

HISTORY
OF
PUBLIC EDUCATION IN BALTIMORE
FROM 1860 - 1890

By
HARRY W. ^{William} KRAUSSE

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Maryland in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

1943



ERRATUM

On page 17, and several times subsequently, there are errors in the form of footnote reference to Annual Reports of the Baltimore Board of School Commissioners. In these cases the errors should be corrected as indicated by the following examples:

Page 18, footnote 1 should read:

Ibid, p. xxii.

Page 22, footnote 1 should read:

43rd Annual Report, Board of School Commissioners,
Baltimore, p. xxii.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF BALTIMORE FROM 1860 - 1890	5
Political Background	5
Economic Background	8
Social Background	11
III. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SYSTEM .	12
Enrolment and Attendance	15
Relations with the City Council	21
Administration	28
Salaries	28
Buildings	30
Important Firsts	36
IV. FINANCING OF THE SCHOOLS	43
V. TEACHER TRAINING AND ELECTION	48
VI. ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AND OTHER PHASES OF EDUCATION	67
Reading	70
Spelling	70
Arithmetic	71
Writing	72
Geography	72
Drawing	72
Discipline in the Primary Schools	73
Punishment	74

	Page
Evening Schools	75
Schools for Negroes	80
VII. SECONDARY EDUCATION	85
Central High School (Baltimore City College)	86
Female High Schools	93
VIII. SPECIAL EDUCATION	98
Floating School	98
Needlework	103
IX. THE FOUNDING OF THE BALTIMORE POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE	104
X. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE CITY AND STATE SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS	112
XI. SUMMARY	120
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124
APPENDIX	i

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE I ENROLMENT IN VARIOUS DIVISIONS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE 1860 - 1889	35-a
TABLE II SUPERINTENDENTS IN CHARGE OF THE BALTIMORE SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS DURING THE PERIOD 1860 - 1890	38
TABLE III PERSONNEL OF BOARD OF SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS AND TEACHERS 1860 - 1889	39
TABLE IV THE BALTIMORE SCHOOL SYSTEM DURING 1860 - 1890	41
TABLE V SOURCES OF REVENUE FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE 1860 - 1889	45
TABLE VI EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE 1860 - 1889	46
TABLE VII ENROLMENT IN WHITE SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE, 1860 - 1889	78
TABLE VIII ENROLMENT EVENING SCHOOLS	79
TABLE IX ENROLMENT NEGRO SCHOOLS	84
TABLE X ENROLMENT IN WHITE HIGH SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE, 1860 - 1889	97
TABLE XI FLOATING SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PUPIL ENROLMENT	102
TABLE XII EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF FLOATING SCHOOL	103
TABLE XIII ENROLMENT IN THE BALTIMORE POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE 1860 - 1889	111

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Several studies of public education have been made in Maryland and Baltimore; among them being "History of Education in Maryland,"¹ "Secondary Education in Maryland before 1800,"² "Public Educational Work in Baltimore,"³ "Baltimore, 1870 to 1900: Studies in Social History."⁴ However, there is no detailed account of the development of the Baltimore City school system covering the period of the Civil War and the years following this war. During this time significant educational history was made as events of great educational importance took place, which events were to affect the future of the Baltimore public schools as well as the future of children attending these schools.

Statement of the Problem

This study undertook the task of gathering together the story of what happened during those tragic years. The purpose of the study was to present in organized form a record

¹History of Education in Maryland-Bernard C. Steiner
U. S. Government Printing Office, 1894

²Secondary Education in Maryland before 1800-Philip C. Potts Thesis, Johns Hopkins University, 1930

³Public Educational Work in Baltimore-Herbert B. Adams
Johns Hopkins University Press, 1899

⁴Baltimore, 1870 to 1900: Studies in Social History-
Thesis Chas. B. Hirschfeld, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1941

of the history and growth of public education in Baltimore, Maryland, from 1860 to 1889 inclusive. The specific questions to be answered included the following:

1. What provisions for teacher training and election were in practice during this period?
2. How were the schools organized and financed?
3. What subjects were taught in the schools?
4. What methods of teaching were practiced?
5. What high school facilities were offered and what changes took place during the period under study?
6. What was the relationship between the City system and the State system of public schools?

Delimitation

This study was limited to the years 1860 to 1889 inclusive. It depicts the conditions in the schools as they were in 1860 and brings to the reader a picture of the development of the Baltimore school system over the years indicated. Only the public schools were included in this study.

Sources of Data

The principal sources of data were as follows:

1. The Annual Reports of the Board of School Commissioners from 1860 to 1889 inclusive
2. Minutes of the Board of School Commissioners, 1877 and 1883
3. Newspapers
4. Ordinances of the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore
5. Laws of the State of Maryland and of the United States.

Sources of a secondary nature were historical works concerning the general field of history of Maryland and Balti-

more, especially the following: "History of Baltimore" by S. Z. Ammen,¹ "History of Baltimore from 1850 to the close of the Civil War" by M. P. Andrews,² "History of Maryland: Province and State."³

Methodology

This investigation was an historical study and the historical method was used. The author first made a study of the various sources from which material could be obtained. Thus a tentative bibliography was developed. Following this, an investigation was made into the references to determine their validity. From the available reference materials the data which were established as valid and reliable were gleaned and the planned study was outlined. The account was then written and, section by section, the significant generalizations and findings which related to the original statement of the problem were drawn up. Finally the work was collated and the final draft of the study was prepared.

Justification

Much of the history of the many and varied phases of Baltimore life and activity remained to be written. This thesis is an attempt to fill in one of the many gaps in the

¹S. Z. Ammen, Baltimore: Its history and its people (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co. 1912) Vol. 1

²M. P. Andrews, Baltimore: Its history and its people (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co. 1912) Vol. 1

³..... History of Maryland: Province and State (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., Inc. 1929)

in the interesting and colorful chronicle of Maryland's leading city. From a perusal of this study the author hopes that students of history will come to a greater appreciation of the development of the Baltimore Public School System.

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER II

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF BALTIMORE

FROM 1860 - 1890

Political Background

Prior to 1860 Baltimore had been subjected to mob rule. The Know-Nothing Party was the dominant political party. It was mainly composed of "toughs" who had no regard for law nor order. Elections were held to the accompaniment of beatings and killings.¹ The City as a result of this came to be known as "Mob Town."² Police protection could not be had because the Mayor was beholden to the Know-Nothings for his position and he made no attempt to issue orders to the keepers of the peace. Popular opinion had been so growing against such travesties of law and justice that in 1860 the Legislature took the control of the police away from the Mayor and placed it in the hands of a Commission of five members it selected.³

The city did not long enjoy tranquillity because it was soon torn by the dissensions engendered by the outbreak of war between the North and the South. Neither the press

¹M. P. Andrews, Baltimore: Its history and its people (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1912), Vol. 1, pp. 155-157.

²Ibid., p. 158.

³Ibid., p. 160.

nor people of Baltimore were in favor of any form of disunion or of armed conflict; yet, economically, Baltimore was closely tied up with the South, for through this city flowed the commerce to and from the states below the Mason-Dixon Line. The City felt the danger of losing this commercial advantage and let material motives shape its policy. Both city and state were in favor "of the maintenance of the Constitution as interpreted and handed down by its framers."¹

The city and state decided to remain neutral when armed conflict broke out, but Baltimore was seized by Federal troops and placed under martial law. This procedure brought many indignities in its train. Search and seizure without due process of law was common. The writ of habeas corpus was ignored and many prominent citizens were incarcerated in Fort McHenry for the duration of the war, or for a part of it, without knowing why they were held. Sympathy for the South rapidly crystallized which attitude made the situation worse.² The old Know—Nothing Party, seeing a chance to regain power, entered the field of politics under the name of the Unconditional Union Party. It soon secured the dominant position through the aid of the Federal authorities so that elections were farces. Union troops were present at the polls ostensibly to maintain order, but their presence kept away many southern sympathizers who were Democrats. The passage in 1864 of an

¹M. P. Andrews, *Baltimore: Its history and its people* (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1912), Vol. 1, p. 164.

²Ibid., pp. 165-166.

act by the Legislature requiring all voters to take an oath of allegiance to the Federal Government reduced the number of votes so greatly that the Unconditional Union Party remained in power until 1867. During this time Maryland and Baltimore existed under a dictatorship of an organized minority.

By 1867 the better elements of the Unconditional Union Party and the Democrats came together as the Democratic-Conservative Party. The elections of that year mark the beginning of Democratic Party rule in Maryland. The reaction against the abuses of minority rule had set in, the effect of which was to swing the state toward one-party rule which was to bring other abuses.¹

In 1869 Arthur P. Gorman and Isidor Freeman Rasin began their rise to power; Gorman in the State, and Rasin in Baltimore.² They and their henchmen ruled in Maryland for 25 years. At first they were called "party managers," but such was their power that they enjoyed several cognomens, those fit to print being "The Ring," the "Third House" (of Legislature), "the Lobby," and "the Organization."³

By 1875 the rule of the Democratic Party had become distasteful to certain elements in it who called themselves Independent Democrats. They became the allies of the Republicans and it was in this year that the political reform

¹M. P. Andrews, History of Maryland: Province and state (Doubleday, Doran and co., Inc., 1929) pp. 563-567.

²Ibid., p. 581.

³Ibid., p. 579.

movement in Maryland got under way. The custom was initiated of electing judges without reference to their partisanship, but for their character and impartial service.¹ The "bosses" continued in power, suffering only minor defeats now and then, but it was the agitation of the Independents which developed the civic consciousness and hastened the political education of the city. Prejudice was cleared away and the public mind directed to the study of the principles which underly successful municipal administration.² One of the greatest gains was the adoption of the Australian ballot in 1890.

Economic Background

Baltimore prior to the Civil War was the northernmost southern city and the southernmost northern city. It was the center of an agricultural region and a manufacturing community as well. It supplied the South with machinery and other manufactured products and was the center of the export trade of this section.

Following the outbreak of the Civil War some of the Baltimore enterprises were curtailed, but the business interests of the city found new markets to the north and the west, and a field for supplying the needs of the armies.³

Trade with the South was resumed as soon after the cessation of hostilities as possible and Baltimore soon was

¹ Andrews, op. cit. p. 585

² S. Z. Ammen, *Baltimore: Its history and its people* (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1912), Vol. 1, p. 275.

³ Andrews, op. cit. p. 206.

in the position it occupied in ante-bellum days. Transatlantic shipping was revived with the establishing of the North German Lloyd Line to Bremen.¹ In 1868 Maryland began some self improvement. Efforts were made to protect and to regulate the fishing industry (which is still neither protected nor regulated) and to improve roads.²

In 1877 Baltimore won her fight for a freight rate differential in shipments from the interior, basing her claim on the fact that she was the farthest west of all eastern seaboard cities of importance and, therefor, freight charges to her should be lower. The result was that foreign shipping increased.³

This period witnessed the growth of competition between the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad. Each expanded and consolidated its holdings. The Pennsylvania Railroad acquired the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railway in 1881, while the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad secured tidewater connections on Curtis Creek near Baltimore and began to lay tracks to Philadelphia in 1883,⁴ establishing a through route to New York by 1886.

This was the time when "big business" was developing,

¹Andrews, op. cit. p. 215.

²Andrews, op. cit. p. 582.

³Ammen, op. cit. p. 248.

⁴Ibid., p. 256.

when vast corporate enterprises were originating;¹ it was also a time of a series of panics, which occurred in 1864, 1867, 1869, 1873, and 1877. The last panic (1877) was the worst of all for Baltimore. The outstanding event was the strike of the employees of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Rioting broke out and the militia was called to quell the disorders and to protect property.²

Real estate development was centered about the small parks located at various points in the city. After the erection of bridges over Jones Falls, the population drift was toward the country north of Baltimore.³ By 1875 the city was composed of a group of villages which had grown up around parks or at intersections of important roads. The names of these communities still designate certain parts of the town, i.e., Waverly, Hampden, Pimlico, Highlandtown, etc. Village pride was great but it was a hindrance in fighting the many fires which occurred during this period, with the accompanying loss of property.⁴ The various fire companies used to race for the nearest hydrant and should two arrive at the same time they very often would settle the question of priority by fisticuffs while the fire burned flaringly on, as my maternal grandparent told me.

¹Andrews, op. cit. p. 596.

²Ammen, op. cit. p. 250.

³Andrews, op. cit. p. 233, Vol. 1

⁴Ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 213-215

Social Background

After the Civil War, Baltimore took a leading part in the re-habilitation of the South by sending this section both money and food. In return it received many of the ablest members of the professions who came to the city to re-coup their fortunes and who settled there permanently.¹ Freed slaves also migrated to the town.

For some reason or other Baltimore was considered a good convention town prior to the Civil War so that by 1870 it was again becoming the foremost city for such gatherings. Horse racing, very much in favor prior to the Revolutionary War, was revived.²

During the period 1860 - 1890 many cultural advances were made. In 1866 the Peabody Institute was dedicated. 1875 witnessed the completion of the Academy of Sciences building and the opening of McDonogh School. The Johns Hopkins University opened its doors in '76 and so did the State Normal School. In 1882 Enoch Pratt gave the city \$1,083,333.33 to found a free library, provided the city would grant and create an annuity of \$50,000 a year. This the city agreed to do and the Library was opened in 1886, which year also saw the founding of Goucher College. 1889 saw the opening of the Johns Hopkins Hospital as well as a training school for nurses attached thereto.

¹Andrews, op. cit. Vol. 1, pp. 213-215

²Ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 220-221

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER III

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SYSTEM

Legal background of the Baltimore School System

The Baltimore Public School System is subject to legislation from two sources - the State Legislature and the City Council of Baltimore. The original source of legal enactment was the State Legislature, which, in 1825¹ passed a law providing for a State Superintendent of Schools and the creation of a system of Primary Schools in each county and for Baltimore City. This law was not mandatory. In the case of the Counties it was to be accepted or rejected at the next general election. Baltimore however through its Mayor and City Council was given a period of five years in which to set up an independent system. Should it fail to do so, any future system of public schools would be subject to the State Administration of Public Schools.

In 1828 the Mayor and City Council passed an ordinance providing for a Board of School Commissioners whose duty it was to -

1. divide the City into six School Districts,
2. establish a school on the Monitorial plan in each district,
3. make rules and regulations for the schools,

¹Laws of the State of Maryland, 1825. Jeremiah Hughes, printer, pp. 130-139.

²Ordinances of the Corporation of the City of Baltimore, 1828, John Cox, printer, 1876, p. 18.

4. examine and appoint teachers and fix their compensation,
5. prescribe the Course of Study,
6. generally to make all necessary provisions for the government and discipline of the schools,
7. to report annually to the City Council respecting the schools, with an account of the expenses for the year, and an estimate of expenses for the ensuing year,
8. to appoint annually a Superintendent and fix his compensation.

Since this action took place during the five-year period allowed by the State Legislature, the Baltimore Public Schools have continued to be independent of the State Public School System, but subservient to statewide legislation affecting the schools of the entire commonwealth.

In the beginning there were only six Board members, but by 1860 there were 20 which number comprised the Board of School Commissioners until 1888 when the membership was increased to 22 upon the annexation of additional county territory.

Baltimore's system of schools in 1860 consisted of -

a. A Board of 20 Commissioners, each representing a Ward of the City. The Commissioners were appointed, at a joint meeting of the First and Second Branches of the City Council, to serve for a period of one year.

The Commissioners elected their own President from among themselves. Should any vacancy occur during the year by death or resignating, the Board of School Commissioners appointed someone to fill it.

b. A Treasurer who was selected by the Board of School Commissioners. In addition to the usual duties of a treasurer, he was given the responsibility of visiting the schools to "observe and consult with the principals, and to give his council and guidance to the younger teacher."¹

The professional duties performed by the Treasurer were in reality those of a superintendent, but it was not until 1866 that the City Council abolished the position of Treasurer and created that of Superintendent. The former Treasurer was immediately appointed to the position after a period of 18 years as the unofficial professional head of the system.²

c. A Clerk, also selected by the Board of School Commissioners, whose duty it was to maintain the offices of the Board; to record the minutes of the Board meetings; and to compile the statistics necessary for the reports of the Board of School Commissioners to the City Council, under the authority of which the Board conducted the system of schools.

d. There were 48 Primary schools - 20 male and 28 female; 28 Grammar schools - 13 male and 15 female; 3 High schools - 1 male and 2 female; 1 Floating school; 6 Evening schools; and 1 Normal school.

During 1862 the Board of School Commissioners set up the regulation that all candidates for teaching positions

¹32nd Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1860, p. 12.

²38th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1866, pp. 5-6.

had to be High School graduates and at least 17 years of age. In addition, they exacted an oath of allegiance from the teachers as required by the City Council.¹

A Teachers Association was formed this year and the Board of School Commissioners permitted the schools to be closed the afternoon of the first Friday of each month in order that the teachers could attend the meeting of the Association. Lectures, essays, and discussions were had on topics bearing on teaching.²

In 1863 the request was made that the Board of School Commissioners open Night Schools for females. The request was taken under consideration but nothing was done about it until 1873.

Enrollment and Attendance

In 1863 the Board recommended to the City Council that some coercive measures be adopted to bring those not employed into the schools. The Board of School Commissioners cited the passage of laws by the Legislature of New York and of Massachusetts permitting local municipalities to pass ordinances governing school attendance.³

The Board of School Commissioners noted the increase

¹ 34th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1862, p. 32.

² Ibid., p. 32.

³ 35th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1865, p. 10.

in enrollment, in 1865, of pupils, especially those from private schools, and reported that former patrons of private schools were now enthusiastic over the Baltimore Public Schools and their work.¹ This increase was due to the many failures among the private schools as a result of the Civil War (1861-64).

The problem of school attendance was again brought before the City Council in 1871 by the Board of School Commissioners in its report. The Board called attention to the benefits derived from a compulsory education, and held that the education of the youth tends to reduce vice and crime; that it is cheaper and better to spend tax money in educating youth than in confining them in alms houses and punitive institutions later.²

In 1872 the Board of School Commissioners went on record regarding the necessity of an annual census of children of school age. It felt that public education had come to be accepted, but that many were not attending school in spite of private and parochial schools. The Board maintained that it was impossible to estimate the number not attending and that until such knowledge was available, it would be impossible to secure the attendance of all children.³

¹37th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1865, p. 10.

²43rd Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1871, pp. 6-8.

³44th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1872, p. viii.

Again in 1873 the attention of the City Council was invited to the need for a school census, the Board of School Commissioners reciting the arguments of the Superintendent of Schools in his 1872 report; namely, that many parents of children were not availing themselves of the services of the schools; that the City through taxes made an annual contribution to the State Educational Fund; that the State returned a certain percentage to the City for school use; that an accurate census would of a certainty result in an increase in the State appropriation.¹

The Board of School Commissioners, therefore, asked the City Council for an ordinance authorizing a census and the means to take it. It again stressed the irregularity of attendance - a matter of great regret and constant embarrassment; and felt there ought to be a stringent enforcement of the rules against delinquents. In spite of the efforts of parents and teachers there was too much absence and the Board stated that it was almost induced to recommend the adoption of the truant-police system which was being used so successfully in other cities.²

Although by implication the Board of School Commissioners was not in favor of universal compulsory attendance, it felt that attendance should be made compulsory to

¹45th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1873, p. 18.

²45th Annual Report, op. cit. p. viii.

the extent, at least, that when a child voluntarily entered the schools he should be compelled to attend regularly, or to be removed.¹

Again, in 1875 the Board of School Commissioners reported the continued irregularity of attendance regardless of rigid rules. Because attendance at school was voluntary, and compulsory attendance could not be adopted without legislation, the Board said that if such legislation could be effected, both schools and truants would be benefited.² It again requested that a school census be taken.

As one reads the reports of the Board of School Commissioners, he notices an increasing determination to get some action. The City Council refused aid in both securing a census of children of school age and in the passage of attendance laws.

In 1876 the Board stated that compulsory attendance was necessary to secure satisfactory results in the schools, and went on to say that if such attendance could not be had by the rules of those in charge of the schools, it must be effected by other means.³ It again cited the truant-police work of New York and Boston, which work consisted in examining

¹ 45th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxii.

² 47th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1875, p. x.

³ 48th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1876, p. x.

and reporting on all cases of absence and arresting all children who were found on the streets during school hours.

The Board of School Commissioners again reminded the City Council that although attendance at the Baltimore system of schools was voluntary and optional, yet, if better results were not obtained it might be necessary to adopt such a plan as that of New York and Boston.

The City Council not having complied with the Board's request for a census, the Board secured the cooperation of the Police Department and had a census taken, by wards, throughout the city. The results of this work showed that there were 69,303 children between the ages of 6 and 18 in Baltimore. They were distributed as follows:

Total children in Public Schools - 30,867 or 44.5%

Total children in Private or
Parochial Schools - 14,559 or 21.0%

Total children in No Schools - 23,877 or 34.5%

The Board of School Commissioners said that many children left school between the ages of 15 years and 18 years to seek employment, and estimated that about $\frac{2}{3}$ of the 23,877 or those not in school were in this category; however, the Board of School Commissioners still considered the remainder too large a group not to be in school, and that it constituted a liability to the community and should be given consideration by those having the public welfare at heart.¹

¹ 48th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xiii.

The Board of School Commissioners, having secured the census which it desired without benefit of legal authority from the City Council, still wished to be "regular" and again petitioned the City Council to authorize an annual census and adopt measures which would secure free public instruction to a greater number of children.¹ Again the City Council did nothing with the request.

The last attempt (during the period 1860 - 1890) by the Board of School Commissioners in its efforts to enlist the cooperation of the City Council in increasing attendance was made in 1877. It again informed the City Council that school attendance was not so good as it might be; that there were too many children not in school; that attendance at school was voluntary; that something had to be done; and that the consideration of the City Council was requested, for if the situation continued as it was, the Board of School Commissioners would ask that an Attendance Law be passed.²

Thereafter the Board of School Commissioners with the cooperation of the Police Department took a census of children of school age, in 1878 and 1888.

In 1889, to equalize to some extent the enrollment of the schools, the Board of School Commissioners divided the City into 80 districts and compelled the pupils to attend the nearest school in the district in which they resided. This

¹48th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xiii.

²49th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners
Baltimore, 1877, p. x.

action was taken because of children enrolling in the more popular schools, even when these schools were farther from their homes than those in their immediate vicinity.

Relations with the City Council

The Board of School Commissioners had been created by the Mayor and City Council by Ordinance #182¹ pursuant to an act of the Maryland Legislature passed in 1825 which permitted the "Mayor and City Council to provide the means and otherwise support the system of schools of their establishment."²

The Board of School Commissioners, being the creature of the City Council, was considered a part or department of the city government. Monies for the maintenance and operation of the school system were appropriated by the City Council from the City Treasury. It was natural, therefore, for the Board of School Commissioners to repair to its seat of origin for permission to exercise authority not already delegated to it as well as to secure any legal protection which it might need.

By 1863 the Board of School Commissioners felt called upon to recommend to the City Council certain changes in the method of selecting its members, stating that only persons interested in education, and having sufficient time to give to the work should be selected; that frequent changes in the personnel of the Board were bad because a great amount of working intelligence was lost, and more responsibility

¹ Ordinances of the Corporation of the City of Baltimore, 1828, op. cit. p. 18.

² Laws of the State of Maryland, 1825, op. cit. pp. 130-139.

devolved on the older members.¹ Nothing was done by the City Council and the Board had to get along as best it could.

Again in 1871 the Board in its report noted the frequent changes in its personnel, and suggested to the City Council that it prepare an ordinance authorizing the retirement of only 1/4 of the personnel each year.²

This was a wise request. Had it been adopted by the City Council the turnover in the personnel of the Board of School Commissioners would probably have been reduced and a working majority of the members would have been created through which the policies of the Superintendent could have been carried out. In making its request the Board stated that at the annual election of the Board members, sometimes a majority of the senior members were lost, many of whom had gained valuable experience. This procedure, said the Board of School Commissioners, was prejudicial to the good of the system; whereas it should be the aim to retain the services of the ablest and most zealous friends of the schools and to secure others like minded.²

A study of the personnel of the Board and the years of service of each will convince one that the above statements are true. A total of 215 persons served upon the Board of

¹43rd Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 6-8.

School Commissioners from 1860 - 1889. Of this number-

83 served for ONE YEAR				
<u>148</u>	65	"	"	TWO years
	21	"	"	three "
	17	"	"	four "
	3	"	"	five "
<u>41</u>	4	"	"	six "
	9	"	"	seven "
	3	"	"	eight "
	2	"	"	nine "
	1	"	"	ten "
<u>19</u>	1	"	"	eleven "
	2	"	"	thirteen "
	2	"	"	fifteen "
<u>5</u>	1	"	"	sixteen "
	1	"	"	twenty-four years
<u>2</u>				

One Hundred forty-eight, or 68.84 per cent served two years or less; forty-one persons, or 19.06 per cent served for three to five years; nineteen persons, or 8.84 per cent served from six to ten years; five persons, or 2.32 per cent served from eleven to fifteen years; and two persons, or 0.94 per cent served sixteen years or more. The mean number of years served was 2.7 while the median number of years served was 1.8.

With the personnel of the Board constantly changing from year to year it was well-nigh impossible for either the Board or the Superintendent to formulate principles or policies and put them into operation. This was one of the principal

handicaps to the Public Schools of Baltimore during the period under discussion.

In 1870 the Board of School Commissioners requested the City Council for authority to appoint an Assistant Superintendent, the system having grown so large as to require the services of such an officer. The same request was made in 1871 and in 1872 the City Council created the position of Assistant Superintendent which was filled by the Board and which delegated to the incumbent the charge of the Primary Schools.

In 1872, for reasons best known to itself, the City Council decided not to insure the school properties against fire loss. To this action the Board of School Commissioners took strong exception and in its report questioned the action of the City Council and advised it of the risk it had incurred.¹ This state of affairs continued until 1874 when the Board again referred to the lack of fire insurance and requested the City Council to amend the ordinance in so far as it related to the insuring of school property.² Again in 1875 the City Council was reminded of the need for fire insurance, and was requested to pass an ordinance to insure the High Schools if not the rest of the school property.³

¹44th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xxiii-xxiv.

²46th Annual Report, Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1874, p. xxiv.

³47th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xxii-xxiii.

The Board of School Commissioners had headaches of another kind as is attested by a part of its reports for 1878¹ and for 1879.² It said that "the members of the Board of School Commissioners have been personally subjected to litigation in performing their official duties and that the members have been personally sued on several occasions for their official acts and put to personal expense." The Board felt such difficulties could be partially avoided if an ordinance, authorizing the Board of School Commissioners to become incorporated under the general laws of the State, was passed by the City Council, thus making it possible for the Board to make contracts and contest claims and suits in its corporate capacity. The City Council failed to act on this request.

To enliven the existence of the members of the Board of School Commissioners, as well as the teaching staff, the "b'hoys" in 1877 decided that the teachers should contribute toward the party "war chest." The Baltimore Sun spread the good news abroad through an editorial which said in part -

"The very worst form, however, of the abuse which has met our notice is that to which attention has recently been called in these columns; viz., the attempt to subject the Superintendent and other persons connected with the public schools of this city to political assessment."³

¹50th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1878, pp. lix-lx.

²51st Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1879, pp. xxxi-xxxii.

³Baltimore Sun Newspaper - November 26, 1877.

To this procedure on the part of the "b'hoys" the Board of School Commissioners took strenuous exception and passed a resolution protesting against it.¹

In 1878 to further enliven the Board of School Commissioners, charges were made in the City Council, on February 18, 1878, by one William P. Tonry, a member of the City Council, charging the dereliction in office of the Board of School Commissioners as well as statements regarding the proceedings, practices, and morals of some of the Board members,² followed by a resolution requesting an investigation.³

In response, the Board of School Commissioners, on February 19, 1878, requested an immediate investigation of the charges.⁴ This was done and the committee conducting the inquiry reported on March 26, 1878 that the charges against the Board of School Commissioners were false and had no factual basis.⁵

Even then as now the Board of School Commissioners felt it was being handicapped in its work for want of funds. In its report for 1880, the Board stated that during the period of 1860 - 1880, it had constantly to work with

¹Minutes of the Board of School Commissioners, December 4, 1877, p. 304.

²Journal of 2nd Branch, City Council of Baltimore, John Cox, printer, 1878, p. 209.

³Ibid., p. 130.

⁴Ibid., pp. 144-145.

⁵Ibid., pp. 209-216.

appropriations from the City Council at figures many thousands less than the Board had estimated. It stated that many of the schools were forced to do without essential supplies and equipment. It complained that "it is certainly unreasonable to expect any department of the city to fully and satisfactorily perform its work without the necessary means for the purpose, and it is impolicy to reduce its appropriations below a fair estimate made by those who know its wants."¹ (Doesn't that have a familiar sound?)

In 1886 the system having continued to grow, and it was being felt that some attempt at standardization of equipment and buying of supplies in bulk should be made, the City Council authorized the Board to appoint a Superintendent of Supplies. His duties were:

1. To supervise, take care of and have general control of the furniture, stores, furnaces, fuel, repairs, and other incidental supplies.
2. He was to report to the Board of School Commissioners and
3. Perform any and all duties required by the Board.²

From this has evolved the Department of Business Management of the Baltimore School System.

¹52nd Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1880, p. xiii.

²58th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1886, pp. 97-102.

Administration

Prior to 1866 the various Commissioners as individuals or as Local School Committees had incurred debts for the maintenance and operation of the schools. These debts had been liquidated by the City Register upon the presentation of bills for services rendered. In 1866 an Ordinance¹ was passed by the City Council which authorized the City Register to acknowledge debts incurred by the Board of School Commissioners only after the following requirements had been complied with:

1. The Commissioners incurring the debts had to certify the validity of the debts.
2. The accounts had to be presented to the Committee on Accounts of the Board, whose duty it was to examine and to certify to the correctness of same; and then present the matter to the Board of School Commissioners sitting as a committee of the whole.
3. The indebtedness had to be acknowledged and passed by the Board of School Commissioners, a certificate of indebtedness signed by the President and Secretary of the Board and presented to the City Register.

Salaries

Because of the length of service of the teachers, the increased cost of living, and a desire to improve the management of the schools, the Board of School Commissioners

¹Journal, 2nd Branch City Council of Baltimore, Jas. Young, printer, 1866, p. 265 and 397.

in 1863 recommended to the City Council an average increase of 20% in the salaries of the teachers.¹ At this time the City Council did nothing, but during 1865 it saw fit to grant increases to some of the teachers if not to all of them. To this the Board of School Commissioners objected, stating that compensation should be based on the degree of intelligence, labor and responsibility required."² The Board was within its rights in taking this stand. It, and not the City Council, should designate those entitled to increased compensation. The City Council, therefore, adopted a salary scale in 1866 which was approved by the Board of School Commissioners.³

The City Council in 1869 requested the Board of School Commissioners to adopt a new salary scale with the aim of reducing all salaries. To this the Board objected basing its arguments on the continued growth of the system both in pupils and teachers; and asserting that the best teaching talent was needed and that it could not be secured with low salaries; and that low salaries would only attract inferior teachers and those who would teach while they were preparing to enter another field of endeavor; that the morale of the system would suffer; that local salaries should be regulated by the standards of other cities; that Baltimore, in average salaries to teachers, was next to last in a list of cities of

¹35th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 24.

²38th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 48.

³Ibid., p. 49.

comparable size composed of San Francisco, Boston, New Orleans, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Springfield (Illinois), New York, Louisville, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Philadelphia.¹ This action by the Board of School Commissioners evidently so effectively silenced the City Council that no further discussion of the subject occurred during the remainder of the period I have studied.

Buildings

Throughout the period 1860 - 1890 the Board of School Commissioners labored under a severe handicap concerning housing facilities. Every annual report presents evidence of the need for adequate school buildings. Classes were held in places never intended to serve as school houses - auditoriums of churches, church basements, warehouses, private dwellings - none of which, because of their construction, furnished sufficient light, heat, ventilation, black board space, or toilet facilities. Even the school houses which had been constructed by the City Council had been allowed to deteriorate through neglect and indifference.

In 1866 the Board of School Commissioners evidently hoped for better things, for in its annual report the Board noted with pleasure that the new Chairman of the Joint Committee on Education of the City Council intended to visit all

¹41st Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1869, p. xxviii.

of the schools. It felt that such practice, if it were frequently performed, would result in improvements to the buildings, and in an increase in the knowledge of the conditions under which the schools operated and in the needs of the schools.¹

The Board of School Commissioners then cited the condition of one school building, that of #25, as an example of the conditions existing. This structure for the past seven or eight years had literally been decaying and falling down piece-meal over the children's heads. The ceiling was held up by boards in it large enough to permit a man to pass through; the roof leaked so badly the pupils had to move about to escape the downpour and as a consequence of which the teachers were instructed to dismiss classes when rain threatened.²

In this same year, 1866, the Superintendent claimed that the greatest handicap to improving conditions was the parsimonious action of the City Council in appropriating insufficient funds for this work. School buildings were rendered inconvenient and uncomfortable and the Superintendent directed attention to the fact that some schools lacked cellars for storing so that the fuel supplied was stolen; that "yard conveniences" were needed; and that many buildings had small rooms which were inconveniently located. He advocated spacious classrooms, better lighting, ventilation, sufficient entrances

¹38th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 26-27.

²Ibid., pp. 27-28.

and stairways, cellars under the entire building and extended yards for more play space.¹

The Board of School Commissioners then went on to say that prior to the Civil War its requisitions were met by the City Council and that sometimes as many as three buildings were erected in a year. It reminded the City Council that for the past five years (1861 - 1866) no school houses had been built, whereas ten or twelve should have been erected.²

The Superintendent in his 1867 report noted the lack of uniformity in the design of school houses and he commented that in many instances the plans appeared to be drawn to inconvenience the pupils and teachers. He favored simplicity in design; in fact, he advocated a standard design be adopted - and varied only as the conditions warranted, with comfort and convenience as the aim.³

He also noted the variability in type and design of the desks and seats in use. He urged that here standardization be obtained and that the furniture be made by carpenters employed by the Board of School Commissioners, and made from patterns adopted by the Board.⁴

¹38th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 174.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³39th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1867, p. 49.

⁴Ibid., pp. 64-65.

The Superintendent, again in 1882,¹ 1886,² 1887,³ and 1889,⁴ advocated the adoption of a set of model plans for school buildings based on the needs of the system, adequate ventilation, heating, lighting, sanitation. But nothing was done by the City Council with the recommendations of the Board.

The City Council must have done something to relieve the condition existing in the school buildings because in 1871, the Board of School Commissioners recommended to the City Council that a program of building and repair be set up and followed so that the improvements effected would be done in a less haphazard manner.⁵ This was a sensible and reasonable idea, but it was rejected by the City Council who apparently was neither sensible nor reasonable in dealing with school matters.

For many years the Board of School Commissioners was compelled to rent buildings and use them for school houses. This was a distinct handicap as noted above and the Board of School Commissioners, in 1872,⁶ recommended to the City Council

¹54th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1882, p. 48.

²58th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 41

³59th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1887, p. 37.

⁴61st Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1889, p. 47.

⁵43rd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 6.

⁶Ibid., p. 11.

that it abandon the practice of renting buildings for school purposes, because they lacked facilities for adequate space, light, heat, and ventilation. They again recommended, as in the previous year, the erection of suitable buildings for schools.¹

Nothing was done by the City Council to relieve the situation in a comprehensive and satisfactory manner even though many schools had enrollments in excess of the building capacity for safety, comfort, or for good teaching. Parents sent their children to these schools because the buildings were newer and in better condition than the older ones. By 1880, the Board of School Commissioners stated that it soon would be compelled to fix the seating capacity of each building according to recognized sanitary rules and that they would then exclude all pupils over and above that number. It warned the City Council that a strict adherence to this rule would require either many new buildings or the exclusion of many pupils. The Board felt that exclusion was the lesser of two evils, because it was better to save the health of the pupils even if so done at the expense of the latter's education.²

In 1883 the Board of School Commissioners again warned the City Council that if conditions continued to exist it would be compelled to carry out the procedure proposed

¹44th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xxi-xxii.

²52nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxiii.

in 1880. It fully realized what would result, and bluntly informed the City Council that school buildings would have to be erected to take care of those excluded.¹ The City Council remained indifferent to these statements, however, and nothing was done to relieve conditions during the remainder of the period under discussion in this paper.

In 1873 the City Council requested the Board of School Commissioners to study the advisability of introducing the study of the German language into the grades below those of the High Schools. This request was made because of the large number of citizens of German extraction living in the city who wished their children to receive instruction in the language of their old home land. The Board recommended that four German-English schools be established instead of attempting to incorporate the German language into the Grammar Schools because to do so would seriously impair the usefulness of the Grammar Schools in the English branches.² Accordingly, in 1874, one German-English school was opened as a test of the public demand. The Board of School Commissioners reported that from the number applying for admission, other schools would have to be opened.³ The next year two more schools were opened and in 1876, two more, bringing the total to five German-English schools. For the rest of the period under discussion this number remained constant.

¹55th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1883, p. xxi.

²45th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xxxiii-xxxiv.

³46th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xix.

TABLE I

ENROLMENT IN VARIOUS DIVISIONS OF PUBLIC
SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE 1860 - 1889

Year : Floating : German-English		
1860	60	
61	42	
62	35	
63	46	
64	21	
65	--	
1875		1747
76		2963
77		3175
78		3188
79		3399
1880		3440
81		3436
82		3648
83		3869
84		3967
85		4611
86		4616
87		4783
88		4826
89		5122

Important Firsts

In 1871 the Board of School Commissioners felt that Physical Education was needed in the schools. It expressed itself that mental training was given at the expense of the body, and that some sort of a "simple system of exercises during recess in which all would participate would be an improvement."¹ It was not until 1876 that a uniform system of gymnastics was introduced into the system for the first time.²

In 1880 the first formal trial of a teacher was held on charges of incompetency and the teacher was discharged.³

In 1873 there occurred in Baltimore one of the usual outbreaks of smallpox. The Board of School Commissioners required the vaccination of all pupils and the attendant success of this regulation in the prevention of epidemics made the Board of School Commissioners determined to do the same under similar circumstances in the future. The Board further reported that as far as is known such a procedure had never before been done in any other community.⁴

After many years of discussion a free library for the use of teachers and pupils of the system was opened in the Baltimore City College in 1875.⁵

¹ 43rd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 9.

² 48th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xlv.

³ 52nd Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xxiv-xxxv.

⁴ 45th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxiv.

⁵ 47th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxiv.

In 1882 fire drills were introduced into all the schools for the first time.¹

An Industrial Education Association was formed in 1887 to obtain and disseminate information upon industrial education; to stimulate public opinion in its favor; to study and devise methods and systems of industrial training; to secure their introduction into the Baltimore schools; and to form special classes and schools for such work, when expedient.²

On September 25, 1879 the semi-centennial of the Public Schools of Baltimore was celebrated. The program included music by the band of the Fifth Regiment Maryland National Guard; singing by 2,500 school children; much speech making by Governor John L. Carroll, Mayor Ferdinand C. Latrobe, Messrs. Francis T. King, J. Morrison Harris, M. A. Newell, and Andrew Reese, the latter being the first pupil enrolled in the Public Schools in 1829; and a military drill by the cadets of the Baltimore City College.³

¹54th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxxix.

²59th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xliv-1.

³51st Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xxxiii-lviii.

TABLE II

SUPERINTENDENTS IN-CHARGE-OF
THE BALTIMORE SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS
DURING THE PERIOD 1860 - 1890

John Nelson McJilton	Appointed Treasurer of System, 1848
	Appointed Superintendent, 1866
	Discharged, 1867
William R. Creery	Appointed Superintendent, 1868
	Died, 1875
Henry E. Sheppard	Appointed Superintendent, 1875
	Resigned, 1882
Henry A. Wise	Appointed Superintendent, 1882
	Served throughout remainder of
	period 1860 - 1889, inc.

TABLE III
PERSONNEL OF BOARD OF SCHOOL
COMMISSIONERS AND TEACHERS
1860 - 1889, inc.¹

Year : Number on Board : Teachers			
1860	20	300	(54 Male and 246 Female)
1861	20	315	(57 Male and 258 Female)
1862	20	319	(44 Male and 275 Female)
1863	20	350	(50 Male and 300 Female)
1864	20	358	(48 Male and 310 Female)
1865	20	377	(42 Male and 335 Female)
1866	20	411	(36 Male and 375 Female)
1867	20	513	(33 Male and 480 Female)
1868	20	555	(43 Male and 512 Female)
1869	20	558	(51 Male and 507 Female)
1870	20	571	(56 Male and 515 Female)
1871	20	578	(70 Male and 508 Female)
1872	20	614	(79 Male and 535 Female)
1873	20	624	(81 Male and 543 Female)
1874	20	661	(89 Male and 572 Female)
1875	20	706	(93 Male and 613 Female)
1876	20	731	(No record as to sex)
1877	20	764	(113 Male and 651 Female)
1878	20	820	(116 Male and 704 Female)
1879	20	822	(106 Male and 716 Female)

¹Annual Reports, Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, Md. 1860 - 1889, inc.

TABLE III (cont.)

Year : Number on Board : Teachers			
1880	20	822	(104 Male and 718 Female)
1881	20	824	(84 Male and 740 Female)
1882	20	826	(84 Male and 742 Female)
1883	20	855	(83 Male and 772 Female)
1884	20	930	(126 Male and 804 Female)
1885	20	963	(115 Male and 848 Female)
1886	20	1011	(120 Male and 891 Female)
1887	20	1007	(98 Male and 909 Female)
1888	20	1123	(112 Male and 1011 Female)
1889	20	1187	(114 Male and 1073 Female)

TABLE IV

THE BALTIMORE SCHOOL SYSTEM DURING 1860 - 1890

	Primary	Grammar	High School	Normal School	Floating School	Evening-White	Negro - Day	Negro - Night	Unclassified	English-German	Baltimore Polytechnic
	M. F.	M. F.	M.F.								
1860	20/28	13/15	1/2	1	1	6					
1861	20/28	13/15	1/2	1	1	5*					
1862	20/29	13/15	1/2	1	1	2					
1863	20/30	13/15	1/2	1	1	5					
1864	19/30	13/15	1/2	1	1	5					
1865	20/32	13/15	1/2	1		5					
1866	20/31	13/16	1/2	0		5					
1867	25/31	16/19	1/2	0		7	10	5			
1868	26/35	17/20	1/2	0		8	13	0			
1869	29/33	17/20	1/2	0		4	13	0			
1870	29/33	17/20	1/2	0		6	13	0			
1871	28/31	18/19	1/2	0		5	10	3	2		
1872	28/31	18/19	1/2	0		7	10	4	2		
1873	28/31	19/20	1/2	1		7	11	4			
1874	28/30	19/20	1/2	1		6	11	4		1	
1875	28/30	19/20	1/2	1		0	11	0		3	
1876	28/30	19/20	1/2	1		1	11	1		5	
1877	29/30	19/19	1/2	1		7	12	4		5	

*Closed before end of school year.

TABLE IV (cont.)

THE BALTIMORE SCHOOL SYSTEM DURING 1860 - 1890

	Primary	Grammar	High School	Normal School	Floating School	Evening-White	Negro - Day	Negro - Night	Unclassified	English-German	Baltimore	Polytechnic
	M. F.	M. F.	M.F.									
1878	29/30	19/19	1/2	1		4*	13	4*		5		
1879	29/30	19/19	1/2	1		1	14	4		5		
1880	29/30	19/19	1/2	1		1*	14	4*		5		
1881	29/30	19/20	1/2	0		0	14	0		5		
1882	30/30	19/20	1/2	0		0	14	0		5		
1883	30/30	19/20	1/2	0		0	14	0		5		
1884	29/29	19/20	1/2	0		4	14	4		5	1	
1885	29/29	19/20	1/2	0		4	14	4		5	1	
1886	30/30	19/20	1/2	0		8	16	4		5	1	
1887	30/30	19/20	1/2	0		4	16	0		5	1	
1888	30/30	19/20	1/2	0		0	16	0	16	5	1	
1889	30/30	19/20	1/2	0		0	18	0	16	5	1	

*Closed before end of school year

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER IV

FINANCING OF THE SCHOOLS

The schools were financed mainly by appropriations made by the City Council, in addition to which, monies received from tuition, rent and sale of school properties; interest, and intestate estates were also set aside for the use of the schools.

A point of interest was discovered in the fact that in 1861 the Board of School Commissioners also received from the Sheriff of the City the fines imposed upon violators of the Sunday laws.¹

In 1865, the City received its first State appropriation, it being a part of the State School Tax which had been levied for the first time.² Then, even as now, the Board of School Commissioners had to remonstrate with the City Council regarding the latter's action in making appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the schools. The Board of School Commissioners took the City Council to task and claimed that instead of making an appropriation as per the estimate of the Board of School Commissioners for the year 1865, the City

¹ 33rd Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1861, p. 11.

² 37th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 225.

Council appropriated an amount for 1865 equal to the actual amount paid out during 1864, disregarding the unpaid balances. The Board of School Commissioners claimed that the Department of Education labored under much difficulty in 1865 because of this oversight on the part of the City Council.¹

In 1882, in addition to the usual appropriations from the City Council and tuition fees, the schools received monies from intestate estates,² and it was during this year that the Board of School Commissioners took the position that it was not enjoying the right to all the monies due it and cited the fact that during the past several years, it (the Board of School Commissioners) had been required to pay to the City Register the amounts collected from intestate estates but had not been permitted to apply the money to the use of the schools and, also that the monies were not credited to the Department of Education, nor was the Board of School Commissioners allowed to draw any part of them for current expenses. The Board of School Commissioners claimed that the monies were thus diverted from the lawful use to which they were intended and used to defray the expenses of other departments. The Board of School Commissioners, therefore, recommended to the City Council that the ordinance governing the use of intestate estates be changed so that monies from such estates be credited to the school and be allotted for their use alone.³

¹ 37th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 21.

² 54th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xv.

³ Ordinances of the Mayor and City Council, King Bros. printers, 1883, pp. 106-108.

TABLE V

SOURCES OF REVENUE FOR SUPPORT OF
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE 1860 - 1889

Year :	City Council :	Intestate Estates :	State Sch. Fund :	Tuition Pupils :	Miscellaneous
1860	126,105.00			24,306.00	
61	133,765.00			20,805.00	
62	124,774.00	186.00		22,952.00	
63	140,836.00			25,859.00	
64	124,060.00			26,978.00	70,003.00
65	179,013.00			29,789.00	64,686.00
66	205,087.00			33,064.00	96,860.00
67	283,519.00			35,944.00	141,392.00
68	641,657.00	246.00	128,973.00	43,651.00	
69	401,948.00	2,073.00	119,682.00	43,464.00	
1870	383,169.00	195.00	145,691.00	42,612.00	
71	251,781.00	129.00	138,362.00	33,571.00	
72	315,253.00	126.00	135,559.00	39,306.00	
73	330,622.00	128.00	138,528.00	40,222.00	1,844.00
74	413,142.00	62.00	137,295.00	39,483.00	681.00
75	439,388.00	97.00	147,148.00	43,674.00	399.00
76	411,185.00	65.00	167,916.00	48,261.00	405.00
77	476,235.00		155,403.00	58,644.00	222.00
78	366,518.00	129.00	159,638.00	48,383.00	
79	404,339.00	130.00	139,677.00	46,980.00	
1880	366,602.00	130.00	147,304.00	46,163.00	
81	413,457.00	1,720.00	150,365.00	40,927.00	
82	137,451.00	130.00	168,290.00	47,009.00	
83	425,628.00	130.00	143,894.00	46,444.00	
84	475,225.00	130.00	158,002.00	34,773.00	
85	552,712.00	137.00	157,127.00		
86	565,704.00	632.00	156,815.00		60.00
87	579,373.00	203.00	147,403.00		
88	757,500.00	94.00	No record		
89	599,287.00	130.00	162,142.00		

	Lot & Bldg Account :	Interest :	Sale & Rent of Bldgs :	Fines, viola. Sunday Laws.
1860	16,527.00	2,963.00		425.00
61				
68	37,559.00		2,525.00	
75			2,000.00	
76				
85		5,395.00		
86		5,592.00		
87		6,591.00	45.00	
88		6,105.00		
89		3,446.00		

TABLE VI
EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF PUBLIC
SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE 1860 - 1889

Year :	Maint.& Operatn :	Equipment :	Supplies :	Salaries :	Rents :	Fuel
1860	48,016.00		15,302.00	96,113.00	10,116.00	4,920.00
61	12,549.00	2,333.00	17,171.00	98,926.00	9,777.00	5,237.00
62	18,462.00	1,216.00	16,414.00	100,365.00	8,322.00	4,841.00
63	21,839.00	3,750.00	20,327.00	102,372.00	9,952.00	8,417.00
64	44,964.00	4,270.00	19,244.00	124,060.00	10,849.00	15,999.00
65	34,359.00	2,397.00	38,900.00	179,012.00	10,576.00	12,568.00
66	39,685.00	5,781.00	40,166.00	205,087.00	11,035.00	9,591.00
67	57,305.00	17,125.00	63,424.00	283,519.00	16,562.00	18,304.00
68	46,728.00	17,042.00	36,194.00	323,348.00	14,921.00	11,766.00
69	24,785.00	19,193.00	33,264.00	352,585.00	20,403.00	12,441.00
1870	44,802.00	13,256.00	32,203.00	356,438.00	18,503.00	12,642.00
71	35,367.00	4,931.00	20,327.00	303,522.00	14,844.00	10,166.00
72	35,136.00	9,887.00	35,828.00	372,205.00	12,191.00	10,614.00
73	38,296.00	15,188.00	22,356.00	388,985.00	15,690.00	11,786.00
74	23,335.00	14,554.00	40,586.00	405,811.00	23,655.00	11,634.00
75	34,084.00	27,430.00	51,758.00	426,720.00	26,587.00	16,270.00
76	25,501.00	21,459.00	43,865.00	447,122.00	31,285.00	16,833.00
77	42,723.00	19,043.00	29,757.00	482,756.00	23,773.00	12,789.00
78	45,960.00	9,240.00	39,086.00	491,104.00	28,893.00	9,349.00
79	35,243.00	6,895.00	30,477.00	491,947.00	29,957.00	11,613.00
1880	42,575.00	7,138.00	33,336.00	510,210.00	29,762.00	12,625.00
81	54,045.00	7,067.00	35,476.00	507,082.00	27,705.00	19,069.00
82	25,603.00	10,044.00	24,670.00	526,100.00	28,678.00	16,290.00
83	26,932.00	5,606.00	41,736.00	525,035.00	29,970.00	20,097.00
84	24,320.00	6,592.00	39,844.00	543,030.00	31,523.00	16,152.00
85	23,834.00	5,733.00	43,039.00	583,631.00	31,186.00	17,226.00
86	29,148.00	13,802.00	43,120.00	594,027.00	33,139.00	17,570.00
87	25,916.00	11,257.00	41,663.00	610,784.00	32,563.00	18,333.00
88	14,540.00	9,406.00	40,889.00	624,312.00	35,200.00	20,514.00
89	49,695.00	21,537.00	47,744.00	733,611.00	39,285.00	27,059.00

TABLE VI (cont.)

Year	Incidentals	Interest	Insurance	Commencement	New Buildings
1860		961.00	622.00	120.00	
61		493.00	583.00	150.00	
62		226.00	702.00	278.00	
63		139.00	630.00	535.00	
64			1,518.00	546.00	
65		1,739.00	1,276.00	468.00	13,088.00
66		730.00	140.00	381.00	31,868.00
67			718.00	375.00	17,299.00
68	21,521.00				116,480.00
69	19,201.00				92,586.00
1870	10,198.00				2,700.00
71	13,860.00				23,935.00
72	7,950.00				49,461.00
73	11,737.00				105,710.00
74	8,346.00				122,696.00
75	9,313.00				83,131.00
76	8,781.00				78,313.00
77	9,440.00				46,874.00
78	7,471.00				21,949.00
79	6,315.00				21,839.00
1880	6,504.00				25,003.00
81	6,476.00				53,928.00
82	7,428.00				8,575.00
83	10,020.00				32,465.00
84	7,525.00				26,915.00
85	13,652.00				61,737.00
86	13,212.00				16,117.00
87	10,971.00				
88	12,633.00				220,003.00
89	19,115.00				

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER V

TEACHER TRAINING AND ELECTION

In 1852 an attempt had been made to furnish some professional training to the teachers then in the Baltimore City schools. This training was what today would be called in-service in type and consisted in a study of the existing curriculum, the reasons for it, and a consideration of any needed changes in it.

In 1860, a more comprehensive system was set up embracing -

1. Principles of mental philosophy
2. Physiology
3. Language, which embraced the study of etymology, orthography, and as an index of thought
4. Arithmetic
5. Geography
6. Reading

Those attending the Normal Classes were divided into a senior group and a junior group. At each session a "pupil" was designated to teach the members of his group. After the lesson, discussion and criticism by the group were carried on.¹

¹32nd Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 191-192.

By 1861 Normal Classes were being held on Saturday mornings, and the School Board had adopted a regulation requiring all candidates for appointment as teachers to attend the classes for a period of six months and that candidates had to be high school graduates at least 17 years of age. The curriculum had been changed from that of 1860 to a study of pupil management and methods of instruction.

In 1862, a new Principal of the Normal School, as it was then called, had been appointed. He stated that the aim of the school would be to furnish those attending a knowledge of subject matter and a knowledge of how to teach.¹ The course was divided into two parts. Candidates for the positions of Primary teacher were to be instructed in methods of teaching the rules of:

1. Numeration - addition, subtraction, multiplication, division
2. Spelling
3. Reading
4. Geography

Candidates for the position of Grammar Grade teacher were to receive instruction in the completion of the rules in the whole or arithmetic, grammar, and etymology. Both groups of candidates were to participate in joint discussions in discipline and class management.²

¹ 34th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 146.

² Ibid., p. 147.

Because of the weather and the fact that attendance at the Normal Classes was on a voluntary basis, the attendance was very irregular. Also, because the Board only required candidates for teaching to attend 26 sessions of the Normal Classes, the principal of the school felt the work to be valueless.

By 1864 a difference of opinion arose in the School Board about the utility of the Normal Classes, some thinking they duplicated the work of the high schools. The Principal took issue on this and held that the high schools gave the candidate a background of knowledge of subject matter, but that the Normal Classes furnished the prospective teacher with a knowledge of how to teach the subject matter.¹ From then on to 1870 the Normal School passed through what might be characterized as a "period of depression" because no mention is made of it in the Annual Reports. During this year the Superintendent of Schools of Baltimore went to the defense of the Normal School taking his stand on the fact that its existence was justified because it gave candidate-teachers an opportunity to practice teaching. He mentioned that practice courts were held for law students; "trial exercises" were engaged in by theological students; and medical schools were attended by prospective doctors of medicine;² and he saw no reason why practice work in teaching should be denied teachers.

¹36th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1864, p. 158.

²42nd Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1870, p. 49.

Due to a continued lack of interest in the Normal School, it was suggested by the teachers in 1876 that some official recognition be given those that attended classes. Nothing about this was done by the School Board and the attendance and enrollment continued to drop until in 1880 the truth of the contention was officially recognized. Teachers who had not attended the Normal Classes as required by the Board rule were being appointed to positions. Also many teachers of the grade of Second Assistant did not attend the classes although they were required to do so by a Board rule. The Board, therefore, suspended the Normal Classes in 1880 with the hope that upon their reorganization and revival the rules of the Board would be observed by those affected or their positions would be forfeited.¹

Conditions in the Board of School Commissioners had become such that in 1877 the Mayor and City Council appointed a commission composed of George William Brown, President; F. Raine; John T. Morris; E. G. Hipsley; and Richard M. Venable, Secretary, to "enquire into the Public School System of Baltimore whether the system now in operation presents any defects, and how they may be remedied, or whether any other system might be advantageously substituted."²

¹ 52nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxxiii.

² Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council, "Report of the Commission to enquire into the public school system of Baltimore," Baltimore, 1880, p. 5.

This Commission made its report in 1880. It had held weekly meetings and interviewed a number of gentlemen some of whom were connected with the Public Schools of Baltimore and others who were interested in education. It also corresponded with prominent educators. Its aim was to recommend such modification of the Baltimore System as would best contribute to place local educational system in the control of men who could appreciate the report and who would adopt a plan best suited for the schools of the city.¹

The organization of the Board was given the most consideration as the Commission "felt that the success of the whole system" depended "primarily on the structure and efficiency of this body."

The Commission recommended -

1. The formation of a new Board of nine members in place of the present one of twenty members, each one of which represented a City ward. The Commission felt that a smaller Board would conduct the business of the schools better than a large one; that the position of Commissioner would be enhanced because of the small number of members; that a greater selection of competent persons would be possible; and that there would be more unanimity in a smaller group than in a large one.

¹ Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. p. 6.

2. Appointments to the Board should be made by the Mayor from the City at large, subject to the approval of the City Council in joint convention. At that time the law required that election to the School Board be made by the two branches of the City Council meeting jointly. In practice, the Commission said, a Board member was nominated by the City Councilman sitting in the First Branch, which nomination was tantamount to election. The Commission found that the consequences which followed from this practice were such that the responsibility for appointments ceased to rest where the law had placed it - in the joint meeting - and in reality the responsibility was destroyed. A Councilman making a bad appointment escaped responsibility for it by pointing to the law; the joint meeting could acquit itself by pointing to the method of appointing as adopted in practice. Secondly, a public trust vested by law in a body of men was by them partitioned out amongst individual members as a private patronage. Third, the method, as then practiced, was calculated to give prominence to political considerations in making selections, whereas, the Commission felt that no considerations of party affiliations or party influence should be entertained; that where the appointing power is

biased by considerations other than the fitness of the appointee, the Public Schools would suffer and the public would spend its money for naught.¹

3. Increase the term of service on the School Board from one to six years. The Commission felt that improvements could only be accomplished gradually; that tenure of office should be long enough to enable the members of the School Board to carry out their plans for the system; also, that terms should expire in such a way as not to produce sudden changes in the majority of the Board membership. To prevent this, the Commission recommended that the terms of office of three members expire every alternate year.²
4. The new Board should be vested with the same legislative, executive, and judicial powers as was vested in the present board.
5. The creation of the office of Supervisor of Schools and the appointment of forty supervisors, two from each ward, to serve for two years without compensation, one from each ward to retire every year.

The Supervisors were to be residents of the ward where they lived. They were to visit the schools and inspect them in cleanliness, heating, ventilation,

¹ Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. pp. 12-14.

² Ibid., pp. 14-15.

and repairs. They were to observe and to report any departures from the school regulations and the rules of discipline; to decide who should pay for books and who not; to appoint and control janitors; temporarily fill vacancies in the teaching corps; to issue entrance permits to pupils; to recommend such substitutes as faithfully performed their work; and to perform such other duties as the School Board might delegate to them. They were not to interfere directly with the conduct of the school.¹

In addition to the above, the Committee also presented to the Mayor and City Council certain defects which they thought merited their attention. The first was the method of selecting teachers. The Commission felt that the examination of candidates should be in the hands of the school authorities exclusively; i.e., the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent. In practice the Board as well as the professional heads of the system examined the candidates, and issued a certificate of eligibility to appointments to the successful ones, which certificate was good for three years.

Next, the Commission took exception to the large list of eligibles. It felt that the list should be large enough to fill the demand as determined by experience; that

¹Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. pp. 7-8.

a large list leaves room for political, social and other considerations to enter into the selection of teachers, which selection should be solely on merit and fitness.

It further stated that too many incompetent and inefficient teachers were in the schools under the method of selection then in force and they felt that this number would be greatly reduced if its recommendations, which follow, were adopted:

1. Standards of the examinations should be raised sufficiently in order to reduce the list of eligibles.
2. The eligible list should be long enough to meet the demand for replacements.
3. Examinations should be competitive.
4. Those with the highest scores should be given the first appointment.
5. Promotion within the system. Those in inferior positions should be given an advantage apportioned on tenure and the success with which they had performed their duties. This would stimulate the teaching corps to study and to faithfulness.
6. Probationary teachers should serve one year instead of ninety days and be subject to close observation.
7. Persons of color should be allowed to participate in the examinations and if found eligible should be given positions in the colored schools.¹

¹Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. pp. 15-18.

The Commission next considered the question of the tenure of office of teachers. Instead of the annual election to position, the Commission recommended that tenure be during good behavior; that removal be for incompetency, inefficiency, bad conduct, or lack of character, and that an honorable discharge be given a teacher upon retirement.

This recommendation was backed by the following considerations:

Under the annual election plan the incompetent and inefficient teachers would be removed, so the Board of School Commissioners said. The Commission held that it had evidence from a number of schools that this system did not have the advantages claimed for it; furthermore, the annual election created a feeling of insecurity in good teachers, which disturbed them in the regular discharge of their duties, and created a sense of subserviency to the particular School Commissioner or Commissioners who had to make the nominations for the position; also, it encouraged in the School Commissioners the idea that the appointments were a patronage which they were entitled to dispense.¹

The Commission also was in favor of a regulation defining the powers of the Board of School Commissioners, claiming

¹ Reports of the City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. pp. 18-19.

that at the time, the powers of the individual School Commissioner or of the local School Committee were not sufficiently defined.

The Commission claimed that the school system should be a system controlled by law and that all should act in conformity to the law.¹ The teacher should have his rights and remedies, as well as duties; and these should be sharply defined. This was essential, the Commission held, to the maintenance of the teacher's self-respect and of his independence under the law.

The Commission further stated that everything should be done to suppress the opinion that School Commissioners are depositories of arbitrary powers, or are irresponsible for the exercise of their powers; and everything should be done to discourage the belief that it is best for the teacher to overlook abuses, or submit to the dictation of the School Commissioners because it is in the power of a School Commissioner to displace or to annoy a teacher to whom he is hostile.

The Commission went on further to recommend a thorough revision of the rules defining the powers of the individual School Commissioners and of the Local School Committees; the rights and remedies of the teachers; and that printed copies of the revised rules be placed in the hands of all connected with the government or teaching of the schools.²

¹ Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. p. 19.

² Ibid., pp. 19-20.

The powers of the teachers were next discussed and the Commission felt that they should be given as much liberty and authority as possible in order to stimulate them and to awaken their interest and zeal - to give play to their individuality and efficiency by enabling them to experiment in the use of methods. The Commission recommended that the faculty in each school be given the control of

1. The progress of classes during the session (evidently meaning the school year)
2. Methods of instruction
3. The promotion and demotion of pupils from grade to grade
4. The arrangement of the order of studies
5. Home assignments¹

Concerning compensation the Commission noted that the salaries of administrators and teachers were on the whole smaller than elsewhere. The Commission went on record as stating that competent and conscientious work in the schools is the thing desired - that the success of the whole system depends upon the teachers. They thought the best method to secure an efficient corps of teachers was to make positions attractive to competent persons who were willing to devote their lives to the profession of teaching. To attract such people four things they regarded as requisites: a secure

¹ Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. pp. 20-23.

tenure of office; a system of promotions for merit; reasonable compensation; and such protection of the law and independence under the law as is compatible with complete self-respect.¹

Of the school financial set up the Commission felt that it lacked authority to examine minutely the several items of expense. It did recommend that appropriations for the schools be ascertained before the commencement of the fiscal year on January 1 instead of making appropriations after the year had begun as the latter proceeding caused the system to operate without funds for a part of the year.²

Regarding the courses of study, the Commission felt that questions of books and what to teach should be left to the school authorities. They did, however, submit some rules for the guidance of the school officials. These were

1. Teach a few things well rather than many superficially.
2. Arrange the subjects within the range of the pupils' comprehension. Grammar, therefore, they felt should be postponed to the higher grades while the practical use of language and object teaching be extended to the lower grades as far as practicable.
3. The aim of teaching should be the development of the faculties rather than storing the mind with knowledge.
4. Some attention should be devoted to the cultivation of the artistic senses by giving some time to music and drawing.

¹ Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. pp. 23-25.

² Ibid., pp. 25-26.

5. Physical training should not be overlooked.
6. The inclusion of moral training should not be overlooked.
7. Attempts should be made to develop good habits and characters.¹

The above report was a scholarly, reasonable, and stimulating piece of work worthy of the consideration of the City Council and provocative of action by that body. The ideas submitted were in the best interests of the City in general and the School System in particular. But such was the shortsightedness and reactionary character of the City Council that it did nothing. Public interest in the schools was beginning to awaken so that by 1883 public opinion was making itself felt through editorials and letters to the press.

An idea of public opinion in regard to the general management of the School Board may be had from an editorial on the administration of the Baltimore Schools appearing in the Sun paper of April 2, 1883 which says in part - "Our whole school system and its management need, it is true, a thorough over-hauling to get it abreast of the times, but a good deal can be accomplished by adopting a correct, non-political method of selecting teachers." A letter to the editor appearing in the Sun paper of April 2, 1833 says in part - "To permit our school system to lose its purity and

¹ Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1880, op. cit. pp. 26-29.

efficiency, to be prostituted to the base ends of irresponsible and unscrupulous partisans at this critical juncture, when all signs of the times point to an epoch of unprecedented intellectual development in Baltimore, would constitute a political sacrilege whose atrocity can not be adequately characterized.
signed H. E. S.

In the spring of 1883 the Board appointed a committee composed of Messrs. John P. Poe, J. F. Hancock, H. B. Roemer, and John T. Morris to consider the expediency of changes in the appointment and in the terms of teachers.¹ The report of this committee as printed in the Sun paper of May 3, 1883 recommended that "a committee of eight be appointed by the School Board to examine into the character and qualification of all nominated for teaching positions; that a written report on each case should be submitted to the Board prior to the assignment of the nominee, thereby enabling the Board to be informed thoroughly on all points necessary to be known in order to vote with intelligence and discretion; secondly, that all teachers be elected for a period of ten years in place of the prevailing practice of being elected annually to the positions. Third, that the abovementioned committee be composed of the President of the School Board, and five members in addition to Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent of Schools."

¹ Minutes of the Board of School Commissioners, February 27, 1883. p. 475.

The Board met on June 6, 1883 and after a lengthy discussion of the proposed changes in the appointment and tenure of teachers, it was moved to lay the resolution on the table due to its not being expedient to make any changes in the regulations at that time. Mr. Poe, as the Chairman of the Committee, submitting the recommendations insisted that the opponents of the recommendations give their reasons for wishing to table the same, stating that the public demanded to know their reasons for their opposition. Mr. Graham, a member of the Board, stated that the resolution was based on conditions that did not exist. (This, so soon after the investigation of 1880!) The discussion was carried over to the next meeting.

On June 11, 1883 an editorial in the Sun paper discussed the proposed changes in the appointment and tenure of teachers by the Poe Committee. The editorial said, in part, "Members of the Board who may be so ill-informed as to suppose that the demand for a better method of appointment and a longer tenure of teachers 'is gotten up from statements of facts which exist only in the mind' of a former superintendent of City schools, are evidently out of contact with the sources of information open to everybody else. Not only has the press of the city favored the reforms advocated, but the general public, of whose sentiment the press is the best interpreter, is decidedly in their favor. Their only opposers seem to be in the School Board....Commissioner Poe's utterances in favor

of the new rule are emphatic. 'There is', he says, 'a great public opinion in this question, - a great public opinion that demands some change in the appointment of teachers. When the finger of attack is laid on the method of appointing our teachers it is laid on a weak spot. If you do not like to give up the patronage in the appointment of teachers - let me say that unless you do give it up you will have no patronage to dispense, for someone else will occupy your seats.'"

On June 9, 1883 the Teachers Association held a meeting to consider the recommendation of the Poe Committee. The teachers were unanimously in favor of the recommendations, and ordered their secretary to transmit the information to the School Board.¹

On June 12, 1883 the proposed changes as contained in the report of the Poe Committee were defeated 12 to 7. An idea of the attitude of some of the School Commissioners may be gained from the utterance of one of them, Mr. Graham, who stated during the meeting that he felt the "action taken by the Teachers Association was unpardonably impudent as it reflected on the individual members as well as the whole Board."² He further stated that "the Board might well begin improvements by reforming the teachers themselves, some of whom should be

¹ Baltimore Sun Newspaper - June 11, 1883.

² Baltimore Sun Newspaper - June 12, 1883.

taught that it would be more proper to be more courteous and obliging."¹

The reaction of the public to the defeat of the recommendation of the Poe Committee is well summarized by two editorials from the Sun paper. The one of June 13, 1883 says in part - "The spirit of the age calls for men of broad views and vigorous intelligence in all positions that concern the public welfare of the people, and in no one direction is the exercise of these qualities more desirable than in that of public education. The majority of the School Board, however, has demonstrated a melancholy incapacity to grapple with one of the simplest phases of the question, and that too in the presence of a public opinion unmistakable in its demand." The second entitled "School Commissioners as Politicians" says in part - "The extraordinary manifestation made in the School Board Tuesday evening of the unfitness of some of its members for the important duties with which they are charged emphasizes the necessity, to which the Sun has called attention, of drawing a broad and deep line hereafter between public school management and politics."²

In addition to the Poe Committee another was appointed by the Board of School Commissioners to study the advisability of reopening the Normal Classes. They must have found the subject very engaging because the official report for the

¹ Baltimore Sun Newspaper - June 12, 1883.

² Baltimore Sun Newspaper - June 14, 1883.

year 1885 still finds them studying the question.

Again in 1886 the Superintendent called the attention of the Board of School Commissioners to the need for a teacher training school. He stated that the schools suffered because those appointed as teachers lacked the knowledge of teaching. He continued by stating that a teacher training school is necessary because it will act as a selective agency which would discover those having little or no aptitude for teaching and would eliminate them; it would find those who have a capacity for teaching and would train them. Nothing was done, however, and patronage ruled supreme until 1895 when teacher tenure is reported as having been changed from the annual election to occupancy during good behavior and efficiency.¹ In 1897 the School Board formally adopted "Civil Service Rules" containing a definite statement that tenure of position was to be had during good behavior and efficiency.² Thus we close a very sorry chapter in the history of education in Baltimore.

¹67th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1895, p. xxiv.

²69th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1897, p. 193.

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VI

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AND OTHER PHASES OF EDUCATION

Elementary education during the 19th century was, from the present day viewpoint, divided into two parts and was offered by the Primary School and the Grammar School respectively.

In Baltimore the Grammar Schools were first organized in 1829 whereas the Primary Schools did not appear until 1848. Baltimore was evolving educationally as was Boston, Hartford, New York, and Philadelphia where Grammar Schools were the first to be organized, followed later by the Primary Schools.¹

In 1860 there were 48 Primary Schools (20 male, 28 female) and 28 Grammar Schools (13 male, 15 female). The highest grade in both divisions was called the First Grade and each grade was a half year in length.

There were five half yearly grades in the Primary School until 1882 when another was added making six. This set-up remained until 1885 when the Primary grades were re-organized and the work divided into three grades of one year each.² In the Grammar School five grades of a half year each

¹ E. B. Cubberly, The history of education (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1920), pp. 664-665.

² 57th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners Baltimore, 1885, p. 31.

continued in operation until 1880 when another half year was added. In 1885 the Grammar grades were reorganized into five grades of a year each. The change and the addition of more grades in the Grammar Schools was necessary to take care of the subjects of geometry, physics, physiology, and hygiene. These studies had been brought into the Grammar Schools because of the demand of parents that their children receive more advanced work without the necessity of entering the High Schools.¹

The rote method of instruction was in vogue in 1860 and continued to be practiced for quite some time thereafter, but in a steadily diminishing degree.

The Superintendent of Instruction (known as the Treasurer) was an implacable foe of the rote system. In advocating the introduction of science into the schools, he said he had been told the subject matter was too technical and would take too much of the pupils' time to learn it. He stated that there was no time to teach science because there was no time to teach anything under the rote method. If a pupil acquired knowledge he did so in spite of his teachers, not because of them. He held that the rote system was very bad because the words in the textbooks were not understood by the pupils; the language was too mature; and the method made no provision for problem solving and reasoning.²

¹ 57th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxii.

² 32nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 54.

It was about this time that the influence of Pestalozzi began to be felt. The Superintendent was the leader in advocating a change from the rote system of teaching. His reports for the years 1860 to 1866 inclusive contain much interesting material on his fight against the old method, and on his advocacy of, what he called, a more intellectual system of teaching. Assignments were to be studied for the purpose of securing ideas, to promote reflective thinking, and to stimulate the imagination. The teacher was to check on the pupil's preparation through discussion, accompanied by illustrations and explanations by the teacher. In this way the pupils' powers of thinking and recall were brought into play; growth could be noted; and the teacher's explanation and the texts used brought down to the level of the pupils.¹

This method contained Pestalozzian ideas and called for a new and real technique of teaching since dependence upon the memorization of texts alone was ruled out. Oral instruction using real objects, and with the essential elements to be taught kept clearly in mind, was to replace the old method.²

Object teaching became the accepted procedure, but the lessons became so technical that they were unsuited for elementary pupils. This necessitated a reorientation of method

¹32nd Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 90-105.

²Katherine F. Muesse, Primary education in the public schools of Baltimore from 1829 to 1929, Masters Thesis, p. 19.

and aim on the teacher's part. To crystallize their thought along the lines indicated, the Assistant Superintendent, in 1873, stated that -

Object teaching consists of two distinct parts - the primary and the academic. The first has for its aim the creation of ability to work; the second, to secure the result for work - the first is for development and training, the second for instruction. It is the first kind only that is adapted to the primary schools. Its aim is to educate the mind through the senses.¹

Reading

Up to 1864, reading was not permitted until one had acquired the ability to spell well. This method was then discouraged because it was found that the texts contained but few words which the pupils and teachers had spent months in learning. In its place the word method of teaching reading was employed. By 1882 writing was the accepted vehicle by which reading was taught; the learning of the alphabet was omitted. Reading was also used to teach spelling and the pupil was required only to spell the words which he had occasion to use.²

Spelling

Several methods of teaching spelling were employed. The mechanical method - words were spelled by syllables and some classes sang in musical (and often noisy) cadences - b-l-a bla; b-l-e ble; b-l-i bli; etc.³

¹ 45th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 50-51.

² Muesse, op. cit. p. 52.

³ 40th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners Baltimore, 1868, p. 47.

Textbook spelling consisted in using the words in the readers instead of using regular spelling books.¹

Pupil selection method - the teacher (to arouse interest) suggested that the pupils bring in five words of their own selection each day. After collecting them the teacher dictated a certain number each day according to the ability of the class. After writing the words, the pupils exchanged slates and the words were checked and returned.²

Arithmetic

This subject was taught mainly by the rote system up to about 1877 with much time devoted to the study of Roman numbers. About 1875 the Grube method of instruction was introduced.³ The Pestalozzian idea of reducing a subject to its elements and making a thorough study of each element before proceeding to the next, was the main-spring of this method and each number was studied in all the possible combinations in which it could be arranged. This method continued in use for some time despite the introduction of the Spiral method in 1881, by which method instruction in all the arithmetical functions was given at the same time.⁴

¹ 36th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 49-53.

² 26th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 49-53.

³ Muesse, op. cit. p. 52.

⁴ 53rd Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 76-77.

Writing

The use of hand lettering was taught for almost the entire period, because it was easier to teach than was the difficult Spencerian script then in vogue. In 1889, script writing replaced lettering.¹

Geography

This subject continued to be taught by the rote method until 1877 when the Assistant Superintendent advocated a change and recommended that instruction be confined to teaching the Cardinal Points; the location of, and the direction of most of the prominent objects around the school; to definitions of the divisions of land and water; and to the shape of the earth.^{2,3} By 1886 the method had changed so that the text was used as a reading book. Pestalozzian influence was creeping in, in so far as subordinating the printed words to the acquisition of ideas and thoughts was concerned.⁴

Drawing

This subject was introduced as an experiment into a few Primary and Grammar Schools in 1869, the main reason being to use it as a vehicle to teach penmanship.⁵ It was

¹Muesse, op. cit. p. 30.

²47th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 37.

³49th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 27.

⁴Muesse, op. cit. p. 52.

⁵41st Annual Report, op. cit. p. 20.

extended to all of the Elementary Schools in 1870 and became an official part of the program of studies.¹

Discipline in the Primary Schools

The Superintendent in 1860 found that the proper enforcement of discipline was difficult. The trouble seems to have been due to the improper exercise of discipline on the part of the teachers rather than to infractions of the rules by the pupils. The Superintendent noted that it was more difficult to keep pupils still than to have them quiet. He advocated the regulation of their activity by keeping them busy instead of trying to keep them still. He suggested making requirements so general that even deviations from the teacher's aim could be considered as a part of the work required; and that pupils be allowed some liberty in obedience.²

In his study of the Grammar Schools, the Superintendent, in 1860, held that the same faults obtained here as were to be found in the Primary Schools. In addition he noted that order was only possible in some schools when the teacher was present. He felt that the idea that the teacher had always to be present to insure order was bad. Defects in character were the result of pursuing such a system. He held that children have a sense of honor and trust and this sense should be made use of by the teacher; that suspicion and distrust do not breed good character but rather deception.³

¹42nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 20.

²32nd Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 63-65.

³Ibid., pp. 67-76.

Punishment

Corporal punishment was inflicted in the schools throughout the system. There was no justification for this the Superintendent stated in 1860. The duty and responsibility of inflicting such punishment lay with the parents, but through conventional agreement the schools were permitted to inflict it. The application of corporal punishment should come only as the last resort of a proper system of school discipline, the Superintendent held, and then only in extreme cases and after persuasion had failed.¹

This study would not be complete if some mention were not made of the man who eventually became the first Superintendent of Instruction. John Nelson McJilton was the individual and as an educator he was, in my opinion, years ahead of his time. His reports are texts on teacher training and school management. In his 1860 report to the Board he claimed the standards of the Primary Schools were too low, because many thought the relationship of the schools to the rest of the system was insignificant. As a result Primary Schools had been given less consideration than had the rest of the system. Teachers were inadequately prepared; they were lacking in experience and in ability to manage children, and in the knowledge of children.² The Superintendent went on to say that the Primary Schools were of great importance.

¹32nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 77.

²Ibid., p. 59.

Habits begun in them would influence the later life of the individual. Hence, experienced teachers were needed; teachers with some knowledge of the mental powers of children - their constitution and character; teachers capable of appreciating the emotions of childhood and directing them.¹

Years later in 1872 the Assistant Superintendent, in his report, substantiates the ideas of his predecessor by objecting to the practice of assigning the most inexperienced teachers to the Primary grades, while those best qualified are permitted to seek higher positions with higher pay. He felt that sufficient inducements should be made to hold the good teachers in the Primary grades and suggested an increase in salary as one method.² He regarded the Primary grades as the most important of the system and felt it would be better for the system if teachers were promoted "downwards" instead of "upwards."³ Again in 1877 the Assistant Superintendent advocated additional pay and promotion from the Grammar schools to the Primary Schools instead of the reverse.⁴

Evening Schools

The history of the Evening Schools, as they were called during the period of 1860 - 1890, is a record of periodic performance. They were organized to "afford persons

¹ 32nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 60.

² 44th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 57.

³ 45th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 46.

⁴ 49th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 29-30.

the opportunity to secure the elements of school instruction and provided for the education of those who from the necessary pursuit of other employment were unable to attend the day schools."

They were in operation in the evening hours during the winter months. No record as to the number of months or the length of the evening sessions has been found. Likewise, no mention has been found regarding the subjects taught in the schools. However, if the statement, "to secure the elements of school instruction" be taken at its face value, then the subjects were probably the same as those taught in the primary schools during the day.

Ages of the pupils in the evening schools are unknown, but the reports say that "those attending were men of advanced age, apprentices, and boys working in casual employment during the day." This seems to indicate that the age range of the students was quite wide.

For information as to number enrolled, see Table VIII.

The schools, prior to 1860, had been inoperative for two years and were reopened in that year.¹ They were again closed in 1861 because their expense was not justified by neither the attendance nor by the general condition of public affairs.² The Civil War was beginning and the public

¹ 32nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 25.

² 33rd Annual Report, op. cit. p. 20.

had not much thought for such humdrum activities as obtained in the Evening Schools.

In 1862 two schools were opened and it was during this year that the first appeal was made to the Board of School Commissioners to open an Evening School for girls.¹ The schools continued to operate for males only until 1873 when the first Female Evening School was opened.²

By 1875 the attendance at the Evening Schools had become so irregular and the conduct of the students so unsatisfactory that the Board refused to open any Evening Schools. In fact, in 1876 only two schools were opened (one white and one negro)³ as an experiment. They operated until 1878 when for want of funds they had to be discontinued before the end of the school year.⁴ The schools resumed work in 1879, but were again closed in 1880 because of a lack of funds and of interest on the part of the public.⁵ They remained closed until 1884 when four white and four colored Evening Schools were opened, again as an experiment.⁶ They were again discontinued in 1888,⁷ and 1889,⁸ because no funds were appropriated for their operation.

¹35th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 21.

²45th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxiv.

³48th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxxix.

⁴50th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxiii.

⁵52nd Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxxi.

⁶56th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners Baltimore, 1884, p. li and p. liii.

⁷60th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners Baltimore, 1888, p. xii.

⁸61st Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners Baltimore, 1889, p. xxvi.

TABLE VII

ENROLMENT IN WHITE SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE, 1860 - 1889

Year	Primary		Grammar	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
1860		7732	2369	2348
61		7109	2743	2789
62	3204	4165	2635	3040
63	3723	4814	2534	3056
64	3778	5047	2565	3175
65	3911	5329	2749	3130
66	4080	5819	3242	3622
67	5100	6002	3778	4056
68	4500	6133	3641	4028
69	6039	6704	3827	4188
1870	6144	6621	3952	4290
71	6350	6526	4186	4424
72	6468	6702	4077	4543
73	6910	7496	4122	4634
74	7557	7624	4218	4699
75	7499	7734	4287	4687
76	7552	7809	4177	4446
77	7706	7998	4519	4802
78	7721	7959	4927	5056
79	7626	8142	5203	5307
1880	7741	7911	5149	5511
81	7857	7944	4961	5660
82	7958	7563	4851	5745
83	8296	8225	4901	5757
84	8343	8371	5250	5878
85	8497	8462	5298	5926
86	8713	8637	5517	6255
87	9012	8948	5403	6297
88	9360	9094	5263	6304
89	10090	9648	5361	6901

TABLE VIII
ENROLMENT EVENING SCHOOLS¹

Year	:	White	:	Negroes
1860		467		
61		*		
62		228		
63		648		
64		626		
65		566		
66		417		
67		848		324
68		874		
69		754		
1870		1135		
71		649		229
72		753		530
73		1002		664
74		598		676
75				
76		133		200
77		328		911
78		520*		634*
79		110		728
1880		184*		781*
81				
82				
83				
84		891		987
85		673		637
86		839		638
87		356		
88				
89				

¹Annual Reports, Board of School Commissioners,
Baltimore, Maryland, 1860 - 1889, inc.

*Closed before end of school year.

Schools for Negroes

In December 1864 a group known as "The Baltimore Association for the Moral and Educational Improvement of the Colored People" was organized.¹ From a perusal of its report it appears that this association was a local manifestation of a form of activity going on in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania. Its aim was contained in its title and it attempted to reach its goal thru the establishment of schools for negroes.

It was supported thru donations of money from individuals; from collections made in Sunday Schools; from proceeds derived from admissions to public addresses given by prominent persons; from the Associations in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania; from the Society of Friends of England for the relief of Emancipated Negroes; and from the City Treasury. The Associations in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania collectively paid the teachers and the incidental expenses of the school rooms, which support covered about one half the cost of maintenance and operation.² They also furnished the teachers, the majority of whom were normal school graduates.³

The schools operated by the Association were located

¹The Baltimore Association for Moral and Educational Improvement of the Colored People, 1865, 1st Annual Report, p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 5.

³Ibid., p. 9.

for the most part in church buildings and in "halls."¹ What subjects were taught is not known, but the daily sessions were from 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and from 8 p.m. to 10 p.m.

Some time previous to 1867, the Association suggested to the City Council that the City assume the control and operation of the Schools. An ordinance, authorizing the Board of School Commissioners to establish schools for negroes under the same regulations as those for whites, was passed by the Mayor and City Council in 1867.² The Association disbanded forthwith and the transfer of the schools to the Board of School Commissioners was effected after much difficulty. The ordinance was passed in July; the schools were closed; teachers and pupils were scattered and the Superintendent had no one from the Association to assist him in the transfer.³ By the end of September, 1867, sufficient teachers and pupils had been assembled, permitting the operation of nine Schools.⁴

The Superintendent noted the disparity between the salaries of the white and colored teachers and recommended they be placed on an equal footing.⁵ The question then arose as to the existence of legal authority to pay the salaries

¹Baltimore Association for Moral and Educational Improvement of the Colored People, 1865, 1st Annual Report, p. 4.

²Ordinances of the Mayor and City Council, Baltimore, 1867, p. 45.

³39th Annual Report - op. cit. p. 71.

⁴Ibid., p. 73.

⁵Ibid., p. 75.

of the teachers in the schools for negroes. Although there was no ordinance covering the question, salaries had been paid for September and October, but in November a new City Register was in office and he refused to pay the salaries.¹

In 1868 the State Legislature authorized Baltimore City to raise money by taxation for the support of schools for negroes.² This was done because there had been some doubt if the City charter conveyed a legal right to appropriate money for separate schools.³ The Mayor and City Council then passed an ordinance⁴ authorizing the payment of arrearages due to the operation of the schools for negroes in 1867, and made an appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the schools in 1868.

Since the ordinance of 1867 stated that the schools for negroes should be established under the same regulations as those of the schools for whites, one may assume that the same subjects were taught as in the schools for whites.

By 1873, the schools for negroes had increased from nine to fifteen, comprising eleven day schools and four evening schools. Up to this time the schools were unclassified. Primary and Grammar School subjects were taught in

¹ 39th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 77.

² Maryland Laws, 1868, p. 706.

³ 40th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 42.

⁴ Ordinances of the Mayor and City Council, Baltimore, 1868, p. 59-60.

them, according to the ability of the pupils. The first grammar school for negroes was this year.¹ Although the enrolment had increased, the Board of School Commissioners reported that attendance was irregular, especially during the season when the oyster packing houses were open.²

The teachers in the early schools for negroes were of the white race, there being no colored persons qualified to hold teaching positions.³ White teachers were still being assigned to the colored schools in 1879, when it was suggested that colored teachers be employed in the hope of increasing the regularity of attendance. The Board of School Commissioners reported that there were not enough qualified colored teachers to form a school faculty; but when and if sufficient qualified applicants could be secured, a school would be organized with an all colored faculty.⁴ In 1888 the Mayor and City Council passed an ordinance⁵ which required that all new schools for negroes be staffed with colored persons qualified to hold the position of teacher.

The main problems of these schools were the lack of colored teachers, attendance, and adequate housing, the last two being similar to those of the schools for whites as reported elsewhere in this thesis.

¹ Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore, op. cit. 1873, p. 24.

² Ibid., p. 24.

³ Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore, op. cit. 1868, p. 44.

⁴ Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore, op. cit. 1879, p. 22.

⁵ Ordinances of Mayor and City Council, Baltimore, 1888, p. 83-85.

TABLE IX
ENROLMENT NEGRO SCHOOLS¹

Year	Primary		Grammar		High School		Night
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	
1860							
61							
62							
63							
64							
65							
66							
67	575	584					324
68	745	567					
69	1016	695					
1870	883	694					
71	925	894					229
72	1165	1005					530
73	1328	990					664
74	1217	1036	122				676
75	1450	1171	140				
76	1582	1234	127				200
77	1755	1261	206				911
78	1879	1651	303				634*
79	2287	1739	362				728
1880	2191	1566	382				781*
81	2233	1680	401				
82	2085	1642	387				
83	2595	1842	424				
84	2605	1803	502				987
85	2523	2065	533				637
86	2211	2190	524				638
87	2403	2442	540				
88	2553	2557	643				
89	3021	3178	867				

¹ Annual Reports, Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, Maryland, 1860 - 1889, inc.

* Closed before end of school year.

CHAPTER VII

CHAPTER VII

SECONDARY EDUCATION

Secondary Education in Baltimore in 1860 was offered in the Central High School (created in 1839) for boys and in the Western High School and Eastern High School (both created in 1844) for girls. Entrance to the high schools was based upon the passing of an examination given at the close of the last year's work in the Grammar School.

Even then, as now, the High Schools complained of the lack of preparation of their pupils. Blame for the superficiality of knowledge exhibited by the students was laid upon the desire of parents to get their children into high school as quickly as possible, thereby saving time in their education, and in making it possible for their children to enter employment much earlier. The mortality rate was high - the withdrawals being due to a lack of adequate background which brought about failures, and to a loss of interest in subject matter because of the immaturity of the students.

In 1870 the minimum age of entrants to the Female High School was raised from 12 to 13 years. The same rule was applied to the entrants to the Central High School in 1872.

The first formal set of regulations governing the High Schools was drawn up in 1871.

1. Entrance to all High Schools was by the passage of an examination.

Baltimore City College

Female High Schools

2. Boys over 14 years of age and having passed one half year in Grammar School
- Girls 13 years of age or over
3. Truants and those guilty of other grossly improper conduct were excluded
- Girls from private schools who secured permits could take examinations
4. No pupils previously expelled could re-enter

Pupils were allowed one week in which to report after the opening of school in September - only sickness or other unavoidable absence was accepted for an extension of time for entrance.

Central High School (Baltimore City College)

In 1863 a change was made in the English Course. Because of the small number enrolling, the four year course which had been in effect was reduced to two years. The Classical Course of four years was retained, however. This marked the first attempt in the High Schools to offer instruction not leading to the University.¹

¹ 35th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 52.

In 1864 the addition of another year of instruction was recommended for the Central High School. The purposes of this addition were to offer advanced Latin and Greek; advanced work in other subjects; and fit those who desire to do so to enter college.¹ This recommendation was carried out in 1865 when a fifth or post graduate year was added. Subjects offered were - advanced classical and modern languages, higher mathematics, physics, history, English literature; mental, moral, and political philosophy. The Principal stated that graduates from the five year course would be equal in attainment to those from the colleges, and worthy of college honors. He requested the Board of School Commissioners that the Faculty and the School Committee be empowered to confer upon the graduates "all the literary honors usually granted by American institutions of learning."²

An ordinance passed by the Mayor and City Council, October 9, 1866 changed the name of the Central High School to the Baltimore City College.³ This change was in line with the extension of the four year course to five years. The curriculum of the Baltimore City College in 1866 was as follows:

¹ 36th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 94.

² 37th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 106.

³ Journal of the 2nd Branch, City Council of Baltimore, Jas. Young, printer, 1866, p. 481.

CURRICULUM BALTIMORE CITY COLLEGE - 1866

First Year

English Grammar and Analysis	Latin, begun
Elocution	German, begun
History of England	Algebra, completed
Writing	Geometry, III books
Physiology	

Second Year

Composition and Elocution	Latin
Rhetoric	German
History of Rome	French, begun
Bookkeeping	Geometry, completed
Physical Geography	Plane Trigonometry
Physiology	Mensuration

Third Year

Composition and Elocution	Latin
Rhetoric	German
History of Greece	French
Bookkeeping, completed	Greek (optional)
Natural Philosophy (full course)	Surveying, Leveling, Navigation, Astronomy, begun

Fourth Year

Original Speeches and Elocution	Latin
History of the Ancient Empires	Greek
Mental Philosophy	French
Moral Philosophy	German
Constitution of United States	Spherical Trigonometry
Chemistry	Astronomy, completed
Geology	Review of Mathematics

Fifth Year

Essays and Original Speeches	Latin
Logic	Greek
Mental Philosophy (2nd course)	French
Moral Philosophy (2nd course)	German
Political Philosophy	Analytic Geometry and Calculus
Political Economy	The higher Physics

An analysis of the curriculum, from the present day view point, clearly shows that although the school closely followed the classical type of High School of the times yet courses were offered which today would be classed as vocational, i.e., bookkeeping, surveying, navigation.

From almost the beginning of the "College," the Faculty and student body worked under the handicap of inadequate supplies and equipment in a building poorly suited for the purposes of instruction. By 1867 the Principal reported

to the Board of School Commissioners that for eleven years no repairs or refurnishing had been done, and that conditions had become so deplorable that he would be ashamed to have the City Council members visit the school.¹

Although a new building for the "College" had been started in 1863, it was not completed because of a lack of funds and because of a disagreement between the Board and City Council as to the internal arrangement of the rooms. The principal reason for abandoning the project was, however, the refusal of the City Council to advance funds for its completion.

On September 9, 1873 the Holliday Street Theatre burned and sparks carried by the wind ignited the "College" Building.* The furniture, books, and apparatus were either so badly damaged or were destroyed that replacements and repairs had to be effected. Another building was rented to house the school, and a piece of ground on North Howard Street opposite Center Street was leased and the building of a new house for the "College" was begun. This was eventually completed and occupied.

Because of a lack of enrolment, for the fifth year of the course, which lack was induced by the fact that all honors and prizes for scholarships were awarded at the

¹39th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 107.

*Northeast Corner, Fayette and Holliday Streets

end of the fourth year, the curriculum was reduced in 1869 to four years instead of five years.¹ In 1874, the "College" restored the fifth year of instruction because of the request of the graduating class.² Several of the studies as contained in the original fifth year of instruction were omitted and new ones substituted as a check of the two years will show. The subjects were -

Subjects for Fifth Year

Geology and Mineralogy	Latin
English Literature	Greek
Logic	French
Political Economy	German
Calculus	Chemistry
Bookkeeping	Review of Mathematics

In 1876 a "preparatory" year of instruction was organized and placed between the last year of the Grammar School and Baltimore City College. This became the first year of the "College." Entering pupils selected either the regular curriculum or the "One Year Course." The purpose of inserting the "preparatory" year was twofold - to furnish additional instruction to those not desiring to take the work of the High School, and to elevate the standard of graduation of

¹ 41st Annual Report, op. cit. p. 56.

² 46th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 63.

the school by the addition of subjects in the senior year.¹
 The curriculum of the "One Year Course" and the five year
 course consisted in 1877 of -

One Year Course

Bookkeeping	History
Commercial Arithmetic	Physiology
Business Correspondence	Physics
Handwriting	Drawing

Five Year Course

First Year	English Grammar and Analysis	Latin, started
	Elocution	Bookkeeping, started
	History of England	Algebra, finished
	Writing	Geometry, III books
	Physiology	
Second Year	Rhetoric, Composition,	Latin
	Elocution	German, started
	English Grammar and Analysis	Plane Trigonometry
	History of Rome	Geometry, finished
	Bookkeeping	Mensuration
	Physical Geography	
	Natural Philosophy	

¹ 48th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxxii.

Third Year	Rhetoric, Composition,	German
	Elocution	Freek, started (optional)
	History of English Literature	French
	History of Greece	Surveying and
	Natural Philosophy (full course)	Navigation
Fourth Year	Astronomy, started	Spherical Trigonometry
	Original Speeches and	Latin
	Elocution	Greek
	English Literature	French
	History of Ancient Empires	German
Fifth Year	Mental Philosophy	Analytical Geometry
	Moral Philosophy	Astronomy
	Constitution of United States	Review of Mathematics
	Chemistry	
	Latin	Moral Philosophy
Fifth Year	Greek	French
	Calculus	German
	English Literature	Chemistry
	Logic	Astronomy

Female High Schools

The education of girls in high school subjects was carried on in the Eastern and Western High Schools both of which had been organized in 1844.

Up to 1863 the graduation exercises of the two girls' schools were conducted in the October following the close of the previous school year. The main reason for this was that the exercises acted as an inspiration to the entering class of new pupils. From the above mentioned year the graduation ceremonies were ordered held at the end of the school year.

The regular curriculum required three years for its completion prior to 1864, when, in that year a "post graduate" year of instruction was added. French and Drawing were introduced for the first time in the "graduate" year. Adding another year to the course was for the purpose of giving a general review; and to furnish preparation for those about to enter the Normal School.¹

Physical training was introduced in Western High School in 1866 where the girls participated in a drill during the change of classes. This drill consisted "in marching (to the music of a piano or melodeon) in single, double and triple files through the halls and aisles between the desks" in the rooms² - a far cry from the modern type of physical education. But then, in those days the girls were "ladies."

The four year course in the Female High Schools was reduced to three in 1870 because the first year of work had been added to the Grammar Schools. The reason for this

¹36th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 25.

²38th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 74.

and for a like change later was due to the desire of many parents to have their children receive some high-school instruction in the Grammar Schools before the youngsters withdrew to enter employment. The Board of School Commissioners complied with the demand of the parents in each instance, eventually expanding the pre-high school years of the school system to eight year.

In 1873 the Principal of the Eastern High School suggested that the Board of School Commissioners give some consideration to the inclusion in the High School curriculum of Photography and Telegraphy in view of the liberal tendencies of the age concerning the advancement of women to positions in the workaday world.¹ This was the first suggestion for vocational training, other than that of teaching, for girls.

In 1876 a "preparatory class" was organized in the Female High Schools just as had been done in the Baltimore City College. Bookkeeping; English Composition; Outline of History; Physical Geography; Elements of Physics; and a review of Grammar made up the curriculum in the Female High Schools. The preparatory class then became the first year of the High School course.²

In 1880, after much agitation, on the part of the parents extending over a period of years, the curriculum in the Female High Schools was reduced by eliminating a number

¹45th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 102.

²48th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxxiv.

of subjects. For these subjects study periods were introduced. The parents and children complained that because of too many studies and the constant application to them, the health of the girls was being injured.

In 1866 the last addition to the Grammar grades came when the first year of the High School was made the last and final grade of the Grammar Schools. As a consequence of this change, there were no promotions to the High Schools that year.¹ From this year until 1920 the Baltimore system of schools was conducted on the 8-4 plan.

By 1888 the full four year course was again in effect in the Female High Schools.

¹58th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners
Baltimore, 1886, p. 113.

TABLE X

ENROLMENT IN WHITE HIGH SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE, 1860 - 1889

Year	: Boys	: Girls
1860	173	564
61	238	545
62	223	621
63	219	501
64	205	549
65	228	610
66	329	798
67	400	892
68	270	685
69	455	1168
1870	313	835
71	267	807
72	340	792
73	306	809
74	400	761
75	422	806
76	433	747
77	389	712
78	526	792
79	579	941
1880	560	846
81	543	885
82	596	974
83	633	1004
84	622	1127
85	630	1163
86	306	660
87	385	713
88	385	794
89	422	837

CHAPTER VIII

CHAPTER VIII

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Floating School

For the purposes of this discussion special education is defined as education differing in content and method from education offered in the regular school.

In 1857, a floating school was opened under the joint auspices of the Board of School Commissioners and the Board of Trade of Baltimore City. The school, it was felt, would meet the need of improving the efficiency of the merchant marine personnel and in consequence the management of ships at sea.¹ It was to be a state institution, open to boys from the city and from the counties; pupils were to live on the ship under the direction of their teachers; board and tuition were to be free;² and the usual expenses of the school were to be paid by the Board of School Commissioners. The nautical instruction and appliances were to be paid by the Board of Trade.³

The ages of the pupils ranged from eight to thirty years. The studies pursued began with the alphabet and ran

¹29th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners
Baltimore, 1857, p. 115.

²37th Annual Report - op. cit. p. 78-80

³30th Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners,
Baltimore, p. 31.

thru spelling, reading, arithmetic, algebra, geography, English Grammar, geometry, astronomy and use of the globe, to navigation.¹ The latter subject included practice in the operations of working a ship; keeping a Log Book; solar and lunar observations; plotting of courses; and calculation of distances.²

The length of time for the completion of the curriculum varied according to the level of the scholastic attainment of the pupils³ and to their native ability. Class periods were 45 minutes in length and the school was divided into three groups.

A remarkable innovation, for the times, was that corporal punishment was tabooed by the joint committee in charge of the floating school. Pupil self-government was the goal of the faculty. The means employed in its attainment were; an explanation of the rules and the reasons for them; individual responsibility for the observance of the rules was stressed at all times. Constant vigilance of the teachers, aided by the council and oversight of the school committee, resulted in a knowledge of, and the need for, the rules for the observance of them. The enlightened judgment of the pupils was the means of control.⁴

¹31st Annual Report - Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore, 1859, p. 248.

²Ibid., p. 94-95.

³Ibid., p. 248.

⁴Ibid., p. 92-93.

In 1860, the principal of the floating school recommended that practice voyages be made, stating that the pupils would learn more and take a greater interest in their work if the ship were under way than if it were tied up to a wharf.¹ He also advocated the establishment of standards of admission² to the school. The desirability of such action was due to: (1) The great difference in the lack of scholastic achievement of the entrants; (2) Impossibility of classification of the pupils for purposes of instruction because of the diversity in educational attainments; and (3) Enrolment of pupils not qualified to take the work would be prevented. Hence, students would remain a longer time in the school and not drop out because of their inability to do the work.

One of the greatest problems of the principal was the retention of his pupils in the school for a period sufficient to give them a good background of theory upon which to build when they went to sea. He was continually advocating to the parents and guardians of his pupils the advantage of a long attendance and he cited the frequent requests of the merchant marine for information pertaining to his pupils and the amount of training they had received.

Before the Civil War this school gave promise of great usefulness. Shortly after the beginning of hostilities,

¹32nd Annual Report - op. cit. p. 198.

²Ibid., p. 199.

it began to decline. This was due to an increased demand for seamen in the United States Naval forces, the need for manual workers in industries supplying the army with war materials, and in the necessity for youths to enter employment because the adult members of their families had joined the colors.

By 1865, the attendance and enrolment in the floating school had reached such a low level that the school was discontinued, the Board of School Commissioners feeling that the results were not commensurate with the expense involved. A special committee of board members was appointed, however, to work with a committee from the Board of Trade to devise a plan for reopening the floating school in the future when and if conditions should warrant it.¹

Nothing further was heard of the project until 1874 when Congress passed a bill authorizing the Navy to furnish a vessel to the ports of Baltimore, Boston, Charleston, New Orleans, New York, and San Francisco.² This vessel was to be used as a nautical school and was to function under the supervision of the Board of Education and the Board of Trade of the City to which it was assigned. The ship was to be fully equipped with a naval officer in charge. Instruction was to be given in navigation, seamanship, and the use and care of ships and ship equipment. The course was to be two years in length with a certificate granted to those who passed an examination.

¹37th Annual Report - op. cit. p. 19.

²Congress of U. S. A., Public Laws of, 1874, volume 18, part 3, p. 121.

The Baltimore Board of School Commissioners appointed a committee to confer with one from the Board of Trade in consideration of the expediency of requesting a ship for Baltimore. Upon learning that all expenses for supporting such a project were to be paid by the city at which the ship was located and that a ship was not available at that time, no action was recommended for the time being.¹ The project was not brought up again in the period covered by this discussion.

TABLE XI
FLOATING SCHOOL
TEACHERS AND PUPIL ENROLMENT

	1860	:	1861	:	1862	:	1863	:	1864
Enrolment	60		42		35		46		21
Teachers	3		3		3		3		3

As stated elsewhere, the floating school was maintained by the Board of School Commissioners and the Board of

¹ 46th Annual Report - op. cit. p. xxi.

Trade. The cost of maintenance and operation of the school for the years covered by this study is as follows:

TABLE XII
EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF FLOATING SCHOOL

	1860	:	1861	:	1862	:	1863	:	1864
Salaries	1650.00		No record		1539.16		1250.00		1245.50
Maintenance & Opera- tion	595.79		"		76.26		84.63		50.79
Insurance	15.00		15.00		15.00		15.25		60.00
Supplies	147.12		No record		43.10		20.82		64.25
TOTAL	2260.79		No record		1630.42		1349.88		1355.29

In the annual reports of the Board of School Commissioners, the item of supplies was not included in the total.

Needlework

Because of experimental work which had been done in some of the grammar and primary schools in sewing, knitting and embroidery, which work had the enthusiastic approbation of the citizenry, the Board of School Commissioners in 1874 appointed a committee to study and report upon the advisability of officially including this type work in the system as a whole. No report was forthcoming but by 1879 requests were still coming into the Board of School Commissioners for the organization for classes in above mentioned work. Again the Board of School Commissioners took the requests under advisement and promised a report.

CHAPTER IX

CHAPTER IX

THE FOUNDING OF THE BALTIMORE POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

In 1876, at the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Russian Imperial Technical Institute of Moscow had on display some of the work of its students. This type of work was especially adapted to secondary school instruction.¹ In consequence of this exhibition, the movement for instruction in manual activities in the United States got under way. Baltimore was one of the first cities to take cognizance of this new educational development.

In 1883 the Board of School Commissioners reports that for some years previously there had been a growing complaint that the schools had been so exclusively mental as to unfit pupils for manual labor and for the practical duties of life.²

In response to the public demand the Board requested permission of the City Council to open one or more special schools. On October 20, 1883 the Mayor and City Council passed an ordinance,³ empowering the Board of School Commissioners to set up such a school.

Children of the citizens and bonafide residents of

¹Cubberly, op. cit. p. 770.

²55th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxiii.

³Journal of 2nd Branch - City Council of Baltimore, op. cit. p. 239 and p. 258.

the City could attend. A tuition charge of \$1.00 per quarter was to be levied for the use of tools and materials. Children of non-residents of Baltimore were required to pay a tuition fee which was to be determined by the Board of School Commissioners.

In establishing this school the Board noted that the oldest school of its type was located at St. Louis, Missouri, as a part of Washington University; that it was not a part of the public school system of St. Louis, but supported by gifts and endowments.¹

The school was named the Baltimore Manual Training School and offered instruction and practice in the use of tools and in such instruction as was deemed necessary in mathematics, drawing, and the English branches of a High School course.²

The contemplated tool instruction included carpentry, wood turning, pattern making, iron chipping and filing, forge work, brazing and soldering; the use of machine shop tools and such other instruction of a similar character as was deemed advisable to be added from time to time. It was also the intention to divide the working hours of the students as nearly as possible, equally between manual and mental exercises.³

The school differed from the Baltimore City College

¹55th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxv.

²Ibid., p. xxvi.

³Ibid., p. xxvi.

in that it omitted foreign and ancient languages and gave prominence to mechanical drawing and particularly in affording scientific instruction and actual practice in the use and care of tools.¹

Three years of instruction were necessary to complete the proposed curriculum which was as follows:

First Year

Arithmetic	Algebra
English Language	History
Physiology	Physical Geography
Freehand Drawing	Mechanical Drawing
Carpentry	Wood Carving
Pattern Making	Wood Turning

Second Year

Algebra	Plane Geometry
Physics	Mechanics
History	Literature
Geometric Drawing	Mechanical Drawing
Forging	Welding
Tempering	Soldering
Brazing	

¹55th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. xxvi-xxviii.

Third Year

Geometry	Plane Trigonometry
Bookkeeping	Literature
Political Economy	Civil Government
Mechanics	Chemistry
Machine Drawing	Architectural Drawing
Machine Shop	Management and Care of Steam Engines and Boilers

One hour per day was given to Drawing and two hours per day were allotted to Shop Work throughout the entire course.

Before graduating and receiving his diploma, each pupil had to construct a machine of some sort from the drawings and patterns made by himself.¹

Boys fourteen years of age and of good moral character were admitted if they passed successfully tests in reading, spelling, writing, geography, English composition, and the arithmetical functions of integers, common and decimal fractions, and denominate numbers. Boys of the first year of the Baltimore City College and pupils in the last grade of the Grammar or German-English schools were admitted without an examination.² The tuition charge to children of non-resident parents was \$12.50 per quarter.

¹ 55th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxviii.

² Ibid., p. xxviii.

The Board of School Commissioners stated that the school was not intended to teach trades but that it would lay the foundation for many trades and at the same time recognize the value of intellectual discipline.¹

In addition to their regular studies, the pupils in 1885 were receiving daily instruction in marching and in the manual of arms.² This was probably in imitation of the Baltimore City College where there was a cadet corps at that period; also, two students a day from the senior class were required for a period of two weeks to work in rotation with other students of the class at the boiler and engine in the mornings before the regular school hours.³

A preparatory department was recommended in 1886 because it was found that few boys between the ages of fourteen and eighteen years could spare the time to attend school - their help being needed at home as wage earners. The preparatory department was to be organized for boys of twelve to fourteen years of age.⁴ It was set up in 1887 and boys from the sixth grade of the Grammar school were admitted. One hour a day was devoted to manual work and three-quarters an hour a day to freehand drawing; the rest of the time was given to the regular academic work of the grade.⁵

¹55th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxix.

²57th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 113.

³Ibid., p. 113.

⁴58th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 148.

⁵59th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 149.

To advertise the school and to increase the interest of the public in its work, a series of scientific lectures was given on alternate Friday evenings, in 1877, for the pupils and their family and friends. The Principal reported that the lectures were well attended.¹

In 1888 a two-year post graduate course in mechanical engineering was established. The regular curriculum was revised as follows:²

Preparatory Department

Spelling	Arithmetic
Reading	Algebra
Writing	Geography
English language	History of United States
Physiology	Elementary Geometry
Science	

Recitations - four and one half hours per day

Freehand drawing - two thirds of an hour per day

Carpentry, Wood Carving, Sheet Metal - one hour per day

First Year

Arithmetic	Algebra
Geometry	English language
Geography	History of United States
Physics	

¹59th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 149.

²60th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 148.

Recitation - three hours per day

Drawing - one hour per day

Carpentry, Woodturning, Blacksmithing - two hours
per day

Second Year

Arithmetic

Algebra

Geometry

Geography

Physics

Physiology

History

English language and
composition

Recitation - three hours per day

Pattern making, Chipping and filing - one hour per day

Construction work - two hours per day

Third Year

Algebra

Bookkeeping

Mensuration

Physics

Trigonometry

English Literature

Chemistry

General History

Political Economy

Geology

Science of Government

Recitations - three hours per day

Mechanical Drawing - one hour per day

Machine Shop - two hours per day

By 1889 the type of work done and the teaching was of such excellence that the school was giving instruction to several students from the Johns Hopkins University in machine shop methods.¹

¹61st Annual Report, op. cit. p. 147.

TABLE XIII

ENROLMENT IN THE BALTIMORE POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, 1860 - 1889

Year	:	Enrolment
1884		150
85		120
86		150
87		273
88		510
89		428

CHAPTER X

CHAPTER X

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE CITY AND STATE

SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS

The first general school law of Maryland was passed in 1825.¹ It provided for a Superintendent and a system of Primary schools for each county. This law was not mandatory as its acceptance was optional with the counties and with Baltimore City.

Up to, and including 1864, there was no State System worthy of the name, but in 1865 a State system was created.² Apprehension of the fate of the Baltimore System of Schools was felt by the Board of School Commissioners because of this enactment of the Legislature. Two important matters of concern were - whether the authority over the Board of School Commissioners would be shifted to another body; and would efforts be made to reduce the local system to the level of the county systems.³

The Superintendent reported that the teachers were excited over rumors that they would be required to stand a

¹Laws of the State of Maryland, 1825, op. cit. pp. 130-139.

²Laws of the State of Maryland, 1865, Wm. Thompson, printer, 1868, p. 269.

³37th Annual Report - op. cit. p. 6.

re-examination to hold their positions; and that their salaries were in danger of being reduced to those of the county teachers. Both procedures the city considered unnecessary and oppressive.¹

The Superintendent compared the liberal support of the Mayor and City Council to that given by the State saying that no aid had come from the State in the form of legislation; that the first act of the Legislature for the benefit of the Baltimore System had yet to be passed; that in no other state had such a condition existed, and that Baltimore had maintained its schools without assistance or encouragement from the State.²

The Board of School Commissioners reminded the City Council of the inequality of the returns from the State Education Fund stating that the City paid almost one-half of the total appropriation to the Fund, through taxes, but that the counties received the larger sum in return. A committee of members of the Board of School Commissioners was appointed to work with the City Council to secure an exemption in Baltimore City from the enforcement of the Law.³

A Committee from the House of Delegates of the Legislature visited the schools of Baltimore in 1865 and reported that the schools "were an honor to the State and

¹37th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 33-34.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³Ibid., pp. 6-9.

City, that their present management and supervision ought not to be interfered with except with great caution; and that the proper point of consideration for the Legislature is the elevation of the schools of the counties to the high standard attained by those of the City."¹ The Committee recommended "that the school system of Baltimore shall remain as it is and that the Mayor and City Council be allowed full power to confer the usual scholastic degrees upon the graduates of the High Schools."²

Another Committee from the Legislature visited the Baltimore Schools in 1866 and made the same recommendations as had that of 1865.³

The act of Legislature which created the Maryland system of schools in 1865 contained the words - "a uniform system of public schools."⁴ In 1866 the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore changed some of its textbooks. To this the State Board of Education immediately took exception stating that such action was contrary to Chapter #7 of the law, entitled "Textbooks," which chapter stated in part - "To secure harmony in the system...and to enable children moving from one county to another, to pursue their studies

¹37th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 100.

²Ibid., p. 100.

³38th Annual Report, op. cit. pp. 31-33.

⁴Laws of the State of Maryland, 1865, R. P. Bayly, printer pp. 269-301.

without interruption or unnecessary expense...there should be a uniform series of textbooks used in all the schools of the State, organized under this Law."¹ The State Board of Education entered suit against the Baltimore Board of School Commissioners in the Superior Court, for a mandamus to compel the Baltimore Board to use only the texts selected by the State Board of Education;² claiming that a uniform system of schools could not be maintained if different texts were used by different parts of the State system. The State Board of Education was upheld and the Baltimore Board of School Commissioners made an appeal to the Court of Appeals, where in March, 1867 the State Board's contention was again upheld and the City Board of School Commissioners was ordered to use only the texts found on the list of the State Board of Education.³

Although today much is heard, written and spoken about the "flight from the cities," yet in 1874 Baltimore was already experiencing such a movement of her population. The Board of School Commissioners heard about it very quickly. The City Council in June, 1874 passed an ordinance prohibiting children (whose parents or guardians were not residents of Baltimore) from attending the city schools,⁴ unless they paid

¹Laws of State of Maryland, 1865, R. P. Bayly, printer p. 285.

²38th Annual Report, op. cit. p. 6.

³Maryland Reports, Court of Appeals, 1866, Brewer, Dubois & Button, 1869, vol. 26. p. 521.

⁴Journal 2nd Branch, City Council of Baltimore, John Cox, printer, 1874, p. 382.

tuition. Almost immediately the Board of School Commissioners began to receive protests from people who wished to send their children to the city schools, but who lived in the counties. They either did business in Baltimore or owned property therein (and paid taxes thereon) and objected to the added cost of tuition, feeling that they already had paid their share (through taxes) for the upkeep of the City schools.¹

The Board of School Commissioners recommended to the City Council a reconsideration of the ordinance in order to rectify the apparent injustice to the complaining county residents,² but the City Council did nothing about the matter until 1886 when the City Solicitor was asked for a ruling on the case.

After due deliberation he ruled that only those children whose parents or guardians were non-residents and were unable to care for them but said children who were living in the city with relatives or friends who were feeding, clothing, and caring for them were exempt from the payment of tuition.³

In 1886 the Legislature passed an act making the teaching of physiology and hygiene compulsory in all the public schools of the State,⁴ with special emphasis on the

¹46th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxii.

²47th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxiii.

³58th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxviii.

⁴Laws of State of Maryland, 1886, George T. Melvin, printer, 1886 - p. 831.

effect of alcoholic drinks and narcotics upon the human system. The Superintendent of the Baltimore Schools ordered that such instruction be given in the schools.

The annexation Bill of May, 1888 whereby Baltimore increased its areal extent, brought in 15 new schools.¹ The Baltimore County Board of School Commissioners administered them until July 1, 1888 when they were turned over to the city. The buildings and their physical equipment were bought from Baltimore County, while the teachers continued in their positions and were placed a year later on an equal footing in salary with the older city teachers.²

¹Laws of State of Maryland, 1888, James Young, State Printer, 1888 - p. 113.

²60th Annual Report, op. cit. p. xxxiii.

CHAPTER XI

CHAPTER XI

SUMMARY

The years between 1860 and 1890 may be considered as a part of the transition period of Baltimore. After the close of the Civil War the city began to experience that growth which was to continue for many years; and which was to see the city change from a loosely joined and scattered group of little villages, each with its own selfish and egotistical outlook, into a great city whose boundaries encompass 90 square miles of territory. Baltimore was growing up and like many youths it felt its growing pains.

Politically, the city was handicapped by a cultural lag. This was the result of the extra-legal rule by mobs prior to 1860; next, by the control of the Unconditional Union Party during the war years; and, finally, by the reign of the Democratic-Conservative Party for the next twenty-five years. The average citizen was uneducated in the management of civic affairs and did not begin to evince interest in such until near the end of the Nineteenth Century.

Economically, the city displayed a steady growth. Many of the ablest and learned of the old South migrated to Baltimore after the war to recoup their fortunes, and here they remained after they had become successful. The railroads expanded and consolidated. This resulted from the successful fight by the city to secure a freight rate differential over

other cities along the Atlantic seaboard, in shipments from the south and west. Real estate boomed because of the increase in the population, but it was always constantly endangered by the occurrence of disastrous fires, for the fire department was not organized properly.

Culturally, Baltimore witnessed during this period the beginning of several institutions of which she is justly proud. The first of these was the establishment of the Peabody Institute in 1865, to be followed in 1875 by the completion of the Maryland Academy of Sciences building and the McDonogh School. The Johns Hopkins University and the Maryland State Normal School were founded in 1876. The important contribution of 1882 was the gift of Enoch Pratt to the city of the fund which made possible the great Enoch Pratt Free Library. In 1886 Goucher College for women was established, and 1889 witnessed the opening of the Johns Hopkins Hospital and its School for Nurses.

In spite of the indifference of the City Council and its own timidity on certain occasions the Board of School Commissioners were responsible for some progressive innovations. After much talk a census of children of school age was taken in 1876 to be followed by a census in 1878 and in 1888. It seems amazing to us that the idea of taking a census did not occur earlier in the history of education in Baltimore.

The creation of the position of Superintendent of Supplies was a business-like move as thereby operating expenses

could be reduced thru standardization of items of supply and equipment, and by purchasing them in bulk.

The creation of English-German schools was a good thing. Probably many children attended the public schools as a result of this who might otherwise have attended private schools or no schools at all.

The requirement in 1873 that all pupils be vaccinated against small-pox was a great step in school administration. The resultant success of this act no doubt hastened the acceptance by the public of this excellent regulation. Today, no child of school age is permitted to enter a public school without first presenting proof of his successful vaccination.

The regulation of 1882 introducing fire drills and making them compulsory was another piece of good administration which has continued to the present time.

The fact that the schools have always been a part of the municipal government has been a fortunate circumstance which has relieved the schools for the necessity of collecting a separate school tax. As a part of the municipal set-up the schools receive their proportionate share of the municipal taxes. When times are prosperous the schools fare well; when times are ill the schools take their proportionate cut in the municipal budget. At no time are they without funds. Thus they have missed many of the hardships under which other systems have had to operate. Furthermore, since the schools also share in the State School Fund the local budget requirements for the operation of the schools is reduced proportionately.

The assumption of the burden of the education of the Negro by the city brought many more children within the influence of the schools. After 1867 the number of negroes attending school steadily increased. The establishment of separate schools for negroes undoubtedly avoided manifestations of racial prejudice.

The opening of the Baltimore Manual Training School in 1883 marks the first attempt at differentiation in education. Baltimore takes credit for originating the first technical high school to be a part of a public school system.

The relationship between the city and State public school systems with the exception of the law-suit of 1866-67 has been harmonious. The autonomy enjoyed by the city in matters educational is a cause of wonder to those who are not in possession of the facts. The situation is a healthy one - each system acting as a stimulus one toward the other.

Membership upon the Board of School Commissioners was a reward for political activity upon the part of the individual appointed, and was considered a step upward toward a more important and influential position in the city government. Appointments to the Board were made annually by the City Council meeting in joint session. This resulted in a large annual turnover in the personnel of the Board. This was a most short-sighted policy to which even the Board of School Commissioners objected. No comprehensive educational policy could be formulated or put into effort under such an arrangement. It

is a wonder that anything was accomplished.

The City Council must carry much of the blame for the conditions under which the schools operated during this period. Inadequate buildings, poor lighting, heating, and toilet facilities; the renting of buildings not intended for school houses; failure to insure the property of the city schools; failure to erect buildings according to some standard plan which would be comfortable as well as efficient; interference with the Board in its function concerning salary of teachers can be attributed to the Council.

The short-sighted policy of the City Council is illustrated in its parsimonious attitude concerning the revival of the Floating School. A better locale for the training of an intelligent and efficient officer personnel for the merchant marine cannot be found than which exists in Maryland's great Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. Had the Floating School been revived it would have probably developed into one of the nation's great marine training schools and contributed much toward the development of the merchant marine.

Another example of indifference to the public welfare and opinion is seen in the two investigations of the Board of School Commissioners of 1880 and 1883. Altho public opinion was beginning to make itself felt such was the attitude of the Board of School Commissioners that nothing was done to correct the irregularities in the administration of the affairs of the schools.

In conclusion, the history of public education in Baltimore during this period presents two contrasts. On the one hand is the professional leaders imbued with zeal to improve educational conditions generally; on the other hand is the handicap of the indifference and short-sighted policy of either the Board of School Commissioners or the City Council, or both.

Throughout all the confusion in the attitudes of both School Board and the City Council improvement in educational work was made. Indifference gave way to zeal, and opposition to encouragement, so that now education in Baltimore City has become one of the most carefully protected possessions of the commonwealth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ammen, S. Z. "History of Baltimore." Baltimore: Its History and Its People, Volume I; New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1912.
- Andrews, M. P. "History of Baltimore from 1850 to the close of the civil war." Baltimore: Its History and Its People, Volume I; New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1912.
- History of Maryland: Province and state. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1929.
- Annual Reports of the Board of School Commissioners. Baltimore: 1860 - 1889, inclusive.
- Baltimore Sun Newspapers. A. S. Abell Company Publishers, 1883.
- Cubberly, E. P. The history of education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.
- Journal of the Second Branch of the City Council of Baltimore.
 John Cox, Printer; 1874.
 John Cox, Printer; 1878.
 King Brothers, Printers; 1883.
 John Cox, Printer; 1888.
- Laws of the State of Maryland.
 R. P. Bayley, Printer; 1865.
 William Thompson, Printer; 1868.
 George T. Melvin, Printer; 1886.
 James Young, Printer; 1888.
- Maryland Reports, Court of Appeals, 1866. Brewer, Dubois, and Button, Printers, 1869; Volume XXVI.
- Minutes of the Board of School Commissioners, 1877 and 1883, Unpublished.
- Muesse, Katherine F. Primary education in the public schools of Baltimore, 1829-1929. Masters Thesis.
- Reports of City Officers to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore. King Brothers, Printers; 1880.

APPENDIX

PERSONNEL OF BOARD OF SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS, BALTIMORE CITY AND
YEARS OF SERVICE

1860 - 1889, inc.

	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69
Jos. E. Parrott	/									
Edw. A. Abbott	/									
C. L. L. Leary	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Thos. I. Pitt	/	-	/	/	/	/				
John L. Yeats	/	/	/	/	/	/				
John F. Plummer	/	/	/	/	/	/				
Washington Hickman	/	/								
Jas. Webb	/	/								
Alex. K. Mantz	/	/	/	/	/					
Chas. T. Maddox	/	/	/	/	/				/	/
Geo. N. Eaton	/	/	/	-	-	/	/	/		
John T. Morris	/	-	-	-	-	/	/	/		
Jos. Merrefield	/									
Geo. F. Sloan	/	/								
Sam'l R. Dunnock	/	/								
E. Y. Reese, <u>Rev.</u>	/	/								
Jos. E. Thumlert	/									
Baltis H. Kennard	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Wm. C. Arthur	/									
John R. Selby	/	/								
John M. Bandell	-	/								
Nicholas Christopher	-	/								
Andrew C. Trippe	-	/								
John R. Blake	-	/								
Geo. P. Woodward	-	/	/	/						
Louis Muller	-	/	/	/						
Livingston Bennett	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Jas. H. Cox	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Thos. M. Abbett	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Thos. H. Hooper	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
J. Asbury Morgan	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Richard Sewell	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Thos. W. Griffin	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
A. A. Reese, <u>Rev.</u>	-	-	/	-	-	/	/	/		
J. Bingham	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Sam'l E. Wheeler	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
A. D. Evans	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
F. A. Crook	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
E. G. Waters	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Geo. R. Berry	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
A. W. Colburn	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/		
Henry C. Larrabee	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/		
Wm. H. Hebden	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/		
Jas. T. Randolph	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/		
Chas. Farringer	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/		
Wm. Daniel	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/		

PERSONNEL OF BOARD OF SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS, BALTIMORE CITY AND
YEARS OF SERVICE,
1860 - 1889, inc.

[illegible]

PERSONNEL OF BOARD OF SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS, BALTIMORE CITY AND

YEARS OF SERVICE

1860 - 1889, inc.

	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79
J. G. Dillehunt	-	-	-	-	-	/				
W. H. Johnson	/									
Eugene Commiskey	/									
L. S. White	/	/								
B. H. Hobbs	/	/	-	/	/	/				
H. Clay Dallam	/									
H. L. Spicer, <u>M. D.</u>	/	/								
John T. Morris	/	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Wm. C. Adkinson	/	/	/	/	-	/	-	/	/	/
H. B. Roemer	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
John Black	/	/								
Geo. L. Hamel	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	
Wm. H. Diffenderfer	/	/								
E. G. Hipsley	/	/		/						
John T. McGlone	/	/	/	/		/				
Jas. Boyle	/	/	-	-	-	/				
Dan'l Coakley	/	/								
Chas. F. Cloud	/	/	-	/						
Jos. McCawley	/	-	/	/						
Wm. H. Ownes	/									
C. H. Tumbleson	-	/								
C. F. Dieterly	-	/								
E. Key Buchanan	-	/								
H. E. Peyton	-	/								
John P. Poe	- ^c	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
G. A. Moore	/	/								
Sam'l White	-	/				/				
P. M. Snowden	-	/	/	/	-	/				
H. S. Greagh	-	-	/	/	/					
Thos. Kelley, <u>M. D.</u>	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Wm. M. Ives	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
John F. Hancock	-	-	-	/	/	-	/	/	/	/
B. Cassidy	-	-	/	/	/	/				
Alex. L. Spear	-	-	/	/	/	/				
T. J. Magruder	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
J. L. Lawton	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
A. W. Dodge, <u>M. D.</u>	-	-	/	/	/	/	/			
C. Emmerich	-	-	-	/	/	/	/			
Jas. G. Ramsay	-	-	/							
B. C. Reed	-	-	/							
G. S. Griffith, Jr.	-	-	/	-	/	/	-	/	/	/
F. S. Hoblitzell	-	-	/							
C. W. Chancellor	-	-	/							
R. H. Sinclair	-	-	-	-	/	/	-	/	/	/
John Johnson	-	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/
John Ferry	-	-	-	-	/	/	/	/	/	/
Wm. R. Brewer	-	-	-	-	/					

