warner named a prestigious panel drawn from a national pool to study the school and recommend changes. This was symbolically as well as practically important, for it indicated to administration that UMS was seeking to build a new constituency and community of support, presaging the recognition that would be necessary to achieve leadership in information science. Members included people from the corporate community, including the CEO of University Microfilms International, a VP for Engineering at Chrysler, as well as John D'Arms, Dean of the Graduate School, and Daniel Atkins, then an Associate Dean of Engineering (and soon to be Interim Dean of Engineering). The meetings came up with few practical proposals, but they did serve to underline the urgency of further change and to develop ties that would in the future be vital to the school. Efforts to have an all-UM Symposium on Information led to naught, largely due to schedule conflicts.

Warner's term as Dean was thus important for the way that it helped blaze a path toward modernization, but even more, to develop external political and financial allies to reduce the insularity and increase the budget of the school. indeed, fund-raising had been Warner's forte at the Bentley and he quickly moved both to increase the endowment of the school—at the time limited to small personal gifts and the residuals of old Carnegie Corporation gifts—and to find new quarters. SILS had been pressured for a number of years to develop its own endowment fund so that it need not rely entirely on funds provided by administration under the "general funds" label, but had had minimal success. In a memo to Frye in 1983, Bidlack had written that SILS alumni were not very well paid and hence not a prodigious possible source of endowment dollars, but worse, according to Bidlack,

> I must confess my own ineptitude in fund raising. I am confident that as my successor is sought during the coming months, fund raising ability will be an important attribute to identify in the recruitment and selection process.[30]

Of course, Robert Warner did become his successor, and his fund-raising, while far from what he might have wished in terms of sheer dollars,

---

[30] Letter of Russell E. Bidlack to Billy Frye, March 23, 1983. SILS archives, Bentley Library, Box 36, Folder: "Dean's Files-Bidlack; capital campaign."

proved that the school could successfully develop external funding allies. Warner's fund-raising acumen materialized elegantly not only in his success at getting new quarters for the school in West Engineering Hall (now simply West Hall), but in a capital campaign to build a state-of-the-art conference and multimedia room, the Ehrlicher Room, named after the spouse of a SILS alumna. The new quarters were impressive and went a very long way to alleviate the low morale of a faculty crammed into the dingy, afterthought dungeon of Winchell Hall. (It should be noted that until 1997, Winchell had been a parking place for departments temporarily displaced by building renovations, but SILS was there from 1969 to 1988, underlining a sense of marginalization and temporariness). As far as funding went, however, SILS lacked a close relationship with a generous foundation as it had had with the Carnegie Corporation before World War II—until Warner met with Dr. Arlon Elser of the Kellogg Foundation in 1987. These first forays toward the Kellogg Foundation started a long and very fruitful relationship for both, not the least of which centered on the Kellogg Foundation's dual concerns for the future of information and its commitment to grass-roots service and hands-on training.

Robert Warner's term as Dean was largely a success. The wrenching process of modernization was well on its way, external research funding

sources were better developed, new quarters had been found, some promising new faculty were hired, finances were improved, the curriculum was up-to-date among its (dwindling number of) peers, and the school had broken out of its insularity. SILS had decisively moved away from its old library school habits and vaulted into information science, but a nagging question remained in suspension: was it enough? Was “information science” the answer to the myriad issues emerging in concert with the rise of the Information Society? Was SILS’ framework of perception and analysis big enough, and were the members of the faculty well enough equipped to take leadership in the broader and more technical issues associated with the emergence of the Internet (and later, the World Wide Web) and the personal computer, as well as the development of information-based business processes, from smart manufacturing to intelligent design and embedded processing? Finally, how would the emerging issue of digital libraries and the growing body of “born digital” information resources be addressed?

The new Provost (and soon-to-be-President), James Duderstadt, had been pondering such questions for months at the time that Robert Warner announced his intention to retire from the deanship in 1991. The IT issues raised during Frye’s term in office (how the university would adapt to the

emerging information technologies, etc.) remained unresolved. In addition, Duderstadt's administrative agenda was already well filled by other, more pressing issues—not the least of which included an emerging financial crisis in the Medical Center—so as far as SILS was concerned, and until Warner announced his impending retirement, the school had garnered little attention from him. Early on, he had decided that though the school might have been a bit troubled, there was no fire burning and, as its net cost to the University was negligible, he decided to table any actions toward it.

The upcoming change in Deans at SILS, however, opened up an opportunity to resolve two issues at once: the continuing tangle of IT service and training activity on campus and the simmering problems in SILS. Another key concern on Duderstadt's part centered on how best to utilize the monumental administrative and intellectual skills of his close ally, Dan Atkins.[31]

Daniel Atkins had enjoyed a long scholarly career in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) and as an Associate Dean of the College of

[31] The question of "what to do with Dan Atkins" was identified as one of Duderstadt's concerns; author interview with Duderstadt, June 15, 2001, UM Media Union.

Engineering, working (with Charles Vest, soon to be President of MIT) as Duderstadt's associate when the latter was Dean of Engineering. In his scholarly work, Atkins had started out on issues of image processing and tomography, later moving into mainframe-based computing architecture. In those pursuits, over time he had become bored with the mantra, "smaller, faster, cheaper," that reigned in EECS. An interdisciplinarian at heart, he saw computer science as a discipline and EECS as a department moving ever more tightly into a space dominated by chips and codes, asking few large questions about users or social contexts. In the meantime, Atkins had demonstrated considerable talent as an administrator, overseeing a major reshaping of the College of Engineering. He first managed a reworking of the engineering curriculum in order to update it away from its older orientation toward traditional Machine Age issues. He then saw to rebuilding the faculty, hiring close to two hundred new members between 1982 and 1987. Conscious of the crisis in IT across campus, Atkins founded the CAEN network under Engineering's own tutelage. Crucially, CAEN's computing services model was based on distributed processing and resources, a vast shift from the time-sharing model then used by computing services on central campus. The concept of distributed computing was new at the time, yet its conceptual framework has since become the foundation for contemporary computing, from wired

personal computers to the Internet and the Web. Indeed, the distributed computing model ultimately allowed the various UM campus networks to access the Internet in an almost seamless fashion.[32]

Atkins' successful administrative approach in Engineering centered on a simple notion. As he stated it, "Get good people, get them resources, and set them off…".[33] The implicit next step was then to increase the incentives and rewards for the best faculty, while hoping the less responsive colleagues might move on. The rewards and incentives were vital in this strategy and he managed to wheedle $9 million annually from administration for the task. In addition, by rewarding grant-writing, he relieved faculty of the risks of wasted, no-return time for unfunded proposals, thereby getting more proposals written and hence vastly increasing externally-sponsored research. Perhaps Atkins' most valuable administrative talent was his personal style. He had an uncanny ability to identify the core issues in specific problems, focus sharply on them, and set up ad hoc committees to resolve them—rapidly. He did not suffer fools

---

[32] It should be noted that Atkins' experience in that domain raised an issue upon which he now in part focuses, that building infrastructure is far from a heroic task. It usually means meeting expectations, forcing changes of habit, and getting noticed only when things don't work. This observation informed his future deanship at the School of Information, as it made him aware that there are very real dangers associated with providing conceptual and intellectual infrastructure for emerging information technologies, as the School of Information now does.
[33] Interview with author, West Hall, November 15, 2000.

gladly, yet he took the measure of all and allocated attention to the movers and shakers.

As the Duderstadt era at Engineering ended with Duderstadt's promotion to campus administration, Atkins was left in suspense. He took a sabbatical to rethink his options and in the process began to realize his nagging second thoughts about continuing in EECS, especially as his intellectual concerns had shifted even further from chips and codes, and toward issues of the process and organization of innovation and the social side of computing. What later came to be known as "cognitive communities," like-minded yet distant intellectual alliances, became a central concern of his. Atkins' discomfort with the then-current agenda of EECS and its peers merged with his concern for organization and innovation. Invited to participate National Academy of Engineering workshops on the future of computing by Josh Lederberg, Atkins laid out his views. The report of the workshops, Computing the Future, A Broader Agenda for Computer Science and Engineering,[34] lobbed an explosive salvo toward the profession—that it had created an intellectual cul-de-sac all its own, focusing on highly technical issues while sidestepping the most important issues of user orientation, organizational attributes, and social systems. For

Atkins as for the report, computer science was becoming more irrelevant as it became more technically sophisticated. It was time to leave. There was a yawning gap between the chips and codes of Computer Science and the user orientation of Information and Library Science; perhaps he could develop a way to bridge it.

Returning from his sabbatical, Atkins tried to be "just another faculty member" in EECS, but couldn't. At the same time, several "homeless" poles of intellectual attraction had emerged outside EECS, and they shared many of his concerns. Key among them was the so-called BACH group, composed of Ed Burke (of ??), John Holland (of Psychology), and Robert Axelrod and Michael Cohen (both of Political Science/Public Policy). The BACH group was not only the core group of a campus-wide Organizational Studies interest group, it grappled with issues of the interactions and interfaces between systems (social and technical) and organizations, as well as the problems of human adaptation to complex systems. On the periphery of that group was a young Assistant Professor in Economics, Jeff Mackie-Mason, who was then grappling with pricing models for information goods and services—a concern centered on decision-making in IT. A community concerned with computer-supported

[34] Juris Hartmanis and Herbert Lin, eds. (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1992).

collaborative work (CSCW) had emerged with Gary and Judy Olson (he of Psychology, she of Psychology and the Business School) leading it. Their research unit, the Collaboratory for Research on Electronic Work (CREW) did far more than their name implied: it studied how issues of trust, organizational identity and solidarity, and social interaction functioned over networks. In liaison with Atkins, CREW (along with a number of space scientists) had embarked on a highly successful distance-collaboration research project, the Upper Atmosphere Research Collaboratory (UARC). Finally, a group of university librarians and several SILS faculty members had developed concepts of user-centered design as it had developed out of reference practice. Their concern with how people made sense of what was on a screen spoke volumes about how cyberspace was being defined and bounded by computer scientists, not users. These nodes of innovation and Atkins were developing a key set of concepts around issues on congruity between social and information systems—and few others on campus seemed to have appreciated the significance of their agenda, certainly none of the extant academic units. They needed a home if their fruitful and promising efforts were to attain a critical mass. That home, of course, turned out to be SILS.

Robert Warner was not distant from the conversations that went on among Atkins, the BACH group, the Olsons, and Duderstadt, who by then had become President of the University. A key meeting was held with Gail McClure of the Kellogg Foundation (following up on contacts in part initiated by Warner) and an avenue for supporting an initiative to join the disparate and dispersed nodes was hammered out. A key component of the Kellogg strategy was hands-on learning and community service, and issues of user-centered information retrieval, practical engagement, and IT innovation had already become clear concerns of the different nodes. In early 1992, therefore, with Warner's strong support, it was decided: Daniel Atkins was to become the new Dean of the school and the research and teaching agendas of BACH, CREW, Mackie-Mason, Atkins, and the user-centered design enthusiasts would meld with those of SILS to form an entirely new intellectual venue on the UM campus.

Despite water-cooler claims by some that the shift in 1992 represented a "coup d'étât," the new agenda for the school represented more an extension of ongoing information science efforts than a complete recasting of the school's mission. Indeed, Atkins himself had already done consulting on networked resources for libraries, so he had credibility in the area of library services. In addition, two recent hires, Amy Warner and Joe

Janes, along with Karen Drabenstott, had already begun to systematically address issues of electronic search and retrieval systems—and Janes was soon to found the Internet Public Library. The fit between SILS faculty and the agenda of the important external nodes conceptually made very good sense in the considered opinions of Duderstadt and Atkins. As the National Academy of Engineering report had noted, Computer Science as a discipline had largely shunned an agenda encompassing information and society issues and by 1992, SLS, and later, SILS had approached an analogous agenda of user services and information access—their own professional version of information and society—since the mid-1980s, but lacked the resources and expertise to master the domain. There was a large, open disciplinary field and the new SILS agenda was soon to have the capacity to master it.

On becoming Dean, Dan Atkins showed a certain reluctance initially to press an abruptly transformative agenda. As he had learned before, the best way to transform an academic unit into a cognitive community centered on first, getting the resources and incentives necessary to set faculty on new, aggressive professional paths. But more importantly and less visibly, it meant building an infrastructure that could support a larger, more innovative community. The IT infrastructure in West Hall and SILS

was then weak in the face of the task ay hand. If SILS was to lead the way globally in the new domains of information studies, it had to have massive networked resources and a staff to support them. Given wide financial flexibility from administration to develop the IT infrastructure suited to the task, Atkins oversaw the transformation of a unit groping its way on a short budget into a working laboratory of state-of-the-art information technology. A more astute faculty demanded more than was usual, but the new Information Technology Services (ITS) unit offered far more than that, with its bank of network servers and expertise in support for all computing platforms and myriad software packages.

Parallel to efforts in IT services, Dean Atkins also modernized the administration of the school, first building a scalable model for integrated financial, budget, and grant accounting. While it had been years since school budgets were managed in little more than ledger books with administration electronically tracking accounts (as in the Bidlack era), the shift to a new system set the foundation for a burgeoning of externally-supported research, for equipment purchases, and for much greater professional travel—all with complex allocations to a plethora of different accounts. Similarly, Atkins oversaw the development of highly professionalized operations in development and public outreach. Finally,

in order to address the continuing problem of enrollments, Atkins began an extended effort to pursue more aggressive student recruitment. In a few short years, SILS shifted from administrative models and practices reminiscent of a small liberal arts department to those of a top-flight professional and research-oriented school. Such efforts were as important symbolically as practically. They let the faculty know that the next transition would rest on solid infrastructural and financial foundations.

Despite plans for rapid growth, SILS did little faculty hiring between 1992 and 1996, in part because of Dean Atkins' determination to build the requisite IT and administrative infrastructures first. Two major hires were made in 1994-95, that of Margaret Hedstrom and George Furnas. Hedstrom was a world-renowned archivist, adept not only at traditional archives, but also a leading figure in the world of electronic records—a very nice fit in an erstwhile library school that was supplementing traditional concerns with paper-based information resources with a new concentration on electronic resources. By happy coincidence, Atkins and Hedstrom had met at an ASIS conference—an information science organization whose meetings neither regularly attended. Furnas, trained as a cognitive psychologist, had, while working at Bell Labs, developed innovative ways for users to interface with complex, mixed content data bases, including the use of intelligent agent

technology. He, too, was a good fit in SILS' transition, as his work shifted to a higher register the older information science concern with data bases and search and retrieval. Hedstrom and Furnas started at SILS in the Fall of 1996.

The real changes began in the fall of 1995 at the first SILS faculty meeting for the 1995-96 academic year. Atop the agenda was a (successful) proposal to offer joint appointments to several people:

- Michael Cohen (Political Science and Public Policy)
- Jeff Mackie-Mason (Economics)
- Judy Olson (School of Business & Psychology)
- Gary Olson (Psychology)
- Ed Durfee (EECS)
- Bill Birmingham (EECS)
- Douglas van Houweling (EECS and Vice-Provost for IT)

This effectively brought into SILS many of the core people in the nodes of change noted above, putting the school on a new trajectory that reached far beyond the old information science framework. As such, the curriculum needed serious redesign, not least of which included redesigning a

common set of core courses and defining new subfields, as well as moving to rename the school and having it rechartered by the Board of Regents—no small tasks, those. The multitude of meetings and retreats were daunting, but the tasks were completed by the end of that academic year. Most publicly important were the rechartering, accomplished in March of 1996, a name change to the School of Information and the writing of a new mission statement.

The greatest danger in the entire venture was that SI could become not a school with a unified vision and mission, but a basket full of divergent interests. The faculty decided that best ways to bridge the gaps was to develop teamwork in research and teaching, and it was on teaching—redesigning the core—that the faculty first developed a common agenda. Ultimately four core courses were built, initially team-taught by pairings of people having diverse backgrounds. The four and their initial staffing were:

1. SI 501: The Uses of Information (Durrance and Judy Olson)
2. SI 502: Choice and Learning (Gary Olson and Jeff Mackie-Mason)
3. SI 503: Search and Retrieval (Amy Warner and Furnas)
4. SI 504: Social Systems and Collections (Hedstrom and Cohen)

A Kellogg-funded Practical Engagement Program (PEP) supplemented the academic training for students. PEP was not optional: the SI faculty made it clear that the new Master's of Science in Information degree (MSI, supplanting the AMLS and MLS degrees) had to have a practical component to be acceptable. A $5 million Kellogg grant for PEP supported in all or in part a number of activities to extend IT knowledge and practice to historically underserved communities, including but not limited to:

- The archiving of liberation movement papers at the University of Fort Hare in South Africa
- Development of community information infrastructures on the reservations of Native American nations
- Alternative Spring Break activities in inner city areas
- The Yupik Alaskan Mask Exhibit to display Inuit cultural artifacts
- The Internet Public Library
- The Community Information Corps (CIC)

The CIC soon became a permanent fixture at SI. Overseen by Prof. Paul Resnick, it became a popular site for SI student sociability, reaching out to underserved communities to help bring them into the Information Age.

PEP seemed to accomplish the impossible, and it did so in new, very innovative ways: to supplement classroom learning with hands-on experience, but in such a way that the results were positive and palpable. The past successes and continuing commitment of SI faculty and staff to PEP represent a unique pedagogical approach and make the new school one of the most innovative in the nation. Indeed, other, similar programs often look longingly at SI's as a model for themselves. For students lacking the requisite technical skills, the school offered a number of low-credit courses in areas such as Web design, Java, and the like, all of which demanded that students demonstrate their competence through concrete projects.

Finally, during the 1995-96 academic year the faculty developed the subfields that would comprise foci for the MSI program—a program which now requires 48 credit-hours for graduation. Just as the old cataloguing/classification, reference/bibliography, and collection-building rubrics were largely expunged from the core in favor of a more innovative agenda, so, too were the areas of concentration. They are now (as of July 2001) four in number, with each offering enough contiguity with the others to encourage broad as well as specific learning: Library and Information Services (LIS, modernized library services), Archives and Records

Management (ARM), Human-Computer Interaction (HCI), and Information Economics, Management, and Policy (IEMP). In addition, several implicit subfields are emerging as well: data architecture and Science and Technology Studies. The panoply of knowledge and skills developed in these areas make SI graduates top candidates for work in almost any domain of the world of information, from Web and database designers to archivists, policymakers, and librarians. SI's recent successes in placing its graduates make it possible for new MSIs from the school to anticipate future salaries far better not only than traditional librarians, but greater even than some of the faculty who trained them!

After Lee Bollinger's ascent to the Presidency of the University in 1997, Dan Atkins vacated the Dean's Office. He was replaced on an interim basis by Gary Olson in 1998, as Atkins' departure was rather precipitous. Olson continued to build the faculty along the vectors developed by Atkins and the faculty. Atkins had already overseen the hiring of Paul Resnick and had managed to convince Derrick Cogburn to retire from jetting around Africa working on information and communication technology systems in order to join SI. In the transition between Atkins and Olson, Paul Edwards was hired from Stanford into a joint appointment (with the Residential College) to teach the history of IT and science and technology studies. Gary Olson

oversaw the hiring of two very promising young scholars, Suresh Bhavnani and Drago Radev (the latter joint with EECS).

Despite unstinting efforts on Atkins' part, however, enrollments were not yet at the desired level. Most of the faculty had thought that with sufficient publicity and professional visibility, SI's "mind share" would soon succeed in a wave of applicants, but that "soon" was not fast enough for the administration. Equally important, trying to gain visibility for an entirely new intellectual and professional agenda was not easy. A law, medical, or traditional library school could simply say, "Come to our Law/Medical/Library School—we have quite the reputation," but the cost of being on the leading edge of change entailed having to explain what SI is. Defining a new agenda was not easy, but making that agenda conceptually accessible to college senior was trickier still. More direct efforts had to be taken to improve student recruitment and along those lines, Gary Olson hired Lipman Hearne, a consulting firm, to rethink SI's marketing strategy toward possible applicants. Much of the consultants' recommendations have been successfully implemented, including skillful identification of potential students, approaching them with postcards, and offering substantial Web-based and human resources to whet their interest

and encourage applications. As a result, both applications and admissions are now rising significantly.

Gary Olson also oversaw a reshaping of efforts in development. He had inherited Linda Bennett from SILS, but decided that SI needed a more professional development officer, one who could keep close contact with the thousands of alumni and potential donors, remembering their names and faces and building a continuing rapport with them. He found the appropriate candidate with Shelley MacMillan. Similarly, though Dean Atkins had restructured the internal accounting system, Gary Olson knew that successful grantsmanship had to rely not only on someone knowing the intricacies of grant administration (with their tangles of cost-allocations, cost-sharing, and the like), but someone who had the broad picture of which granting entities would be appropriate for the wide range of research performed at SI. He found that person in Ann Verhey-Henke, who now is the faculty's powerful and practical ally in their quest for research funding resources.

Daniel Atkins and Gary Olson did not succeed in finding new physical space for SI. Over the years, promises and proposals had come and gone, and SILS and SI staff had walked every inch of North and Central

Campuses looking for space. Even before SLS moved into West Hall, Bob Warner had elicited a promise from administration that SLS would get space in the proposed engineering library, now the Media Union, but that led nowhere. Similarly, Atkins had won a commitment from the administration to reallocate LS&A space in West Hall to SI—an architect was hired an initial plans were developed—, but that option evaporated with Duderstadt's retirement as President. Now SI's operations are split between the main offices in West Hall, supplemented by space vacated on North Campus as a consequence of removing a mainframe computing center, and assorted offices on East Liberty Street, Shapiro Library, and (until recently) in the School of Education Building. The obvious solution would be a new building dedicated to SI exclusively, yet SI lacks a capital budget of sufficient scale at this time.

In the Spring of 1999, the search for a new Dean commenced, facing a pool of candidates that was far from deep. The number of people with the requisite experience who also understood and admired the SI agenda was small, but SI was fortunate to identify a sufficient number of very good candidates. The faculty recommended the appointment of John L. King of the University of California-Irvine (UCI) and the administration approved, so King became Dean in January, 2000. King came to the SI agenda with a

very diverse set of experiences, not least of which was his successful transformation of UCI's Computer Science Program from a chips-and-codes operation into a unit with an agenda nearly as bold as that of SI. He had also done work in digital libraries and had sat on system-wide councils for the University of California. A well-known scholar, his work was already known by a diverse array of SI faculty. Better still, he had been successful at turning around enrollments while at UCI. As of this writing, King's potential has been largely realized, as he has integrated SI with other academic and professional units on campus quite successfully, negotiated a solid relationship of mutual respect with the administration, and overseen a sustainable upward trend in enrollments. He had performed the hard task of managing to integrate the diverse agendas that until recently remained strong, helping to create an internal sense of unity and purpose that the school has not known for two decades. His vision and practical administrative skills bode well for the future of SI.

Conclusion: Into The New Millennium

In 2001-2002, the School of Information at the University of Michigan simultaneously celebrates its distant past, recent past, and promising future, marking seventy-five years as an academic unit and five years as

the School of Information. As you have seen, that path has not lent itself to being a simple, heroic, and linear story—no history really does. There have been twists and turns and unforeseen events, but through it all the school has maintained standards of excellence and leadership in its chosen professional and intellectual domains. The faculty and staff have learned as well as taught, adapting to the changing world of information in an extraordinarily agile fashion. We are confident that it will do even better in the future.

SI is now confidently looking to the future. In the Spring of 2001, a campus-wide task force, the President's Information Revolution Commission (PIRC), studied the instructional and research dimensions of UM's future position in the Information Society and implicitly concluded that SI's agenda now stands at the center of the University's mission. For the first time in over half a century, the School is moving to offer courses undergraduates, providing them with the bases to become citizens of a new, information-based economy. Supported by PIRC's conclusions, SI is now being launched into a role as a key center of innovation for the University as a whole.

Rising from the wreckage of failed peer library programs across the country, SI has proved that the dubious "modernize or die" dilemma faced by librarianship programs in the early 1980s could be surmounted by assiduous rethinking, innovation, and leadership. Most importantly, the Deans appointed to transform the school—Warner, Atkins, and King—refused to build a future by abandoning what was so positive in the past. All three only consented to taking their jobs after being assured that SI's historical foundations in librarianship would not be razed. The consequence has been a school with a memory and set of strong intellectual traditions—and a proof that transformation is a better alternative than extinction and replacement. The University of California at Berkeley's library school faced a similar set of choices in the early 1990s and decided to abandon a commitment to the traditions of librarianship (it decided not to seek ALA accreditation), thereby building its School of Information Management and Strategy (SIMS), which treads perilously close to myriad Management Information Systems programs in business schools. Early reports on the success of the SIMS approach indicate that while it has a strong presence and mind share in the press—its Dean, Hal Varian is both a brilliant scholar and skilled pundit—its visibility within the Berkeley campus community remains low.

Other erstwhile library schools have found in SI a useful model to emulate. Florida State University (FSU) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) have both been through a transformation similar to the one that yielded SILS here: the modernization of the library school agenda by adopting an information science approach. As noted above, that shift does go a long way to addressing information issues in the twenty-first century, yet it still relies on older notions of user-centered reference work and design—the end-use orientation, not the complete system approach adopted at SI. Computer scientists often remain negative references rather than allies, so students tend to be regarded as users of information, not developers and designers of information systems and structures. Explicitly emulating SI, the University of Washington has taken a different tack from the others, creating a synthesis of library and computing science by merging many of those units' courses. Enjoying solid private-source funding from a highly prosperous neighbor in Seattle, that program is in a rapid and promising expansion phase.

Though widely emulated, however, SI remains unique among its peers, going beyond updating library science or merging it with computer science. SI has developed a unique, wide-ranging approach that empowers its graduates to assume the commanding heights in the information

industry and that focuses it research on a broad range of leading-edge issues in information. Equally unique to SI is, of course, its commitment to community service, arguably its richest inheritance from the public library movement of a century ago, and with a strength of commitment to public service that far exceeds that of its earlier incarnations. It enacts that commitment through an innovative win-win approach, offering practical training to students while serving the public as well. The education students receive at SI is, therefore, much more than the book-learning of the academic or the hands-on of the practitioner. It merges them both, forging its students into the future leaders of the Information Age.[35]