Professor George S. Bonn is no stranger to Indian librarians. Though attached to the Department of Library Science of University of Delhi as a visiting professor, his curiosity has prompted him to go afar frequently and meet and talk to quite a few librarians, library administrators and library science teachers and students, to observe closely the working of a number of libraries, of all types, and teaching departments, and also to attend a number of library conferences and meetings in this country.

For Dr. Bonn, interest in library science grew out of his deep interest and involvement in technical literature, both as a reader and writer-editor. In fact, after graduating in the subject of Chemical Engineering in 1935 and taking a Master of Science degree in the following year, he started his career as a research engineer and technical writer. This was interrupted during the war years when he took up a U.S. Army assignment. After the war he returned to technical writing and editing, but soon decided to join the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago in 1947. After receiving the degree of Master of Arts in Library Science, he worked in a number of important libraries. In the list of libraries served by Dr. Bonn, there are such important and challenging positions like that of the Librarian of the Technological Institute, Northwestern University, Chief of the Science and Technology Division, New York Public Library etc. In his teaching assignments he has been ably associated with the Rutgers University, Japan Library School of the Keio University, and the Graduate School of Library Studies, University of Hawaii, from which place he came over to Delhi.

THE STATE OF LIBRARY EDUCATION IN INDIA

George S. Bonn

After getting more or less settled in Delhi, among the very first things I did to help me to be more useful here in India were (1) to subscribe to several Indian newspapers and to a number of Indian cultural and current-affairs magazines, (2) to subscribe to or to buy all the Indian library publications I could find, and (3) to visit libraries of all kinds to gain first-hand knowledge of the state of Indian libraries (at least of some of them) and to talk with working librarians about the state of Indian library education as they saw it judging from recent products.

As might be expected, the visits and talks were especially rewarding and revealing. The state of the libraries naturally varied widely, depending on the size, type, affluence, and administration of each one. But professional opinions about library education were remarkably in agreement: it is simply not adequate.

The shortcomings in library education, as identified by the 40 or 45 Delhi librarians, affect three very important elements: (1) the recruits accepted by the schools, (2) the aims of library education, and (3) the content of library education. The aims mentioned are those, besides the more obvious ones, which the librarians feel need emphasis here in India but which are not getting it to the extent they should. These can be considered shortcomings-by-default, as it were. In addition, the librarians called attention to a group of nation-wide needs of the profession itself (not directly related to library education as such) which can be considered shortcomings-through-apathy, of its products.

I would like first to present my findings and to make a few comments about them, and then to talk about Indian library education from the point of view of a sympathetic outsider. Here are the shortcomings in present-day Indian library education that were pointed out to me by Indian librarians:

Regarding Recruits

1. Too many seem to be cast-offs from other parts of organizations or from more difficult curricula, or to be just marking time until they get jobs (of any kind).
2. Their general background is very poor. They should have, e.g.:
   a) knowledge about India and its regions, states;
   b) knowledge about world movements, trends;
   c) a broad general education, a wide background of knowledge;
d) a special and continuing acquaintance with some subject field; and

e) a knowledge of language (especially Indian, but also foreign).

3. They need a good public relations point of view.

4. They need knowledge of psychology.

5. They should be "live" individuals, who are interested in developing themselves and in continuing their learning.

Regarding Unemphasized Aims of Library Education

1. To stir up students' consciousness of, and curiosity about, the world around them.

2. To stimulate students to be creative.

3. To instil in students the desire to keep up with librarianship after graduation and to become involved in professional associations (not merely to become members).

4. To develop in the students a professional point of view.

5. To emphasize the career aspects of librarianship.

6. To give students as much practical "on-the-job" experience as possible (while in library school) in, e.g.:
   a) "floor service";
   b) office routines (e.g., government procedures);
   c) management; and
   d) administration.

7. To stimulate all librarians to rise to the levels of the new ratings, especially in academic libraries where ratings are comparable with teaching staff ratings.

Regarding Content of Library Education

1. The intellectual content needs to be raised.

2. There is too much emphasis on "technical" matters rather than on substantive.

3. Rapport is needed between teachers and practicing librarians.

4. Outside practicing librarians should give occasional lectures.

5. Specific needs: To teach, especially:
   a) service, public service, personalized services, social services, personal attention, personal involvement, actual handling of materials, human relations, or whatever else it may be called;
   b) reference tools - what is in them, how to use them;
   c) reference work and "how to find out";
   d) administration (theory);
   e) management (practice);
   f) government publications;
   g) Indian tools;
   h) how to index, how to abstract (especially in science-technology) without worrying overmuch about the mechanics involved;
   i) proper bibliographical entry system, and consistency in its use;
   j) consistency in using any classification system;
   k) school library work (elementary, secondary) - work with children, young adults; and
   l) sources and resources in local area (e.g., Delhi), in India, elsewhere, and how to find out about other sources and resources.

Graduates should know:

a) all the work and activities carried on in libraries since many one-man libraries are being started;

b) the whole library picture (the total job, culminating in and directed toward service to users) besides one's own part in it, to develop internal smoothness of operation and cooperation instead of friction and competition;

c) what library work is (service to users) and how to instil understanding and appreciation of what library work is in the minds of the whole library staff (professional, non-professional);
d) the needs of small public libraries in local language areas;
e) the needs of (e.g.) Delhi libraries;
f) the important professional library journals, other publications, societies, leaders, trends, happenings, developments, collections, etc.

Regarding Nationwide Needs
1. Strong national library associations.
2. Emphasis on professional (rather than trade) point of view among librarians and in library associations.
3. Indian tools for reference work and for bibliographical control if they do not already exist.
4. Cooperation and coordination in indexing, abstracting, and other documentation activities.
5. Improved photoduplication services.
6. Humanizing of chief librarians: too many are inaccessible, and they talk only to people of the same rank.
7. Continuing appraisal of Indian librarianship and of Indian library education. Has "library science" become a "sacred cow"?
8. A system of accreditation or certification of library schools based on nationally-accepted professional standards.

Comments
It is at once apparent (1) that these same (or similar) shortcomings can be identified in library education programs everywhere in the world, (2) that a good many of these shortcomings can be pointed out in other professional education programs in universities almost anywhere in the world, (3) that a number of these shortcomings can be blamed on the pre-professional education programs of the students or on the education system or on the apathy of the profession or on tradition (as you choose), (4) that all these shortcomings and many more besides have been examined and discussed in imnumerable articles and seminars and conferences almost ever since the programs began, and (5) that in spite of these shortcomings Indian (e.g.) library (e.g.) education programs have turned out many good - and quite a few excellent professional librarians (e.g.).

It is also true, as I am continually learning, that many other Indian professional librarians (including numerous recent graduates) and an increasing number of library school students in Delhi and elsewhere are not satisfied with the existing Indian common library school program. As this article was being written, in fact, returns were coming in from the recent alumni-record questionnaire sent to all graduates of the Department of Library Science of the University of Delhi, which had included questions on library education. Most (80%) of the M.Lib.Sc. graduates and many (40%) of the B.Lib.Sc. graduates took the trouble to comment on these questions, and their comments whole-heartedly corroborated my findings (above) especially those dealing with the aims and the content of the programs.

But just as it was with Mark Twain's weather, everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it...

Surely there are in India public-spirited educationally-minded professional librarians who are willing and able to look at the evolving Indian library situation objectively, dispassionately, and intelligently with a long-range, pro-Indian, non-partisan point of view, and then to relate their findings to Indian library education and to make appropriate recommendations for the improvement of library education in India.

Surely there is in India a public-spirited professionally-minded library school that is willing and able to develop and to put into practice a program of library education based on these recommendations which will effectively serve the needs of this evolving Indian librarianship.

Just as surely there is in India no outsider (i.e., foreigner), however good his motives, however sharp his intellect, and however experienced and willing he may be, who is able to prescribe precisely what ought to be done to improve either Indian libraries or Indian library education. In a dispatch from Washington head-lined, "Outside Guidance for Growth Not Infallible", in the March 9, 1968, issue of The Hindu, India's former Food Minister, Mr. C. Subramaniam, pointed out...
that no outsider could understand the various complex forces functioning in a developing country or could prescribe on the basis of his own experience the rules of growth and development in such a country. "The change," he said, "has to come from within." He was addressing the annual meeting of the Society for International Development in Washington, and his words are pertinent to international library development, too.

All that any outsider can do is to look at Indian libraries and Indian library education from his own professional point of view, to try to understand what he sees, and then try to help Indian librarians not to make the same mistakes his own country's librarians made some years earlier, but to profit by them, and to encourage Indian librarians to think and to act, "from within".

It seems to me that an outsider can be most helpful in India as a catalyst, as one who meets and talks with Indian professional librarians, with library school teachers, and yes, with library users, and gets them to interact and react with each other, as many as possible, as often as possible, as freely as possible, as professionally as possible. There must be frequent professional dialog between librarians and library school teachers and between librarians and library users, at all possible levels. There must be understanding of what librarianship is all about: effective library service. But, above all, there must be action: to do what is best for India, for Indian libraries, and for Indian library users. Only then will Indian librarianship gain - and really deserve - the recognition, the appreciation, the respect, and the status it is entitled to.

A VIEW FROM THE OUTSIDE

Conditions Affecting Library Education

Professional library education must, unquestionably, serve the identified needs of the library profession, but the pattern of this education naturally will vary from country to country depending on local conditions. A few of the more obvious local conditions would include (1) the philosophy and the pattern of education itself, (2) the state and the status of librarianship, (3) the calibre and the background of library school students, (4) the competence and the experience of library school teachers, (5) the adequacy and the availability of teaching materials, and (6) the economic level and the cultural level of the country.

But even librarians need to be reminded from time to time that librarianship by definition (by Law?) is not static, it is not concerned merely with the status quo, it is not merely a dependent, a satellite, a parasite profession. While it does get its motivation and its nourishment largely from the society of which it is a part, it also, in its own way, motivates and nourishes that society. So librarianship moves forward, not only with its society but also ahead of its society, and library education necessarily must also move forward, not only with librarianship but also - and purposefully - ahead of librarianship.

In any country, therefore, and especially in a developing country, there are certain other important factors besides the prevailing local conditions that have considerable bearing on local librarianship and local library education and that must be taken into account in any discussion of the library profession in a particular country. These factors include (1) professional foresight and the desire and the ability to bring about change, (2) professional resourcefulness and the desire and the ability to make full use of existing library materials and of practising librarians (including oneself), (3) professional unity and the desire and the ability to co-operate and together to promote librarianship, and (4) professional understanding of the aims and the standards of librarianship and of library education throughout the world and the desire and the ability to adapt, or even to adopt, whichever seems to be worthwhile among these for local librarianship and library education.

Aims and Standards: Of these four factors the most important, in some ways, in a developing country is the last one about aims and standards of librarianship and library education. And this one also may well be the most troublesome to implement, for economic reasons if for no other. Yet aims and standards must be high, at least as high as those in the countries against which a developing country is comparing its overall progress, or there will be little or no motivation for improvement.
Fixing aims and standards for librarianship and library education is one thing; performing up to them is quite another, especially in a country which must set national priorities for the most effective disposition of its national resources, and in India, at the present moment, librarianship and library education are quite likely not at the top of any national preferential list. But, I repeat, internationally respected aims and standards are essential to the development of Indian librarianship and library education.

Clearly, then, Indian librarianship and library education will benefit most, both now and in the foreseeable future, from aims and standards that (1) are set high, (2) are relevant to India, (3) have well defined, regular, operational phases, i.e., realistic, attainable, intermediate goals, and (4) are appropriately objective or subjective as each case requires. But they must be reasonable, reliable, and reachable.

Let me give a few examples of ways in which even reasonable standards (or aims or goals) may be misinterpreted.

1. Research Library: Must be adequate to serve the needs of research scholars.
   (a) But suppose the research "needs" themselves are regularly of a very low order. Almost any library is adequate in this case, as I found in Canada a few years ago. By the same token, absolutely no library is adequate when the research needs are regularly of a highly specialized nature.
   (b) A physicist I know here was quite happy that the Delhi University library could procure a photocopy of an article he wanted from an obscure Argentine journal in "only ten months" from, I believe, INSDOC which got it from an American library. But, as a Canadian scientist once told me, if he could not see a desired reference within a fortnight he could no longer use it! (A week's delay in getting a reference is considered acceptable by most research workers in Canada).
   (c) I was pleased to learn that the Delhi University library is now adding books at the rate of 12,000 cataloged items per year. By Indian standards, 12,000 is high; the average annual accession rate among 36 University libraries is 9,800. But among the top 50 University libraries in the U.S. in 1964-65 the average rate was about 82,000 volumes per year; the range was from 21,000 to 258,000. (The average total holding of these 50 libraries was about 1,217,000 volumes; the range was from 795,000 to 7,445,000).

2. Personnel: Must be as many as required to do the work expected of the library.
   (a) But suppose each person is expected to do only one specific task. What happens when absences or vacancies occur?
   (b) In one specialized library I visited in Delhi I learned of a "large" processing backlog because, I found on inquiry, the one librarian had no assistant and he, of course, was the administrator.
   (c) In another Delhi library there was no written library policy or precise directive regarding the librarian's duties. So he did nothing.
   (d) In still another Delhi library there were four librarians and three assistants, and there was authorization (but no money) for two more librarians. Documentation lists of various kinds were from two months to two years behind, although rush reference work for the research staff was taken care of on request. When asked how to convince the top administration that the library did, indeed, need the two allotted persons, I suggested that considering the size of the collection, the number of acquisitions, the clientele, and the work being done, two professionals plus two clerks (typists ought to be quite enough to do everything - by American standards.
   (But Indian standards naturally have precedence here).

Obviously, standards of performance in libraries vary greatly from one library to another, from one country to another. So do the aims, the goals, and the levels of professional library practice. How high are India's,
nationally and internationally? The answer is crucial to the continuing development of library education in India and, indeed, of India itself.

The Student

One of the important elements of any educational program is, of course, the student himself. But all too often he is completely forgotten or at best simply ignored in discussing and comparing education in different countries.

Take, for example, the student in an American accredited library school. For one thing, he has had at least 16 years of formal schooling, 12 in primary and secondary schools and four in college or university, with progressively more attention being paid to both books and libraries during these 16 years. For another, he probably has had several years experience in some line of work which drew his attention, directly or indirectly, to books, reading, education, research, information, documentation, or some other library-related interest; very few students go to library school immediately after receiving their bachelor's degrees. For still another, he therefore probably is in his late 20's or early 30's, is relatively mature, and is likely to be quite serious about his purpose in being in school again. As a matter of fact, more than half the students in American accredited library schools (58% in 1963-64) are part-time students who are at the same time working (full - or part-time) in some library or other information-centered organization.

Usually, then, students in an American accredited library school are reasonably well motivated, are quite willing and able to work hard and think for themselves, and are rather practical in their assessment of library education (and hence often critical of emphasis on detail, of frequent repetition, of too elementary an approach, and of lack of experience or authoritativeness on the part of the teacher).

The student in an Indian library school, on the other hand, has had in most cases only 14 years of formal schooling, 11 pre-college and three college, with very little, if any, attention being paid to either books (excepting textbooks) or libraries at any time during these 14 years. Very rarely has he had work experience, library-suggesting or any other kind; he ordinarily goes directly from his bachelor's degree course into library school although there may be one or two years of unemployment between the two. He usually, therefore, is in his early 20's (he may matriculate at 19), is probably still in adolescence, and is likely to look upon library school as merely a one-year last-resort inurement leading, he hopes, to just a job - any job.

Students, then, in the Bachelor of Library Science course in an Indian library school (the first post-graduate year) naturally tend to be rather aimless, woefully naive about libraries (and hence about library education), and not at all prepared to work or to think very much more than they did in their under-graduate courses. (The one-shot annual-or-terminal examination-centered Indian education system, still quite common at all levels, seems to contribute to a cram-memorize pattern of learning, or at least of question-answering, rather than to a step-by-step-reason pattern). The library school must motivate, teach, and activate students intellectually, all within this context.

However, students in the Master of Library Science course (one year beyond the B. Lib. Sc.) frequently are more highly motivated and more mature and they often have had some library work experience. For example, a number of M. Lib. Sc. students are deputed for the course by libraries in which they have been working for a number of years, so these students are more likely to have a greater sense of purpose as well as a better idea of what library work in India is all about. All the M. Lib. Sc. students, of course, must already have a B. Lib. Sc. degree so they are naturally older on an average than B. Lib. Sc. students. Some of the M. Lib. Sc. students, to be sure, are B. Lib. Sc. graduates of a previous year who have not been able to get jobs, but at least they are familiar with library parlance, if not with library practice.

The library school has the opportunity (indeed, the responsibility) therefore, to build on whatever background is already present in M. Lib. Sc. students, and thus to broaden their horizons, to develop their special interests, and, in general, to raise their sights to higher goals and better practice of professional librarianship, including, particularly, good library service. But, does it?
The Teacher

It is axiomatic that a teacher must, to begin with, know the subject he teaches. He must know its principles, its personalities, its traditions; and he must know its status and its possibilities in the worlds of modern scholarship and of current affairs.

If that subject has certain professional aspects, such as societies, conferences, a body of literature, and social significance, then the teacher must participate in its professional activities -- be active in its societies, take part in its conferences, peruse its journals, add to its literature, extend its intellectual frontiers through research, promote its social usefulness, and take pride in its work -- not only because each teacher, if anyone, must take a leading part in developing the standards, the point of view, and the image of the profession, but also because each teacher must describe, interpret, justify, and advocate the profession to his students as a vital, creative, socially valuable, and personally gratifying one.

If that subject has certain practical aspects, then the teacher must also have first-hand experience (both work and observation) in the subject as well, not only to enable him to teach the practical parts more realistically and effectively but also to allow him to personalize and dramatize the subject to make it seem both dynamic and attractive to his students.

A good teacher knows the principles, the practices, and the professionalism of his subject and he keeps aware of its changing interrelationships with other disciplines and with current events. He perforce reads widely. A good teacher not only informs, describes, and explains but he also inspires, encourages, and motivates. He must indeed, that is, be good at teaching.

It is self-evident, therefore, that a teacher in a library school to be a good teacher must first know the principles, practices, and professionalism of librarianship, particularly, of course, of his special area of librarianship. He also has to know what is going on in the world of letters and in the world of affairs, and he has to know how these events affect librarianship (and vice-versa). In addition, especially here in India, he must be a past master at the art of inspiring and motivating students, he must be an expert in the art of teaching. Above all, he must be well-read — certainly in librarianship, but also in as many other areas as his teaching warrants and his time permits.

But even a good library school teacher must have something truly substantive and relevant to teach if he would continue to be a teacher. Furthermore, that "something" must be properly organized within its own area of librarianship, properly articulated in the sequence of subject development, properly integrated with all the other areas of librarianship, and properly related to other areas of knowledge. But remember, whatever is taught in a library school must have substance and it must be relevant to the needs of the library profession.

A meaningful, profitable, and stimulating course in library education anywhere in the world, therefore, requires (1) that its teaching staff have first-hand knowledge of the present state of librarianship and of the immediate and long-range needs of that library profession wherever it might be; (2) that the individual teachers be professionally active, competent, experienced, informed, and well-read; (3) that the curriculum (a direct responsibility of the teaching staff) be well-constructed, substantive, and relevant to the needs of the profession; and (4) that the necessary teaching and learning resources (bibliographic tools, professional publications, equipment) -- another direct responsibility of the teaching staff -- be up-to-date, representative, comprehensive, and adequate to serve all the teaching and research needs of the staff and the students.

Teachers in American Library Schools

Administratively, the accredited graduate library school in the United States and Canada is an independent teaching unit with its own dean or director, a permanent teaching staff, a separate budget, and more or less complete control over selection and admission of students subject only to the overall regulations of the graduate school and of the university of which it is a part. It has no formal tie at all with the university's library or librarian although its own library, if it has one, probably is administered as a branch of the university's, and the school itself may or
may not be housed in the university library building.

Every accredited library school in the United States and Canada has a permanent full-time teaching staff. In 1966-67 the 38 accredited schools had an average of 9 full-time teachers per school; the range was from 4 to 18. In addition, the schools had an average of 12 part-time teachers per school; this range was from 0 to 21. The total number of teachers per school averaged 21, and ranged from 6 to 32. (The minimum number of full-time teachers considered acceptable for accreditation of a library school is 4, but 5 have recently been proposed as a more realistic minimum because of increased enrolment).

In every school every full-time teacher and many part-time teachers participate in the administration of the school by serving on standing or ad hoc committees which deal with such matters as curriculum (coordination, development, planning), course content, policy, recruitment and selection of students, staff (selection, promotion, tenure), library school library, evaluation, and so on. In addition, members of the permanent staff will serve on graduate-school or university-wide committees and academic bodies of various kinds.

The results of a few studies made on teachers in American library schools may be of interest at this point, not as goals to aim at but as records of the status quo which have elicited many questions and much concern from persons seriously wondering about the present and future state of library education in the United States and Canada.

A study [1] based on 1962 staff rosters showed that 86 per cent of the teachers in 32 accredited library schools reporting were between the ages of 36 and 65. The breakdown went like this: ages 26-35, 10 per cent; ages 36-45, 36 per cent; ages 46-55, 34 per cent; ages 56-65, 26 per cent; over age 65, about 3.5 per cent. (One teacher in the study was below age 25). All but two of the full-time teachers in this study had some academic training in librarianship: 37 per cent had master's degrees and 26 per cent had doctorates. In addition, 31 per cent had master's degrees and 15 per cent had doctorates in other areas. Most of the teachers had been recruited from library administration positions but the length of their pre-teaching experience was not reported. However, since professional experience has long been the main criterion for selecting library school teachers in the United States, it must have been noteworthy if not extensive. It might be mentioned that 3 to 4 years of professional experience in a responsible position is usually considered to be a minimum qualification for a library school teacher and anything up to 10 years is considered advantageous; more than 10 years, some think, may be as much as a liability as an asset [2].

In 1963 a study [3] was made of the publication productivity of a random sample of full-time library school teachers. It was found that the mean per faculty member for the years 1959-1963 was 4.9 publications, about one per year. Almost half (49 per cent) of the publications counted were periodical articles, 23 per cent were reviews, 15 per cent were papers (conferences), and the rest (about 1 per cent) were books. Not surprisingly, in those schools with doctoral programs the mean was 10.5, and in those without such programs the mean was 2.5. Also, as might be expected, nothing at all was published during the 5 years by 14 per cent of those in the doctoral-program schools and by 33 per cent of those in the non-doctoral-program schools. On the other hand, some of those who wrote, evidently wrote a lot, and nothing was said, of course, about the quality of what was published.

Teachers in Indian Library Schools

To the best of my knowledge there are no similar surveys of teachers in Indian library schools excepting, possibly, the more general one undertaken by the University Grants Commission Review Committee, 1961-1963 [4]. Tabulated returns of Section G of the questionnaire (Department of Library Science and Staff) appear in Appendix 2 of the report of this committee. While the returns may not be complete, some of the results may be at least suggestive of the pattern of library school teaching staffs in India.

In the 14 schools reporting (6 years ago), there were 75 teachers, an average of 5.4 per school, the range was 2 to 11. Of these, 17 (23 per cent) had master's degrees in library science and 3 (4 per cent) had
doctorates. In addition, 49 (65 per cent) of the teachers had master's in other areas and 6 (8 per cent) had doctorates. Not counting the 200 papers reported by one staff member, the average number of publications reported per person per career, so to speak, was 2.1.

Of the 75 teachers listed, 17 were identified as readers or lecturers (some specifically of library science) in 7 schools and most, presumably, were full-time; in one school the lecturer worked in the library 2-3 hours a day. All other teachers were part-time and were drawn from the university (or other nearby) libraries or, in one case, subject departments. Only one school seemed to have its own head; in all other cases the university librarians were also heads of the departments of library science, although four of these departments were reported to be independent. In the 6 schools with the 16 full-time teachers, then, the average number of full-time teachers was about 2.7; the range was from 1 to 6. The average administrative (professional?) experience of 15 of them (no data on one) was 6.5 years; the range was 1 to 20 years. Teaching experience (of 15) averaged 2 years; it ranged from 1 to 3, but remember the report is now 5 or 6 years old.

Double-duty Librarians

The only reason I have heard for the double duty of university librarians as heads of departments of library science is the shortage in India of qualified persons (but, in any case, it is said, all the departments are relatively small...). I must say this is a rather disparaging point of view to take with regard to Indian librarianship (and rather downgrading with regard to library education). Perhaps I should ask, then, if there will always be in India persons who are qualified to handle both jobs at the same time and to devote to each one the time, energy, and professional attention each job needs to ensure the effective, user-oriented library service (and the requisite preparatory library education) that India itself requires, deserves, and must get even now and particularly in the creative, productive future.

By the same token, running a full-time library school entirely with a part-time staff of teachers-cum-librarians on the pretext of better utilizing personnel in short supply (or of making sure that teachers have practical experience) not only disparages Indian librarianship and downgrades library education but also defrauds library users of proper service and gives library school students something less than their money's worth. Proper library service requires full attention and a profitable library education requires a core of full-time teachers whose only concern is planning, developing, evaluating, improving, and implementing the library education program on a continuing basis.

Part-time teachers do have an important contribution to make in library schools in areas of their full-time job specializations or of advanced studies, rather than in areas of broad, general, or fundamental interest. Permanent, full-time teachers (even as few as two) give a school stability, continuity, personality, organization, and a definite sense of purpose. Students deserve no less. My own experience as a teacher-and-librarian-in-one (for a much more pragmatic reason) has convinced me that such a two-in-one job is not always wholly satisfactory to the person who holds it, either.

Admittedly, there is a shortage in India of older, scholarly, highly respected, long experienced, traditionally-qualified librarians (and, of course, library school teachers). There is everywhere, and all things considered it's probably just as well what with the tremendous changes in librarianship, yes, and in opportunities for service that are upon us throughout the world. What bothers me more is the over-supply of librarians (and library school teachers), old or young, all over the world - including India - who lack some or all of the qualities so desperately needed by librarians and library educators today: adaptability, awareness, common sense, courtesy, discrimination, enthusiasm, imagination, initiative, judgment, leadership, maturity, originality, responsibility, tact, understanding, willingness, vitality, and zeal; a feeling for communication, cooperation, experimentation, innovation, and participation; an ability to be constructive, creative, decisive, expressive, and receptive; and a truly professional point of view.

But surely there are in India librarians who are known to have many, if not all, of these qualities. These must be found, encouraged, and given opportunities to prove their worth as full-time library school teachers.
and department heads - before it is too late.
It is high time that library education in India
be taken seriously.

The Curriculum

Library education is undergoing critical
review all over the world. The well-publi-
cized knowledge "explosion", the rapid
development (and glamour) of mechanical and
electrical devices of various kinds, the grow-
ing attention of government to the information
needs of the nation, the increasing availa-

bility and use (as well as cost) of library re-
sources, the spreading emphasis on identify-
ing and serving the interests and library needs
of individual users, and the multiplying de-
mands on the knowledge (and the time) of
professional libraries in every area of librarianship, all are having a very decided
impact on library education and on the curri-
culum of each of the library schools.

The Curriculum in an American Library
School

In the United States the first profes-

sional library degree is the master's degree,
granted now by 44 accredited graduate library
schools after approximately one year's
specialized study beyond a 4-year bachelor's
degree. An accredited school is one which,
on inspection at 5-year intervals, meets
nationally-accepted standards established,
published, and applied by the American
Library Association through its Committee
on Accreditation.

The curriculum is just one of the parts
of a library school that are examined closely
when the school is visited by an accreditation
team of the American Library Association,
but it is the one part, perhaps, that gets the
most careful attention. (Other parts, a few
of which have already been discussed, are the
teaching staff, the students, the library re-
sources, the physical facilities, and the finan-
cial support).

Briefly, there are four basic elements
looked for in a good library school curri-

culum: (1) core (introductory) courses (i.e.,
papers) covering the principles, processes,
materials, and techniques of librarianship;
(2) specialized courses in the various areas
of librarianship such as school, public,
academic, and special libraries or cataloging,
reference, administration, audio-visual
materials, and so on; (3) related courses
outside the library school, e.g., chemical
bibliography, curriculum development, psy-
chology, sociology, etc.; and (4) provision
for continual evaluation and revision in the
light of new developments in librarianship, in
library equipment, or in any area that might
affect librarianship.

(After noting what courses are regu-
larly offered in the school's catalog (i.e.,
prospectus), the visiting team studies the
syllabus of each course to determine its
coverage, its scope, its up-to-date-ness, the
kind of assignments, the adequacy of reading
lists, and so on. The team also looks at
sample student written work and visits actual
classes if time permits).

Usually the core courses are re-
gularly offered for all students) and all the
others are elective (i.e., optional) but the
number of required courses varies from
school, from 0 to 10 with 4 as the norm. Each
student's advisor will likely prescribe addi-
tional courses depending on the kind of library
and the area of librarianship the student pre-
fers. Beyond these the student may take as
many electives as he wishes (and has time
and money for), even above the minimum 12 to 15
courses necessary for a degree. (Actually,
the degree depends on the number of 'credits'
the student acquires during his study program,
and the credits per course depend partly on
the number of hours per week the course meets.
These vary from school to school).

One other minor characteristic of a good
library school program is convenient schedul-
ing of classes, convenient, that is, to the
students who may wish to take them. For one
thing, most American universities operate on
the semester, trimester, or quarter system,
often with a separate summer session in addi-
tion. Library school core courses thus can
be, and usually are, offered two, three, or
four times a year enabling a student to enter
library school at the beginning of any term
and still take his required introductory
courses in proper sequence.

For another thing, many American
library schools have more than one section of
certain courses (especially the required ones)
which will meet at quite different times during
the week. Many other courses (the more
specialized ones) are often scheduled to meet late in the afternoon, in the evening, or on Saturday, so a student can work out a desirable program which will suit not only his needs but also his convenience, a most important point to consider since so many students in American library schools are working somewhere either full-time or part-time. In many schools each course section meets only once a week but for 2 or 3 hours each time, depending on the course and its content at a particular school.

In the two American library schools with which I am most familiar, full-time students take 5 courses each semester for two semesters and two courses during the previous or following summer session for a total of 12 courses (or 36 credits, since each course carries 3 credits) in approximately one calendar year. Each course meets 3 hours per week for 15 weeks (one semester) or an equivalent time during the summer session, for a total class time of 45 hours per course (i.e., paper). This pattern varies somewhat in other schools but the end result is about the same.

The Curriculum in an Indian Library School

In India the first professional library degree is the Bachelor of Library Science (B. Lib. Sc.) granted by 6 universities, the Diploma in Library Science (Dip. Lib. Sc.) granted by 9 universities. In the past each has been granted after an academic year of study at the post-graduate level but the entrance requirements and, presumably, the papers studied for the B. Lib. Sc. have usually been at a little higher level. Gradually, however, the requirements for the two degrees are coming closer together and it will just be a matter of time when the Dip. Lib. Sc. disappears entirely having been replaced by the B. Lib. Sc.

The B. Lib. Sc. courses (i.e., curricula) are all very much alike. There are 8 papers, all are required, and all run through the academic year of about 30 weeks from July through April. They cover certain basic principles and practices of librarianship - administration, organization, document bibliography and book selection, reference service, classification (theory, practice), and cataloging (theory, practice) - and all papers carry the same weight. There are no part-time students so scheduling of classes and tutorials can cause little inconvenience to students (or teachers) excepting what may result from difficulties in reaching early classes because of delays in public transportation.

Four universities also offer (or did offer) courses leading to Master of Library Science degrees, a prerequisite for which is a B. Lib. Sc. degree. One of the universities is experimenting with a program which is quite permissive in allowing students to select areas in which they would like to specialize and the students themselves have been particularly selected to take the course; this program will be interesting to watch. The other three programs are quite similar and consist of 8 papers, in two of which students have a choice of topics allowing some specialization. The papers cover universe of knowledge (its development and structure, intended as groundwork for advanced theory of classification); depth classification (theory, practice), advanced cataloging (theory, practice); choice of public, academic, or research/technical library system, and documentation; bibliography and literature of either the humanities, natural science, or social sciences; and a sessional project on an approved topic within one of the foregoing areas. (All choices, however, are not always offered, and there is some variation from school to school). Again, all papers run through the academic year, all papers carry the same weight, and there are no part-time students in the programs.

In the one Indian library school with which I am familiar, each paper in both the B. Lib. Sc. course and the M. Lib. Sc. course meets two hours per week for the 30 weeks for a total class time of 60 hours per paper. It might be mentioned that the University Grants Commission report referred to earlier recommends a total of at least 400 working hours during a session for the B. Lib. Sc. course, or at least 50 hours per paper. For the M. Lib. Sc. course the report recommends 300-325 hours for lectures, tutorials, and seminars plus whatever is needed for student guidance and student practicals. So it would seem that the 60 hours per paper allotted by this one school is not at all unreasonable or unrealistic under Indian conditions.
Time vs. Variety

However, an outsider judging the curriculum of an Indian library school by American experience is at once struck with what seems to be an excessive amount of time devoted to the teaching of each paper during the one-year course and a resulting restriction on the variety of papers that can be studied during that one-year period. In American library schools, as we have seen, each course (i.e., paper) may meet a total of 45 hours, but in Indian library schools we find that each paper may meet a total of 60 hours and my impression is that less is covered at that.

On inquiry, the point is made that it is the practice of Indian teachers to go into great detail in presenting class lectures, to spell out each topic carefully, and to cover a large variety of examples; consequently more time must be spent on each topic and fewer topics may be covered in any one paper. As to the reason for this practice, some librarians have suggested simply (and perhaps facetiously) that Indian students are less educated and informed than, for example, American students or that Indian teachers are less competent and experienced than, for example, American teachers, hence the need to spell out each topic in so much detail with so many examples!

But looking at the practice realistically, I have come to believe that there are more fundamental, perhaps more credible, reasons for it. And one of these reasons, as I see it, is the pattern of Indian experience.

On one hand, this method of teaching is what all Indian students - and their teachers and their teachers before them - have always been accustomed to, so they always expect it. On the other, the idea and the reality of librarianship are almost unknown to the majority of Indian library school students and even to many teachers who must normally specialize in particular aspects of the subject but who may have little or no experience or knowledge in the area, save what they gained in library schools as students themselves not long before.

With limited prior experience both in methods of personal intensive study and in what is being taught, students must perform learn by spoon-feeding and often at the same time from teachers who are just one spoonful ahead of them. So each paper drags along with the brighter students getting bored (just as they do anywhere when they have too little to challenge them, too little that is different, too much that is repetitious) and with all students getting cheated of a broad, well-rounded education in librarianship by the meager content and variety of the papers available to them.

There is another and, I believe, much more decisive reason for the relatively slower pace and leaner content of papers offered in Indian library schools, one that happens also to be recognized as a root problem in all higher education throughout India. And this is the language problem, although only one particular aspect of the whole problem concerns me at this point: the relegating of English to, mark you, a "library language" instead of maintaining it as a "learning language", albeit a secondary one, which it has long been.

For, paradoxically enough, most of the important professional literature of librarianship, most of the important bibliographical tools, most of the important reference works, indeed, most of the books that library school students (and librarians, too) read, evaluate, and discuss are in English and will probably continue to be in English for some time to come. Thus English is and will continue to be, quite literally, the "library language" and library school students (and librarians), if anybody, ought to be proficient in both written and oral English.

It is my impression, however, that many present-day Indian library school students - certainly through no fault of their own - are just not adequately equipped to handle either written or oral English very rapidly, as rapidly as, for example, their counterparts in American library schools. The reading speed of a sampling of good M.Lib.Sc. students averages 10 to 15 text-book pages per hour (or roughly 70 to 100 words per minute) of substantive material such as appears in the literature of librarianship. Some students, of course, do read faster than that, and many students read light material very much faster. But it is obvious that at these rates not many journal articles and only very few books, once they are located, can be digested in the time available to students to do their studying outside the classroom. So reading assignments,
literature surveys, evaluations of library tools, written work, and even class lectures and discussions simply take more time and, consequently, fewer topics can be covered. (Studies show that a good college student or adult reader in the United States reads 200-300 words per minute of average textbook material, and it has been said that students there must be able to read 200-400 words per minute, depending on the text, in order to succeed in the average college. For comparison, the average full column (half of a page) of the Annals of Library Science and Documentation contains about 325 words).

This is not the place to go into the complexities and other ramifications of the language problem in India, but its effect on Indian higher education is already quite evident. Yet, very little attention seems to have been paid to it in Indian library literature. Three rather obvious aspects of the problem that need looking into come to mind immediately: (1) adequacy, (2) up-to-date-ness, and (3) availability of original works, reprints, and translations of reference books and textbooks in the 14 scheduled Indian languages, and not only books dealing with librarianship, of course.

Classification and Cataloging vs Variety

Another striking feature of the curriculum of an Indian library school - to an outsider - is its unparalleled emphasis on classification and cataloging which together use up 4 of the required 8 papers in the B. Lib. Sc. programs (and the M. Lib. Sc. programs as well, where they are offered) in most of the schools, and which together also cut down on the possible variety of papers that might be offered.

(In American library schools classification and cataloging are treated together in each of two one-semester course - i.e., papers - usually called simply "basic" and "advanced" with often only the basic course being required of the student depending on the kind of library he expects to work in. Classification and cataloging together thus use up at most only two out of the 12 to 15 courses required in the usual library school curriculum. I should add that more advanced, more intensive, study of classification and cataloging is also possible in a number of schools where suitable courses and seminars are available as electives).

The primary reason for this emphasis on classification and cataloging in Indian library schools is, without question in my mind, the necessity for each Indian library to be completely self-sufficient in the technical processing of library materials since there are no national or other centralized aids in India to help a library in its technical processing (as there are in the United States) - no printed unit cards, for example, no up-to-date current, classified, truly comprehensive list of works published, no "shared cataloging" arrangements, no national union catalog - even for Indian publications let alone foreign, and in most libraries (especially university, college, and special) foreign publications outnumber Indian publications.

Another related reason certainly is the wide-spread use of the Colon Classification in Indian libraries making it troublesome to use whatever foreign aids may be available and making it necessary for each library to do original classification and cataloging on all foreign publications as well as on Indian. So students must be especially well-grounded in Colon Classification. But they must also be well acquainted with the Dewey and the Universal Decimal Classification systems since these, too, are in use in India, and any library school graduate may be called upon to take over an old library or to set up a new one, often as the first - or only - professionally trained person to be in charge.

No doubt some (or all) of the reasons for the amount of time spent on each paper, mentioned above, are valid for the classification and cataloging papers, too, and possibly with even greater justification: both classification and cataloging definitely require attention to detail; both classification and cataloging surely are the least known by most people among all topics or concepts in librarianship; and both classification and cataloging in Colon may well demand of their teachers more careful and solid practical experience as well as more thorough and precise knowledge of principles than other topics do. But no doubt, too, the effects on the students, also mentioned above, are also the same: the good ones get bored, and all suffer from the lack of variety in their library education diet.

Tradition vs. Variety and Service

Even more glaring to an outsider looking at the curriculum of an Indian library school
is the absence of papers laying any stress on those aspects of librarianship which are at the very heart of the profession today: (1) reader services, (2) building library collections, (3) subject reference materials, (4) management, (5) research, (6) communication media, (7) information science (theory, mechanized practice), (8) documentation, (9) indexing and abstracting, (10) work with particular groups (e.g., children, young people, adults, villagers), and (11) collection and use of specialized materials (e.g., audio-visual materials, government documents).

(In a number of the accredited library schools in the United States and Canada the first four of these are covered in separate required courses and in most of the other schools all of these are covered in separate electives. I know that many, if not all, of these topics are dealt with to some degree in one paper or another in an Indian library school curriculum, but I know of none that is especially stressed even to the extent of being the main part of any paper regularly being offered).

One explanation, I am told, is that many of these, and other, topics have been considered from time to time as possible library school papers, but that (1) there has been very little demand for most of them, (2) there is very little need for some of them given the present state of librarianship in India, and, in any case, (3) there is a dearth of persons qualified to teach many of them. Besides, certain of these topics are already being offered in the courses available at INSDOC (New Delhi) and at the Documentation Research and Training Centre (Bangalore) or are optional papers in one or another of the library schools.

These reasons are all too valid. But one more (so far, tacit) reason has to be taken into account: within the present rigid library school program there is no room for any more papers unless the program is lengthened or unless one or more of the existing papers are dropped, either of which eventuality seems currently unthinkable.

I wonder, though, if the pattern of Indian experience already mentioned and the pattern of Indian custom may not have a good bit to do with the apparent neglect of, especially, the public service aspects of librarianship in the standard library school curriculum. Traditionally, according to both Indian and foreign writers and observers, educated Indians have favoured intellectual pursuits rather than service-oriented ones, and this inclination toward mental instead of physical work coupled with the also traditional individuated rather than social outlook of most people in India has simply unconsciously strengthened the more technical (i.e., intellectualized) aspects of librarianship (hence, in India, library "science") at the expense of the service aspects. Furthermore, in order that library education could be considered worthy of university sponsorship (particularly at the post-graduate level) its curriculum had to be as intellectual as possible in its own right, so the technical aspects of librarianship were emphasized, this time consciously, but again at the expense of the service aspects.

As a matter of fact, American library schools for many years have had to justify their graduate-level programs to many a sceptical scholar in some of the more precisely defined "substantive" disciplines, and they have not always succeeded. Even among American librarians and library educator today, there is considerable disagreement about the amount and the level of the intellectual content of many library school courses, and this disagreement has been intensified with the establishment of Ph.D. programs in some of the schools.

It should be noted, in passing, that in the United States the public service aspect of librarianship has always been taken for granted as the principal, indeed the only, justification for a library of any kind. Undoubtedly, the fact that American librarianship has been from its very beginnings a popular, practical development, rather than an official or an idealistic one, has had a lot to do with its public service point of view. Library education naturally has reflected this well-established concept even when the library schools physically moved out of the workaday world of public libraries into the intellectual world of post-graduate universities. Library research in the United States has also reflected this service emphasis: effective, efficient, individualized service is its goal.

In more recent years the tremendous increase in the amount of library-directed material, in its interdisciplinary nature, in its subject depth, in its subject breadth, in
its internationality, in its variety, and in its use, has put pressure on libraries and, in turn, on library schools all over the world to cope with it. The concept of effective service to users, the very bedrock of librarianship, has become even more important in libraries and other information centers because of this pressure, and increasing attention is being paid by library administrators in many countries to the library needs and the library habits of the regular, irregular, and potential users of all kinds of libraries. So library service simply can not be ignored or slurred over by library schools anywhere in the world; rather, it must be emphasized and improved upon.

Unfortunately, this same pressure also demands that other professional and intellectual competencies in librarians must also be improved upon, either before, during, or after their formal professional library education. In the United States this strengthening, this buttressing, of librarians is being undertaken at three levels: (1) at the regular fifth-year M.L.S. level, (2) at a new sixth-year specialization certificate level, and (3) at the regular Ph.D. level, normally 3 years beyond the master's.

Not surprisingly, in order to put more meat into their M.L.S. programs some schools have found it necessary to take out the more elementary courses and to admit as M.L.S. students only those who already have credit for the basic core courses obtained in an undergraduate program, in an intensive-study program (e.g., during the previous summer), or possibly by passing exemption examinations prior to matriculating. But the fifth-year M.L.S. programs are still considered to be general programs, "wherein lies the unity of the profession," as Dr. R.C. Swank recently put it [5]. The sixth-year certificate programs are usually tailored to the specialization needs of individual students, so they are gradually becoming the specialized programs, "wherein lies the diversity of the profession". The Ph.D. programs are, of course, highly individualized and prepare experienced librarians largely for academic (college, university) library administration and for teaching.

In India this pressure to cope with more sophisticated materials and to improve both library service and librarian competency may not yet be so great. But it is definitely noticeable: witness the list of librarian-identified shortcomings of Indian library education given earlier, most of which touch on these very points. So it does seem students in Indian library schools are being at least undernourished if not actually cheated, not only by the limited variety and content of their prescribed fare but also by the apparent neglect of each syllabus to focus on its contribution to the overall purpose of librarianship: library service.

One can believe that American libraries exist primarily to serve their users. One can also be led to believe (just by looking at the curriculum of an Indian library school) that Indian libraries exist primarily to give Indian librarians something to administer, or to classify and catalog.

Course Comparison

A comparison of the amount of truly substantive material covered in similar courses (i.e., papers) in American and in any other country's library schools may be quite difficult for anyone to make for a number of reasons: (1) students in the two countries have very different educational backgrounds, learning patterns, and library-use experience; (2) libraries to be used as working models in the two countries differ greatly in size, in scope, in service; (3) library resources for examination and study in the two countries differ greatly in availability, in up-to-dateness, in internationality; (4) teaching methods differ; (5) emphases differ; (6) needs differ; (7) examinations and other methods of student evaluation differ; and so on. For any one of these reasons it would not be possible for a library school teacher to follow exactly the same syllabus in both countries, nor would it, for that matter, be proper. (From personal experience, I can say that it is not easy to use the same syllabus in different schools even in the United States!)

And it would also be very difficult for a library school student to compare the substantive content of similar courses (i.e., papers) in both countries.

But not even the international education experts have settled all questions of equivalences between presumably similar curricula in different countries, so mere teachers and students should not worry overmuch about the
difficulties of comparing library education programs in various countries.

The Current Curriculum

Taking all the factors into account, it is presumptuous of an outsider to question either the emphasis on classification and cataloging or the amount of time spent on individual papers in any Indian library school curriculum, although he surely would question sharply the curriculum's lack of coverage of current pivotal topics in librarianship. Nor can an outsider readily evaluate the substantive content of any of the papers as they now are taught without first knowing what the needs of Indian librarianship are and without actually sitting in on the presentation of the papers; but this procedure is time-consuming and it relies on what is likely to be an artificial classroom situation because of the presence of the outside observer, so it is not completely satisfactory.

The best he can do by himself is examine each syllabus, note its coverage, bibliography, and timing, take into consideration what he has been able to learn about the requirements of domestic libraries, and trust that what is supposed to be taught actually is; but this "best" quite clearly is really not very good, either.

I cannot help but wonder, though, about the complete separation of cataloging from classification and the complete separation of practice from theory in each of these topics in the usual Indian library school curricula for both the B. Lib. Sc. and the M. Lib. Sc. courses. It seems to me that this double extraction has, in essence, isolated the book classifier from the book user as effectively as if they were on two different planets.

If there are any basic library activities that must be user-oriented, those activities, I believe, are classification and cataloging. Without user consideration, classification becomes the intellectual sport of classifiers, pursued for its own sake; and cataloging becomes the technical ritual of catalogers, a professional rite performed by code. There is some evidence in some libraries that this is already happening, with the result that users and librarians are becoming ever more estranged.

In actual library practice, of course, the classification and the cataloging of a book are done at one sitting, by the same person, in one continual process, and, I suspect, with precious little attention to theory. Why, then, should library schools teach classification and cataloging in so many fragmented parts? Why do they draw and quarter that which some say is the very soul-and-body of professional librarianship?

I also, quite frankly, wonder about the amount of time that seems to be needed to teach Indian students the fundamentals of cataloging (and of classification, too, for that matter, but at the moment I'm more concerned about cataloging). Surely, neither the materials to be cataloged nor the principles of cataloging and the cataloging rules that are applied in India are any more complicated than those met with in, for example, the United States. (The already-noted general availability in the United States of printed catalog cards and other processing aids for most books that a library is likely to require has not eliminated the need for catalogers in most libraries, according to an Indian librarian recently returned from a visit to America; rather, in some instances, the need for catalogers is greater, to adapt or to correct the printed cards to conform to local usage).

It is true that printed catalog cards certainly have eased the pressure on catalog departments of many American libraries. They have reduced drastically the amount of catalog card preparation required, and they have standardized the appearance, the arrangement, the informative quality, the acceptance, and the use of card catalogs in libraries all over the country. But they have not eliminated catalogers, or the training of catalogers in library schools. In addition to the cataloging demands made by the local uniqueness of most library card catalogs, there is also an irreducible minimum (as well as an undefinable maximum) number of items that every library, small or large, must do original cataloging on. (In very large libraries much of the processing work may be done by nonprofessionals, trained and supervised by professional catalogers). So, catalogers will always be in demand, often at a premium judging from the help-wanted columns of library periodicals.

If the materials, the principles of cataloging, and the cataloging rules are, indeed, similar, why, then, should be basic training
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of Indian catalogers take 120 hours while the basic training of American catalogers takes 45? Why should advanced training of Indian catalogers take an additional 120 hours while the advanced training of American catalogers take 45?

I do believe that experienced Indian librarians and library educators need to take a hard look at the four classification and cataloging papers in the B. Lib. Sc. course and at the four classification and cataloging papers in the M. Lib. Sc. course to find out whether or not any of these papers can be combined, shortened, made optional, or even eliminated, in the light of demands made on catalogers in Indian libraries and in the light of identified shortcomings of Indian library education in so many other important areas of librarianship. And shortening the program another year is not a suitable solution...

This may be the place to comment about the annual-or-terminal-examination-dominated system of education prevalent in India with its very detached external examiners, its stress and dependence on remembered facts and precise wordings, and its remarkable low pass standards. Since jobs are scarce and since only the best students (i.e., those with the highest marks in the year-or-course-end examinations) stand a chance of even applying for jobs (let alone getting them), all student effort and study during the year is directed only toward passing the examinations rather than toward getting a well-rounded liberal education.

Similarly, only the top post-graduate students are ever considered for seats in graduate or professional schools, with the result that students admitted to library schools, for example, may indeed have high marks in their previous courses but yet not have the well-rounded liberal education and personality so essential to becoming a good librarian. Grades alone are not enough to ensure the quality of library school graduates.

My reference throughout this paper to practices in American library schools does not mean that I necessarily consider it to be the most suitable practice to be followed everywhere—or anywhere—else. It is simply the practice I know best.

But two observations about it are pertinent anywhere and everywhere else: (1) American library education has been developed primarily to serve the needs of American librarianship; and (2) American library education is constantly being discussed, examined, and evaluated by practicing librarians and revised to meet the changing needs of the profession. Similarly, library education in any country primarily must serve the local, and changing, needs of the library profession in that country.

One other point occurs to me: If the principles and practices of American librarianship and the concept of continuing evaluation and revision of library education to meet the changing needs of the library profession are considered by others to be worth emulating, or at least thinking seriously about, then the practices in American library schools are also worth at least thinking about with a view toward adapting (if not adopting) that which can be most useful locally, including ideas about the curriculum.

Library School Program Evaluation

India very much needs an assessment of its library school programs. Other countries have both formal and informal arrangements for continuing evaluation of their programs, but India has none.

Within the past few years, it is true, there have been seminars, conferences, whole issues of journals, reports, and numerous articles devoted to the question of library education in India with most attention being given to the curriculum (at both B. Lib. Sc. and M. Lib. Sc. levels) and particularly to whether or not it includes what the individual authors of the papers think it ought to. In many cases the history of library education in India has served to introduce the topic, but each author always manages to get around to the one or two subject papers the considers essential to the education of Indian librarians and that must be included in the curriculum of each library school in the country.

At least one report (the 1965 U. G. C. report mentioned earlier) and one seminar (the 1966 seminar sponsored by the University of Delhi) recommended that the curricula include more subjects and a wider variety of optional papers, and they made other suggestions with regard to teachers, students, internal assessment of papers, scheduling,
and so on. So far the recommendations and the suggestions have had little effect.

India has no procedure for the professional certification of libraries, librarians, or library schools, nor any nationally accepted standards in the library field although both certification (or accreditation) of library schools and the creation of library standards have been proposed by individual librarians from time to time and a number of excellent bibliographic and documentation standards have been in effect for many years. Under these circumstances, it seems to me, a reliable, valid, and conclusive evaluation of the nation-wide library school program in India can be made only by the users of its products, the experienced library administrators who hire library school graduates, and by the graduates themselves once they have had experience in a professional position in a library.

The only criterion need be, how well do the graduates perform on the job. Each individual library school, of course, may also be examined quite closely after the fashion of an A.L.A. accreditation survey which looks at student body, teacher qualifications, physical facilities, curriculum, library, and so on, but more with a view toward identifying probable reasons for the on-the-job performance rating of its students. In themselves these factors can only indicate the potential rather than the real worth of the school's program.

(In a related way, the test of a library is simply how well does it serve the needs of its patrons. Its size, its physical facilities, and even the qualifications of its professional staff, for example, are only contributory to the total effect and, while interesting as such, they can not in themselves measure the worth of a library).

Such performance evaluation, however, is neither simple nor easy. For one thing, it presupposes that all library jobs are well defined, described, and rated and that those holding jobs know their duties, their responsibilities, and their rights. For another, it presupposes that all library administrators have settled on well-defined, clearly-described, and impartially-rated standards of performance for all the jobs in their libraries and that they can and do apply them; and further, that all library administrators know their users' needs and know how best to serve them.

For still another, such performance evaluation presupposes that all library schools are well aware of the state of the local library profession and know what library administrators expect from their library staffs to best serve the needs of their users, and particularly that all library schools have constructed their programs to satisfy as well as to anticipate the needs of the profession and the expectations of the administrators.

No, performance evaluation is neither simple nor easy.

One major difficulty, perhaps, in evaluating library education here in India is the lack of nationally-accepted standards by which it can be measured. One major difficulty, perhaps, in setting up standards here in India is the lack of nationally-accumulated data covering the entire library profession on which standards can be based. One major difficulty, perhaps, in collecting data on library work here in India is the lack of organized procedure to collect data. And one major difficulty, perhaps, in organizing a procedure to collect nation-wide data on library work here in India is the lack of awareness on the part of librarians of the value to the profession of having up-to-date data on libraries, librarians, librarianship, and library education in India.

It is not within the scope of this review of library education in India to suggest why's and ways of collecting such basic nation-wide data on a continuing systematic basis. However, a few agencies do come to mind which seem to me to have some responsibility to gather such data: Indian Library Association, IAilic, GOI Libraries Association, UGC, and, possibly, Indian Academic Libraries Association. Or perhaps the Indian Standards Institution (ISI) can do the job. Its Documentation Committee (EC-2) has been one of the most active groups within the Indian library profession ever since it was formed in 1947 and it might well expand its activities to include gathering the necessary data from which library performance standards can be developed.

In this paper I can do no more than urge Indian librarians to do something about developing nationally-agreed-upon standards, not only for the performance of professional (an non-professional) work in libraries, but
also for the evaluation and development of libraries of various kinds (school, college, university, public, special) covering their collections, staffs, facilities, services, and financial support. Standards for library schools can then be developed, too, covering teachers, students, curriculum, facilities, teaching materials, and financial support. Again, perhaps ISI's EC-2 can do the job.

One way to begin, would be for each library in India to develop (1) a staff manual covering policy, program, procedures, and personnel; and (2) a career and salary plan covering job description (employee qualifications, duties, responsibilities), organization structure, promotion, and staff benefits.

Each one of these projects will take much time and great effort on the part of many Indian librarians. More, each one will require patience, persuasion, fortitude, dedication, and, above all, a truly professional, non-partisan turn of mind.

But unless and until the library schools of India develop a clear understanding of the present state of Indian librarianship, of the direction in which it is moving, and of its present and continually changing needs, there will be little purpose in even talking about evaluating, let alone improving, Indian library education which is so inseparably bound with Indian librarianship.

Library school teachers must become fully informed about Indian librarianship. They must go into the field to find out what actually is the state of the library profession in India. They must learn at first hand what really are the programs and the problems and the prospects of Indian libraries. They must verify in person what in fact are the accomplishments and the needs and the hopes of Indian librarians. They must, in short, become truly involved in Indian librarianship, take part in its work and in its development, and anticipate its growth and its progress. Only then will they be able to develop a dynamic library school program that will indeed serve the needs of the library profession in all of India.

More than that, of course, library school teachers must also do something about putting library school programs in shape. But this, I suspect, will take time — and professional pressure.
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