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Abstract

This case study situates the evolution of Teachers College as a negotiation between two strands of Progressive Era social reform—one that emphasized direct service and one that emphasized the development of education as a profession. While in the early years of Teachers College efforts at professionalizing education were privileged, the consequences of this “victory” were ironic. Increased agreement that teaching and administering schools required expert knowledge and skill that could be acquired by specialized training enhanced the position of Teachers College, Columbia University and its reputation. However, ultimately neither teaching nor school administration achieved the status of an autonomous and self-regulating profession. This case study provides historical evidence that suggests that failure has left college and university based teacher education vulnerable to criticism from the “descendants” of direct service reformers and sheds light on contemporary challenges to teacher education.
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On Feb. 22, 1923, over 1200 members of the Teachers College, Columbia University community gathered to celebrate the 25th anniversary of James E. Russell’s tenure as Dean, the growth of the institution, and the unique contributions of the other founders. Grace Dodge’s “cooperation, material, mental, and spiritual” was noted. Nicholas Murray Butler was cited for his institutional expertise and Russell was honored for creating a school for educators that “uplifted” the teaching profession.

This case study situates the evolution of Teachers College as a negotiation between two strands of Progressive Era social reform—one that emphasized direct service and one that emphasized the development of education as a profession. We provide evidence of Teacher College founders’ affiliations with each of the movements. We examine the negotiations between the competing impulses and their influence of those reforms on Teachers College in particular and, more generally, on teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher education. We have found that, overall, while in the early years of Teachers College efforts at professionalizing education were privileged, the consequences of this “victory” were ironic. Increased agreement that teaching and administering schools required expert knowledge and skill that could be acquired by specialized training enhanced the position of Teachers College, Columbia University and its reputation. However, ultimately neither teaching nor school administration achieved the status of an autonomous and self-regulating profession. This case study provides historical evidence that suggests that failure has left college and university based teacher education vulnerable to criticism from the “descendants” of direct service reformers and sheds light on contemporary challenges to teacher education.

education were privileged, the consequences of this “victory” were ironic. Increased agreement that teaching and administering schools required expert knowledge and skill that could be acquired by specialized training enhanced the position of Teachers College at Columbia University and its national reputation. However, ultimately neither teaching nor school administration achieved the status of an autonomous and self-regulating profession. This case study provides historical evidence that suggests that failure has left college and university based teacher education vulnerable to criticism from the “descendants” of direct service reformers and sheds light on contemporary challenges to preparation programs based in institutions of higher education. It also sheds light on “reforms” imposed on school systems in the name of professionalization that serve to further marginalize community members as direct services are increasingly removed.

**The Social Context**

The social context of New York City in the last decade of the nineteenth century reflected the rapid changes that took place in the United States after the Civil War and shaped the work of Teachers College’s founders. Industrialization drew hundreds of thousands of immigrants and migrants seeking work opportunities. Urbanization led to sanitation, housing, health, education and human welfare problems. The wild economic swings made the post Civil-War market seem lawless. In many ways to many people, the United States was a disordered and uncertain nation. The search for clarity and stability created movements to reform existing social institutions and establish new ones.

Between 1865 and 1898 the economy—wages, wealth, and capital—grew at the fastest rate in United States history. Much of the resulting personal wealth could be found on display in New York City. Newspapers chronicled the parties, galas, engagements, weddings, and divorces of the rich, including Vanderbilts, Goulds, Astors, Rockefellers and Whitneys. Luxurious hotels, like the Waldorf Astoria and later the Ritz and Knickerbocker, provided ballrooms and meeting places for younger members of the elite families and upwardly mobile contemporaries.

At the same time, however other New Yorkers lived on “filthy streets” in “over crowded and ill-ventilated housing.” Many neighborhoods consisted entirely of dark, damp and dirty tenements. Refuse flowed into the streets and yards; water supplies were contaminated. Disease was rampant. Children played in backyards where human and animal waste was abundant.
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imimately 300 were killed in street accidents during the 1890s and the danger persisted into the new century.  

8 Twenty percent of children died before they were five, especially in summers when death rates peaked.  

9 Approximately 30% of Black New York children died before their 7th birthday.  

By 1910, of the 4.7 million people living in greater New York, approximately 2 million were immigrants. They came poor; many were illiterate.  

11 Scholars point out that the absence of social safety nets meant that immigrants faced “an undemocratic system of arbitrary work rules, petty abuses, poor pay” and terrible working conditions.”  

12 The city had no “local, state, or federal welfare program, no systematized workmen’s compensation...only private charity.” Economic downturns like the depression of 1893 affected them dramatically. Large employers shut down their businesses and working class people suddenly became poor. Newspapers chronicled their efforts to survive, and their despair.  

**Direct Service Movement**  

For some members of society, the differences in the lives between the wealthy and the poor during this period led to an “awakening of social conscience.” Civic commissions, charity associations, church leagues, reform societies and social settlements emerged as organized efforts to tackle human problems that were increasingly intolerable to a growing number of wealthy and middle class men and women and to the poor and working class people who endured them. These progressives saw themselves as searching for ways to solve persistent and potentially catastrophic social problems. Historians have suggested their view of themselves was too benign. Some argue that they also acted out of self-interest, fear of status displacement, and/or from a desire to control working class, poor and immigrant members of society.  

Many direct service progressives believed that the real dangers of industrialism were not so much its physical attributes (such as the poverty and unsanitary conditions of the city) but its faced particular difficulties. They cared for younger siblings. See, “Little Mothers of the Slums,” *New York Times*, June 7, 1896.  


destruction of “historic human associations.” Their ideas led to the development of Toynbee Hall in London, Hull House in Chicago, led by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr, and the Henry Street Settlement in New York, led by Lillian Wald. Settlement workers aimed to heal and recreate neighborhoods and soften the harsh, inhuman tendencies of the new industrial nation. Over time other reformers lobbied for novel public services and policies. “In the late 19th century and early 20th century, New York city became...a vibrant, innovative center—of social science ideas and organization, an incubator for social science and progressive reform.” The city was home to organizations that united clerics, academics, businessmen, labor leaders, settlement house workers, and “practitioners of the new social science.” The organizations utilized an increasingly similar array of approaches including kindergartens, libraries, homemaking and industrial arts classes, housing, savings banks, and vacation schools. Increasingly, all these reform efforts coalesced around the belief that the eradication of the problems faced by many city residents could best be handled through direct service-oriented education projects.

While individuals, both men and women, founded and worked for these organizations, women played a critical role and tended to approach reform through a direct service agenda. The organizations that served the poor also served the middle class women who ran them. In response to others’ needs they were justified in breaking social custom and taking on previously unthinkable public roles. As they worked for and achieved suffrage, they became increasingly interested and active in government, civil service, and electoral reforms. They investigated problems, publicized their findings and pressured public officials to act. In New York City, women created the New York Council of Jewish Women, the Young Women’s Christian Association, the Catholic Women’s Benevolent League, the Traveler’s Aid Society, the University Settlement, the Henry Street Settlement, and the New York Women’s Committee. They lobbied for changes in working conditions, housing availability, and prisons. Some women moved into paid positions supervising reform efforts.

Women progressive reformers, mostly white and middle class, who sought to bring direct service reform to a variety of areas were not above racism and classism, and they did not engage fully with Black and working class women who also sought similar reforms. National organizations such as the Federation of Women’s Clubs and the National Women’s Suffrage Association—
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tion refused to admit African American Women or to take up their causes. Parallel organizations were also set up in New York City.

**Grace Hoadley Dodge and the Founding of Teachers College**

Teachers College was influenced by the direct service reform movement through the work and commitments of one of its chief founders and donors, Grace Dodge. Dodge (1856-1914) was born into a wealthy Riverdale, New York family. In the late 1870s, she became involved in several “social welfare” projects designed to teach working class and immigrant women middle class values such as “providence, thrift, cleanliness, and (household) management”. Unlike other women reformers of her class, however, she believed that it was not only the poor who needed reforming. She also believed urban, poor women could, with appropriate education, bring about positive change in a troubling world. To Dodge, the right education for such women was “domestic” training and, in 1880, she collaborated with other women to found the Kitchen Garden Association (KGA) to educate New York City girls, their parents, and public school-teachers. After four years, the KGA expanded to include training for boys and the name was changed to the Industrial Education Association (IEA). As the organization’s objectives increasingly focused on making industrial education co-equal with general education in public schools, the need to provide adequate teacher training became clear to Dodge and her colleagues.

When in 1887 Dodge obtained a $10,000 gift from Cornelius Vanderbilt to fund the salary of a president for the IEA, she used her influence to secure the position for Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia, with whom she had become acquainted through their common interest in the New York City Schools and in preparing teachers to provide industrial education in public schools. Several years later, she supported the evolution of the IEA’s teacher training into the New York College for the Training of Teachers. In 1892, she raised funds to purchase land in Morningside Heights for Teacher College’s permanent home. For five years she devoted herself to building and sustaining the College in its new site. She helped the institution ride out the 1893 Depression so well that it was debt-free at the end of every fiscal year and its needs were “liberally” met. Dodge served as the Treasurer of the Board of Trustees until 1911. She participated in negotiating the formal alliance of Teachers College and Columbia University and was key to hiring James E. Russell as the first dean. She raised or donated hundreds of thousands of dollars, provided financial, moral, and social support for students and faculty. When she died in 1914, Teachers College received more than a million dollars from her estate.

Grace Dodge has provided two descriptions of the founding of Teachers College. In the first, published in 1893, she addressed the work of the members of the KGA and the IEA. In the second, she expanded that story and included information about how Teachers College be-
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came “an integral part of Columbia University.” In both documents provide insight into Dodge’s relationship to the College—and to the College’s relationship to the direct service movement of the Progressive Era.

In the earlier work, Dodge said that Teachers College evolved from the “earnest work of a few men and women” in the KGA and IEA and was “not created” by professional educators. In Dodge’s description, Teachers College was situated in the organizations’ early commitments to manual training. The KGA provided a free education in the household arts to children of the “laboring classes.” The IEA promoted training of boys and girls in industries that affected “the house or home directly or indirectly” that would “enable students to become self-supporting.”

Wealthy and influential members of society supported both organizations and Dodge praised them lavishly. The earliest members of the KGA included Mrs. Samuel P. Blagden (Julia), whose husband was the senior member of an insurance firm in New York. Mrs. John Sinclair and her husband—a New York banker—supported charities including the New York Eye and Ear Hospital. The treasurer of the IEA was John S. Bussing, a stockbroker, who was associated with the New York Sunday school movement. George Vanderbilt provided the funds to hire its first president, purchased the land on 120th Street that became Teachers College’s home, and remained a donor for many years. These philanthropists’ were model elite “social reformers.” They chose causes that would train the poor to adapt successfully to the realities of the industrial world through projects such as vacation schools, reformatories, orphanages, and kindergartens. They signed on to the KGA’s articles of faith including the belief that to develop young people’s intellectual and moral “faculties”, public schools must combine a traditional course of study with manual training. The seal of the IEA—made up of three entwined M’s that stood for the words “moral, mental and manual—symbolized the values these elites wanted to instill in working class children and their families.

Their endeavor required skilled teachers. According to Dodge, the first report of the KGA, issued in 1881, showed “promise of future ideas” in its recognition that “Too much stress cannot be laid upon the importance of teachers being trained for this work before they undertake it.” In the process of organizing the IEA in 1884, Dodge said, “the need for the true training of teachers came to the front.” The members became convinced that such education would have to exceed the practical courses of study that had previously been offered. “It was apparent that to train persons equipped for a single branch of instruction, and not to give them besides the basis of a professional training, was not to train teachers, but mechanics, cooks, etc. The post-graduate or professional character of the work here took its start.” When Nicholas Murray Butler was appointed president of the IEA, the New York College for the Training of Teachers emerged and essentially supplanted the other work of the IEA.

Dodge worked for the new Teachers College with her usual dedication. She was known to personally address or see between twenty to thirty people in one month on behalf of the Col-
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college, including reaching out to generous donors.\textsuperscript{50} Mrs. Bryson funded the dormitory floors of 9 University Place, which provided income to the struggling college.\textsuperscript{51} Mrs. William Vanderbilt provided money for the rental and equipment of a building for the Department of Manual Arts. Many of her friends made the main building on West 120th Street possible including, George Vanderbilt, Spencer Trask, William E. Dodge, V. Everit Macy, and Mrs. Josiah Macy. James H. Jones sent $20, 000 from New Zealand to purchase additional land on 120th Street. The original three buildings—Main, Macy, and Milbank, provided seven shops for manual training, laboratories for domestic arts, and laboratories for training in the practical application of physics and chemistry.\textsuperscript{52} Dodge’s contribution provided space for the training of teachers and leaders in Household Arts—the department most closely associated with the original (direct service) purposes of the KGA and IEA.

Dodge’s descriptions of the early days of Teachers College also included tributes to members of the staff. She cited several faculty members and warmly remembered Mrs. C.L. Williams who served as the “Lady Principal” of the College. Dodge noted Williams’ combination of “a delicate sensibility, sweetness and sympathy with strong executive force and marked will.”\textsuperscript{53} She was, Dodge said, the “trusted friend of adviser of everyone from the President or Chairman of the Board of Trustees to the newest comer among the serving force.”\textsuperscript{54} Dodge’s appreciation of Mrs. Williams’ mirrored other people’s praise of Dodge herself\textsuperscript{55} and stands in sharp contrast to Russell’s evaluation of the “Lady Principal.”\textsuperscript{56}

Like many other elite women in the Progressive era, through her philanthropic work, Dodge created a place for herself in an increasingly industrial world. In her final speech to students at Teachers College, she referred to that accomplishment by noting her lack of formal education but taking pride in her work, nonetheless. “I was never educated as you are. I never had an M. A., because I had to work. But I got my education by working with people.”\textsuperscript{57} Ultimately, Dodge’s understanding of her task was one of service done in community, in keeping with its roots in the Social Gospel movement that was central to the direct service movement of the Progressive Era.\textsuperscript{58}

**Professionalization**

Industrialization not only created poverty and extremes of wealth. It also created a “middle class” whose members attempted to develop new identities through “professionalization.” The new “Professionals” pressed the idea that defining problems and identifying effective solutions required specialized knowledge and skills. Lawyers, doctors, and engineers believed that, as “experts” they should have the autonomy to regulate membership into their professions.
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and to influence the shape of the education that would prepare its members.\textsuperscript{59} Young middle class men—and a very few of their sisters—used higher education to develop new “sciences” and new identities as Progressive professionals.\textsuperscript{60} For example, the creators of the new “social sciences” claimed their expertise was essential to resolving national and municipal crises.\textsuperscript{61} They led reform associations, bureaus, committees and leagues and administered urban and industrial surveys focusing on a range of issues from class uplift to child labor.\textsuperscript{62}

School systems in cities and towns were also sites of professionalization efforts. As part of “good government” reform efforts, members of the professional class (joined in some cases by elites) replaced elected school boards with appointed ones—or eliminated them altogether. They argued that public education was vital to America’s progress and prosperity and that school governance should be centralized in the hands of experts and buffered from politics. Science, efficient management, and standardization would turn capricious educational policy into rational planning.\textsuperscript{63} In New York City in the late 1890s, a Committee of 100, the vast majority of whom were “reformist” professionals used their money, publicity, and prestige to centralize control of the school system in the Department of Education in 1896.\textsuperscript{64}

The professionalization movement shaped administration within schools as well as in district offices. “Scientific” methods were used to sort and place students in educational programs, no longer subjecting everyone to the same “traditional” teaching. Programs that were tailored to students’ presumed futures met the needs of an industrial society “efficiently.”\textsuperscript{65} Leaders with “specialized” expertise advocated for “industrial” and “vocational” programs taught by appropriately prepared professions.\textsuperscript{66}

Academics’ claims to professionalism rested on their ability to distinguish themselves from relative “amateurs.” As Robert Church argues, “Doctoral training, professional societies, esoteric jargon, and specialized publications flourished in the period largely because they symbolized this differentiation.”\textsuperscript{67} Teachers College exemplifies the professionalization movement that introduced schools of education in research universities and liberal arts institutions and transformed normal schools, the traditional sites of teacher preparation into four-year colleges.\textsuperscript{68}

The creation of a teacher education program at Columbia University was the result of collaboration between philanthropists and direct service reformers in the Industrial Education Association, and middle class “new professionals” like Nicholas Butler and James Russell.
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Nicholas Murray Butler and the Founding of Teachers College

Nicholas Murray Butler (1862-1947) was born in Elizabeth, New Jersey to a middle-class family. By twenty-two, he had earned bachelor, master’s and doctoral degrees from Columbia College. At Columbia, President Frederick Barnard was interested in the emerging science of education. Butler’s efforts to realize Barnard’s dream of transforming the college into an institution of higher education more appropriate for America’s changing social needs also served his own ambitions. In 1886, as an opening move in that campaign, Butler offered a series of lectures at Columbia “to the teachers of New York City.” According to Butler, the idea was so popular that 1500 teachers had to be turned away. Soon after, he and President Barnard presented the university Board of Trustees with a proposal to create a professional school of education that reflected their shared belief that education was “an intellectual interest” as well as “a career.” Perhaps not surprising, the proposal was rejected. Butler believed the university was simply not ready: “A department of education seemed as strange and as odd as a department of aviation would then have been!” The university was especially not ready to create a professional school that would enroll women students and employ female faculty members.

Around the same time, Butler developed an interest in industrial education that ostensibly drew him to the KGA and, eventually, the IEA. Later events suggest Butler was even more interested in using the association’s teacher training programs to advance the development of a professional education school at Columbia. At the IEA, he interacted with other supporters of educational professionalization, including President Gilman of Johns Hopkins University and John B. Pine, a trustee of Columbia University. His role on the IEA’s Board of Trustees led to employment as its second president—and the distinction mattered to Butler: “This [Board of Trustees] was a purely honorary office and in no sense a professional career. Almost immediately, however, the directors of the IEA requested me to make the presidency an office of administration and to devote as much time to it as possible.” He acknowledged that his new position enabled him to “combine this useful movement with that which President Barnard desired pushed forward at Columbia.”

Butler knew that the IEA’s founders feared that philanthropy would be overshadowed by “academic interest and academic ideals.” Their fears were justified. Fifty years after the fact, Butler remarked, “My opportunity came when I pointed out to the directors of the Association that what was needed…was trained teachers in the fields of instruction in which they were interested.” He invited John F. Woodhull of Yale and Walter F. Hervey of Princeton to join him in the project. In Butler’s version of the founding, it was not Grace Dodge, but her brother, Arthur, who was influential in the creation of Teachers College, the institution, by appearing with

---

70. Ibid., 1.
71. Ibid., 177.
73. Butler, Across the Busy Years, 180-181.
74. Ibid., 181.
75. Ibid., 181.
76. Ibid., 181.
77. Nicholas Murray Butler, “Beginnings of Teachers College” Address Delivered at the 50th Anniversary Convocation of Teachers College, November 15, 1944, 3.
Butler before the Board of Regents to obtain a state charter for the New York College for the Training of Teachers. Teachers College, which had begun as a department of the IEA, absorbed the association and became its legal successor in 1888.

Butler described the founding as the “grafting” of President Barnard’s “educational ideals upon a philanthropic enterprise of outstanding importance.” He remained its president until 1890 when he became Dean of the Graduate Department of Philosophy at Columbia. Walter Hervey, who had served on the faculty for several years, replaced him. Butler remained on the Board of Trustees of the college and worked from within the university to formalize a relationship between the two institutions. He declared that he had provided George Vanderbilt with the information that Columbia was buying land in Morningside Heights in 1892, which led Vanderbilt to purchase nearby property for Teachers College. While assigning some credit to Columbia’s President Seth Low, he described his pivotal role in the 1893 “alliance” between the two institutions. The pact officially renamed the school of education as Teachers College, preserved the independence of its governing board, fiscal responsibilities, and curriculum in non-degree programs. It also put the president and faculty of the college under the direction of the Dean of the Philosophy faculty (Butler), and transferred Teachers College’s authority to establish criteria for and grant degrees to Columbia. Teachers College male students could pursue degrees directly through Columbia; its female students were required to use Barnard College as their academic home, although they, like other Barnard students, were eligible for Columbia degrees.

In 1894, Butler resigned from the Teachers College Board of Trustees but continued to be involved in his role of Dean of the Philosophy faculty. In particular, he intervened in the 1897 selection of Walter Hervey’s successor as president, attempting to secure someone who shared his belief in the “science” of education and, in the process clashing with his former colleagues on the Teachers College board, whose choices wavered between a classical academician and a school-based practitioner. The process revealed ambiguities in the affiliation agreement, especially with regard to whether the University or the College had the authority to hire key members of the College’s administration. While Low counseled patience and a renegotiation of the agreement, Butler lashed out at the “amateurs” on Teachers College Board. “He had seen the issue plainly. University work done at Teachers College—that is, work leading to a Columbia degree—was Columbia’s responsibility. Columbia must in future control appointments to key posts to prevent debasement of Columbia degrees and, perhaps more important, to insure the status of Teachers College graduates.” In spite of or because of her knowledge of Butler’s dissatisfaction with the process, Grace Dodge supported James Earl Russell, his candidate for professor of methods and psychology, and won the Board’s agreement to Russell’s appointment.
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James Earl Russell and the Founding of Teachers College

James Earl Russell (1864-1946) was born to a farming family in Hamden, New York. He attended a one-room country school and a private high school and went to Cornell University on a state scholarship. He characterized much of his early education as “a dull, senseless grind, enlivened only by what Kipling calls the art of guessing what kinds of answers best please certain kinds of examiners.” He earned a B.A. from Cornell and a Ph.D. in 1894 from the University of Leipzig. Like Butler, he came to believe that educators needed university-based preparation to develop the knowledge and skill they required to meet the challenges of the industrial age. Russell had visited Teachers College in the late 1880s and, in his own words, “was not greatly impressed.” However, when Benjamin Wheeler, one of his mentors at Cornell was offered the presidency of Teachers College and invited Russell to become professor of psychology and methods, he accepted. He believed that if things had changed enough to satisfy Wheeler, they would be “good enough” for him. When he arrived at Teachers College, Grace Dodge greeted him with the “body blow” that Dr. Wheeler had declined the presidency. When the search for a new president produced candidates who did not share a commitment to the scientific study of education, Russell proposed a repositioning of Teachers College at Columbia. Butler and Low and Low and Dodge had been having similar discussions throughout the presidential search, although Russell claimed he knew nothing of their efforts. In 1898, the Boards of Trustees of Teachers College and Columbia University signed a new agreement, based on Low’s modification of Russell’s plan. Teachers College became the professional education school of the university and Russell became its first Dean.

Russell’s account of Teacher College’s founding is more complete than Butler or Dodge’s versions. Citing Walter Hervey’s description of two “main streams of influence” that brought the College into being: the “philanthropic” and “the higher study of education,” Russell situated himself as the bridge between them. However, his account emphasized the work of the professional educators. Russell named none of the founders of the KGA but identified the governing body of the IEA as including “some of the most influential men in the city”, including Columbia’s Presidents Barnard, Low, and Butler. He noted “the prestige” of its young president Butler. He argued that the philanthropists’ “ideals” and “methods” were in conflict with “aims” and “methods” of educational reform. He criticized their faith in discipline as an educational objective and called it a “doctrine devised by those ignorant of the humanism of the Renaissance or opposed to its diffusion among all classes, a doctrine that has made the work of illiterate teachers a students’ nightmare these past one hundred fifty years.” Despite his objections to the philanthropists’ methods, he argued that their desire to “make life...worth living particularly among the underprivileged classes” was not dissimilar from the educationists’ (among whom he included himself) goal of “making American schools genuine service agencies.”
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acknowledged the contribution of the Trustees who, he indicated, believed in the educationists’ vision of professional education and “tempered” that faith by “practical experience with expert service in public affairs.”

Russell believed he had created an institution that incorporated the ideals of the philanthropists and the university scholars into programs that responded to the professional needs of American education. He cited the creation of the Speyer School in New York City as an example of the integration of the vision and work of the social welfare reformers with those of the educationists.

At a time when the public schools...were closed after three p.m. on school days and all day on Saturday, Sunday, and holidays...we established the Speyer School...and opened it to the public from early morning until ten o’clock at night every day of the year. The kindergarten room was also the social center for the neighborhood; there were a good loan library, a reading, room, baths, and a gymnasium...and to make the enterprise still more attractive we provided living quarters for residential staff.

In spite of his attempt to situate his role in the founding as a reconciler of differences between two competing ideals or set of goals, as it unfolds, Russell’s account leaves no doubt about his primary allegiance to the professionalization reform movement. He describes the creation of a talented and ambitious faculty who, in a time of “pedagogical unrest, the stirrings of a new social order, our location..., and our association, however tenuous, with a great university” saw their chance and “took it” and “invented” whole areas of professional education for teachers and school administrators. He cited Professors Dutton, Sneeden, and Strayer, Monroe, Thorndike, De Garmo, Lodge, and McMurry and noted the irony of the creation of a professional education school by a faculty who had no “settled philosophy of education or common denominator in the wide range of their practical experiences.” Although he acknowledged that what they accomplished could be seen as a refutation of their claim for the “necessity of professional training,” he argued that their work was an exception. They had to create the theories and practices on which such training could be based and no preparation existed for that work. He also credited Teachers College’s first graduate students, “pioneers,” who were ambitious and drawn by the opportunity to work cooperatively with the faculty in opening up new fields within education.

Russell described events that led to professionalism taking its proper place in Teachers College’s governance. Russell also described the confrontational approach he took in at least one instance when the autonomy and authority of the professional faculty was challenged—including by Grace Dodge herself. According to Russell, in 1899, Dodge became alarmed at reports she heard about Dr. McMurry’s performance in a demonstration class. She had been informed by a friend that, in modeling how to teach young children, McMurry failed to utilize methods prized by the original founders—those that would, according to direct service reform ideology, foster the self-discipline and organization needed by working class and poor children. In his response to a letter that Dodge proposed to send to Dr. McMurry and had shared with Russell, Russell said
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that professional educators had expertise that lay people did not and that teaching and learning could not be judged fairly by lay people, including her, no matter how well-intentioned she was. Russell stated that the letter effectively silenced Dodge and the other philanthropists with regard to the work of the faculty. “...Never again did Miss Dodge raise such a question or permit anyone to use her official position as a means of influencing the dean...never after did any Trustee attempt, directly or indirectly, to restrain any member of the staff in doing his work as he thought best. That letter marked the end of external influence upon the professional policies of the faculty.” That same year, Russell laid out four goals for the curriculum. It would include general culture, special scholarship, professional knowledge and technical skill.

**Prioritizing Professionalization at Teachers College**

In his first report as president of the IEA, Butler told members of the Board of Trustees, “a platform of humanitarianism had been exchanged for one of educational reform and advancement.” Russell saw the exchange with Dodge as securing the priority of scientific professional knowledge over the naive belief of amateurs with regard to the governance of Teachers College. The institutional history positions the changes as the necessary and inevitable triumph of the experts over the philanthropists and an example of educational progress. However, the story is more complicated. The professionalization reformers fought their battles on two fronts—inside and outside the university. Within the university, they strove to prove their academic worthiness—by changes to the curriculum and regulations for admission and graduation. Outside the university, they contested for necessary material resources—at first by appearing to be aligned with the original philanthropists goals and, eventually, by attracting new donors whose need for “experts” matched the need of the Teachers College leadership and faculty to “be” expert.

Even before the move to Morningside Heights, the professionalization project was evident in the changes to the curriculum, which required students to take courses in areas other than the particular practical or industrial “art” they intended to teach. Departments of English and Literature, Latin, Greek, History, Biological and Earth Sciences, and Mathematics were created. In place of the original two-year course of study taken by all students, there were 11 different programs, all managed by and requiring courses in the Department of Psychology and General Methods. Despite the increasingly academic nature of the curriculum, Teachers College still prepared teachers of industrial and domestic arts.

Russell and Butler, who had become president of Columbia in 1901, became adept in accepting gifts from donors who had direct service reform commitments and adapting them to advance professionalization purposes. The earliest Teachers College buildings, funded with money from philanthropists associated with the project prior to the affiliation with Columbia, reflected their direct service reform priorities. Macy and Millbank Halls had labs and shops for manual and domestic arts by 1899. However, within four years, the buildings were used for courses in areas ranging from nature study, agriculture and Bible study to household chemistry and chemistry of food and nutrition. By 1904, Thompson Hall’s facilities, originally built to offer oppor-
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opportunities for “physical training and physical culture,” housed courses in scientifically-based “hygiene and physical education.” In 1909, the Household Arts building opened (later renamed for Dodge, its donor) ultimately providing space for the “applied sciences,” not just the domestic arts and manual training Dodge had sponsored at the KGA and IEA.

In 1901, Mr. and Mrs. James Speyer, founders of the University Settlement House, donated $100,000 toward the creation of an experimental school. The original work of the Speyer School was consistent with many of the goals and practices of the Settlement House movement. The building was open and supervised throughout the day and evenings. A community library and labs for domestic and industrial arts were created. Programs were offered for public school children, for mothers, and for community residents, and there was a community garden. The directors of the various activities, including the school principal, lived in apartments on the top floor of the school.

The Speyer School also provided a setting for practice teaching and research by Teachers College faculty and students, housing a private kindergarten and elementary school. In fact, Dean Russell announced the need for a Laboratory School in 1898, since Seth Low had declared that Horace Mann had to be kept as a model school and not a site for the preparation of teachers.109 The Speyer School not only provided a practice site for Teachers College students, it served also as a research site for faculty who saw the school as an opportunity to create “scientific” knowledge about curriculum, administration, and motivation.110 However, the expense of running the private school proved to be too much and by 1916, the College turned the administration of the school over to the New York City Department of Education, while maintaining ownership of the building and role in the school for Teachers College students and faculty.111 In 1935, the building once again was rented to the Department of Education to house PS 500, the “Public School Experiment with Mental Deviates,” a collaboration between the city and Teachers College to provide education for children with very low and very high scores on IQ tests.112

Over the twenty-five years of Dean Russell’s administration, the movement toward professionalization also played out in admission standards, degree offerings, and organizational structure. In creating its place in the evolving structure of Columbia University, Teachers College faced challenges from faculty who saw the school’s aims and its students’ competency as inferior to those of Columbia and Barnard Colleges. The conflicts between Teachers College and Barnard were part of a struggle among supporters of higher education between classical and professional programs. Russell often engaged in turf wars with Barnard’s deans, especially with regard to the reciprocity agreements that allowed students from each school to take courses at the other. Conflict arose, for example, about the presence of “extension” (non-matriculated) students in Teachers College classes in which Barnard students were enrolled. Barnard faculty argued that the presence of such students would inevitably decrease the rigor of the coursework and, ultimately, devalue any degree of which they were a part.113

In 1900, while attempting to deal with challenges from the traditional liberal arts colleges in the university, Russell and the faculty were also striving to show that Teachers College de-
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served the same status in the university as other professional schools. Teachers College increased its admissions standards as part of that effort. Undergraduates in the four-year program were required to pass the same entrance examination as Barnard and Columbia students. A normal school diploma or its equivalent was needed to enter the two-year program leading to the Bachelor’s degree. Candidates for graduate degrees were required to complete a four-year undergraduate degree. Consequently, Teachers College was given authority by Columbia to award a B.S. in Education to students completing the four-year academic program; the two-year program, which had been primarily offered in the household and industrial arts programs, was eliminated. The reorganization of the College in 1912 resulted in the creation of two distinct schools that also demonstrated the move toward greater emphasis on professionalization. The School of Practical Arts’ authority to award Bachelor’s degrees was limited to the 5% of Teachers College students who were enrolled in programs that did not prepare them to become teachers. In effect, the School of Practical Arts had become an institutional stepchild despite its connection to the ideals of the philanthropic founders. The marginalization strategy had the intra-university effect the professionalization reformers desired. In 1912, the Board of Trustees of Columbia relinquished the authority to issue all diplomas to students at Teachers College and elevated it to the position of a graduate school. The School of Practical Arts’ survived only in programs that privileged the “academic” or “scientific” forms into which the original industrial and domestic arts had been shaped by the tide of professionalization reform dominating the country and the institution. The Department of Rural Education, for example, not only prepared teachers who would provide domestic and industrial training in southern and rural schools. It also prepared building, district, and state administrators for those schools. During World War I, the practical arts departments mobilized, providing “courses in automobile mechanics, photography for hospital and field work, camouflage for military purposes, occupational and physical therapy in military hospitals…administration of relief in time of war and emergency, care of orphaned and neglected children.”

In 1934, the College reorganized and the School of Practical Arts was eliminated.

Conclusion

This case study shows that as Teachers College became an influential center for the creation of a new science of education and to the preparation of expert teachers and administrators, the original direct service dimension of its parent organization was almost completely lost. Robert Church suggests that the process of professionalization itself required a separation from the direct service dimension of the social reform strand of Progressive reform. He further argues that historians of education can provide insights into why the resulting “educational establishment” is only “selectively responsive to the social pressures and demands on it and many of its responses distort the social demands that called them forth.” This case study illustrates his argument in the context of the founding of Teachers College.

We suggest that there were several inter-related causes for the loss of the direct service dimension of professional study at Teachers College. These include: 1) Grace Dodge’s acquiescence to the change; 2) The gendered nature of direct service reforms; and, 3) The need for re-
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sources and the agenda of the sources of funding for those resources. While these factors can be somewhat separated for analysis, in real time, they overlap and interact.

Acquiescence of Dodge

Throughout her life, Dodge remained a devoted worker for other organizations whose work was more closely aligned with her original interests, including the Travelers’ Aid Society and the YWCA, and showed a commitment to radical social positions. For example, through her influence the Traveler’s Aid Society collaborated with the White Rose Society, an African American organization that protected young Black women arriving in New York City from sexual and economic exploitation. In addition, she ensured that African American women served on the Board of Directors of the YWCA. Ultimately, she left more money to the YWCA upon her death than her generous legacy to Teachers College. What explains, then, her continued commitment to Teachers College as it grew further away from direct service? One explanation is that Dodge was a wealthy 19th century woman who was engaged in a professionalization project of her own in the creation of an identity as an influential philanthropist. Her work as a fundraiser and treasurer for Teachers College would have contributed to that effort.

Gendered Nature

In many ways, direct service work was considered “feminine” and that gender assignment defined its reach as well as its status and affiliations. Women like Jane Addams, Ellen Gates Starr, and Lillian Wald in the settlement movement were viewed as occupying a caretaking position in reform through projects that were characteristically feminine. Dodge’s style of philanthropy—as evidenced by her work at the Working Girls Society, the Kitchen Garden Association, the Traveler’s Aid Society, and the YWCA—encountered status problems like the work of women who founded the social settlements. While at Teachers College, Dodge supported the same sphere to which she had been devoted across her life. Butler, Hervey and Russell used gendered language when describing Dodge. Russell remarked that Teachers College “was her firstborn child, and she lavished upon it all the mother-love of her great heart.” He continued: “Miss Dodge’s conception of education was not altogether orthodox. She was no pedant. Perhaps she undervalued the academic foundations of education, but only to the extent that they were dwarfed by her emphasis upon the moral and spiritual factors.” In his remarks at the 50th anniversary celebration Russell described Dodge as the, “Leader of one of the three movements that gave us birth, member of the Board of Trustees constantly from the first day until her death; guardian and nurse of the infant during the panic years...” According to Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, a “contest” between direct service reform and a professionalization agenda was settled by status differences as they pertained to gender and institutional affiliation, local versus cosmopolitan interests, and what was considered “old fashioned”
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versus “modern.” These characteristics diminished their validity in the eyes of many, including potential funders. For example, the Carnegie Corporation deliberately excluded funding for social settlements, which were considered to be “‘pre-professional’ and operated usually by ‘amateur’ female college graduates.” In this way the corporation helped weaken these locations for “often radical, highly intellectual, and female-led” reform. This history corresponds with the eventual shutting down of the School of Practical Arts at Teachers College, which Dodge supported through financial contributions. In the end, her support would not be enough to keep direct service in the curriculum.

Funding

Silva and Slaughter have suggested that the privileging of professionalization was in some ways the only option open to leaders and social scientists, if their goal was the creation of a professional school. They argue the necessity was caused at least as much by economics as ideology. That is, the Progressive Era was characterized by the presence of several groups with various economic interests including leaders of large national corporations, owners of smaller regional firms, and leaders of populist and trade union movements. The academics needed large resources to create departments, colleges, and universities, and support for the services they and their graduates could provide.

In the case of the first twenty-five years of Teachers College, access to needed funding came through its connection to Grace Dodge, who, as this study has shown, represented the philanthropic social welfare reformers of the late 19th century. Russell nor Butler wanted to lose Dodge’s involvement at Teachers College most likely because they understood that the connections between her family and other wealthy clans provided an opening to other donors.

For example, Spencer Trask, who became a member of the Board of Trustees and a large donor, had become involved in Teachers College through his friendship with the Dodge family. In turn, a partner in his firm was George Peabody, whose interest in philanthropy resulted in involvement with Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes in the South and, along with other northern philanthropists, the creation of the General Education Board. The General Education Board, in turn, provided tuition for Southern students to attend Teachers College to become administrators in schools for Blacks in the rural South. The Jeanes Foundation supported students to attend what became a very profitable summer school at Teachers College in the 1910s and 1920s. As James Anderson has shown, however, the philosophy behind the industrial education supported by northern philanthropists, to a large extent, was predicated on and maintained an inferior status for African Americans. Teachers College maintained more “professional” versions of the ini-
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tial domestic and industrial education as a result of the funding from such benefactors. It is worth considering whether Teachers College’s dependence on funding from philanthropists connected with the GEB and similar sources constrained it from preparing teachers and administrators who would challenge racial or economic structures that benefited their donors.  

Discussion

There are significant consequences of a diminished direct service agenda in education across the twentieth century and on the present. The professionalization movement, in fact, had ironic consequences for schools of education in institutions of higher education and for school administration. Privileging the professionalization reform strand in university based teacher preparation across the 20th century did not raise teaching to the status of a profession with regard to autonomy and expertise. The degree to which the profession is regulated by public and private agencies is evidence of this reality.

In addition, minimizing the direct service reform agenda in university-based teacher education left programs vulnerable to “reformers” who argue that they do not prepare educators who can achieve key goals—equality of access, opportunity or outcomes. Professors of education, the new direct service reformers charge, are “educationists” out of touch with the “real” needs of children and schools and focus on abstract ideas and their own interests. Licensing requirements are seen as stumbling blocks to the admission of “dedicated” people who would be “effective” teachers in the educational workforce. In the last twenty years, institutions of higher education are no longer the sole providers of teacher preparation and they now share the exclusive right to recommend teachers and educational leaders for state licensing with organizations such as New Teachers Project, Teach for America and New Leaders for New Schools.

The prioritization of the professionalization reform agenda in the early twentieth century at Teachers College and other schools of education left them isolated from residents with whom they shared neighborhoods. Teachers College interacted only occasionally with schools and community members in Harlem and provided little direct service to them until the 1970s. The legacy of professionalization meant that, even when collaboration took place, issues of knowledge, status and leadership had to be negotiated. When education faculty or their alumni enforce agendas that prioritize professional expertise over direct service, the consequences can be damaging to local communities. For example, in many cities including Chicago, Detroit and Philadelphia system leaders use “scientific” analysis of school system data to remove principals and close schools. School closings pit race and poverty against budgets in that cost-saving measures affect poor and Black city residents more than anyone else. Interviews with parents
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and community groups reveal that school closings remove direct services to families.\textsuperscript{137} While education experts secure their professional positions, gaining recognition from politicians and funders, poor communities and children are faced with the consequences of shuttered local schools.

In the present, the spotlight shines brightly on improving teaching and schooling through professionalization. With a direct service agenda eclipsed in the past and present, it is unclear if teachers and schools will ever be able to serve all students, including those who are poor and otherwise marginalized in American society. This case study illuminates findings that suggest that those who align teacher preparation (and school administration) only with personal professionalization or philanthropy jeopardize their power to create teachers and schools that can achieve the social change both agendas claim to seek.
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