THIS AUTHORISED FACSIMILE WAS
PRODUCED BY MICROFILM/XEROGRAPHY BY
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS LIMITED
TYLERS GREEN, HIGH WYCOMBE, ENGLAND.

A XEROX COMPANY

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FULL-TIME EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP IN GREAT BRITAIN SINCE THE WAR

A thesis submitted for Fellowship of the Library Association

C. Bradley, M.A., A.L.A.

A Note on Sources and Acknowledgements

Part I is based very largely on unprinted source material, and even at the risk of some lack of balance in the work as a whole I have quoted extensively from this material. The fact that the steps that led to the establishment of the post-war schools are not very well known, and that some misconceptions are already current, constitutes one justification for this; but the most cogent one is that they determined the whole subsequent development of education for librarianship in this country.

The most important source I have used is the archives of the Library Association; and I should like to express my gratitude to Mr. Bernard I. Palmer, F.L.A., Education Officer of the Library Association, and his staff, for the help they have given me in locating and using this material; and for their unfailing consideration and courtesy to me while I was working at Chaucer House. I am also grateful to Mr. Palmer for giving me much useful information based on his own personal recollections, and for allowing me to see the text of his Ranganathan Lectures before publication.

The Head of my own Library School, Brighton, Mr. W.H.C. Lockwood, M.A., F.L.A. , has also helped me very considerably by giving me access to his large collection of original papers and memoranda; and by giving me the benefit of his very long experience as the Head of a Library School deeply involved in the development of education for librarianship since 1946.

The Heads of the other Library Schools have also helped; and I should like in particular to thank Mr. Philip M. Whiteman, F.L.A., now of the Library School at Queen's University, Belfast, but then Head of the Manchester School, for making available to me the very interesting collection of papers relating to the establishment of the Manchester School. The Head of the Leeds School, Mr. Neville E. Dain, F.L.A., was also kind enough to send me some useful papers relating to the establishment of his School. The then Honorary Secretary of the Association of British Library Schools, Mr. P. G. New, B.A., F.L.A., made available to me the archives of the A.B.L.S., and of its predecessor, the Schools of Librarianship Committee, which were of great value.

Finally, I have been fortunate in having as my supervisor, Mr. Philip H. Sewell, F.L.A., who has been able to give me much useful information relating to the North-Western Polytechnic Library School (of which he was Head, until he was appointed to his present post as Library Adviser to the Department of Education and Science) and to the development of education for librarianship in general.

CONTENTS

Introduction

Part I: The Successful Establishment of Full-time Schools of Librarianship after the Second World War.

Part II: Consolidation and Expansion - the development of the Library Schools and the Pattern of Full-time Education for Librarianship from 1946 to 1963.

Part III: The Introduction of a New Pattern of Education for Librarianship in 1963.

Part IV: The Present State of Education for Librarianship.

INTRODUCTION

Full-Time Education for Librarianship in Great Britain before 1946.

The introduction of full-time education for librarianship in Great Britain on any appreciable scale was an essential if minor part of the new educational pattern that was put into effect after the end of the second world war. Its later expansion was likewise part of the educational expansion of the post-war years; and its more rapid development in the 1960's closely reflected the massive developments in higher and further (including vocational) education in those years.

The similar, and in some ways more promising, experiment in full-time education that was started at University College, London after the first world war never developed sufficiently to make any appreciable encroachment on the part-time and correspondence-course pattern of education for librarianship that was general in this country before 1946. That it did not do so was not chiefly owing to the failure of the Director of the School, the College authorities, or its sponsors, the Library Association, to make the most of their opportunity: the circumstances of the times were not favourable.

The combination of part-time or correspondence-course instruction with the apprenticeship type of training on the job was almost universally considered the right one for most professions, including librarianship. Practising librarians were themselves

chiefly of this mind, as were the members of their governing bodies and authorities; so there was little pressure from the libraries themselves to develop full-time education for librarianship. The public at large were naturally unable therefore to see the desirability of facilities for the full-time education of librarians; and neither central nor local government authorities, nor for that matter parents, were willing to make the necessary funds available.

Educational expansion in general between the wars was by no means as rapid as it became after the second world war. Some useful progress was made in the field of professional and general vocational education, but even there was little movement towards full-time courses in most fields. The pool of well-educated young people suitable as recruits to full-time professional training was also small by post-war standards, as the proportion of boys and girls going to grammar schools, staying on in the VIth forms, or going on to universities was at each stage smaller than it became after the war. Finally, libraries themselves, and in particular non-public libraries, were not expanding at the rate they began to expand after the war; and the need for well educated and highly trained librarians was not so apparent.

In the circumstances of the time the London University School of Librarianship could hardly be blamed for not expanding more rapidly. The number of students it provided tuition for each year - up to some 60 full-time plus about 50 part-time - was quite large for one school in the conditions of the day; and it would have had to grow very large to make any real inroads into the part-time or

correspondence-course system by sheer weight of numbers. A more realistic, and in the long run more valuable, aim would have been for it to act as a really effective pilot scheme for full-time education for librarianship in Great Britain. In the light of post-war experience we may consider that its function should have been to convince both librarians and public that full-time education was the right type of education for librarianship, to promote the idea of full-time education by proving its value, and to spark off the creation of new schools elsewhere.

Unfortunately the London University School did not perform this role at all well; and the prevailing opinion, even among those well disposed towards it, including many of its own ex-students and staff, was that it made very little impact on the profession as a whole, even less in fact than the number of students it produced would have warranted. There were many reasons for this. The bulk of the profession had not been very enthusiastic about the creation of the school: it came into existence as a result of the enthusiasm of a handful of members of the Council of the Library Association with the backing of the Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees, who financed it for the first five years of its existence. Once established, it survived, but instead of overcoming the prejudice against full-time education, it seems rather to have increased it. Innovations are always disliked by the conservative, and where they appear to be setting up a privileged minority they are particularly disliked. Many, probably the majority, of senior librarians, had no

faith in what they regarded as academic or theoretical education as opposed to directly practical and immediately useful training. Many junior librarians resented the fact that the students of the school were obtaining their qualifications more easily and quickly than they had done. The London University School was not solely a post-graduate school before the war; in fact until 1930 the majority of its students were non-graduates, and a substantial proportion remained so throughout the period. They were all, however, better educated than the average librarian, and attracted some prejudice on this score.

The personalities of those responsible for the School in the first place were altogether of the wrong kind for the sort of public relations operation that should have been one of its essential tasks. A. Esdaile wrote of its first director :- [1]

> Dr. Baker, though a man of remarkable intellectual freshness and vigour, had lacked judgment and had failed to conciliate the urban public library element; it must be allowed that the then Provost [of University College, London] was partly responsible for a rather narrow academic outlook, which hurt the School.

There was some improvement with the appointment in 1934 of the second director, J.D. Cowley :-

> Cowley was exactly the man to put all that right. Endowed with good natural ability, excellent sense and a gift for general goodwill, he ended the irritations caused by the dyarchy in the control of the School by the College and the Association. And he broadened and much improved the curriculum, and altogether put a new status and spirit into the School.

In spite of his gifts, however, Cowley does not seem to have been able to make much impression on the general prejudice against

the School. In his Annual Report for 1937/38, for example, he struck this rather pessimistic note :-

> While the municipal libraries for the most part, and some of the university and college libraries, make little use of the School, there are nevertheless sufficient library authorities regularly recruiting from it to provide employment for most of the students who can be accommodated under present conditions.

Andanother of his colleagues, J. Wilks, wrote that "he was ... bitterly disappointed that so few of those who had passed through the School after a university career were welcomed in the public library service." [2]

The School closed in 1939 and J. D. Cowley died in 1944, so that there was little continuity between it and the post-war School, which opened under a new director, R. Irwin, in 1945, especially after 1947 when it was re-organised as a solely post-graduate school of librarianship and archives.

Part-time and Correspondence-Course Education for Librarianship

Before 1946 the vast majority of practising librarians had obtained their qualifications by part-time or correspondence courses. [3] (Some large libraries, particularly academic libraries, dispensed even with these facilities, and relied entirely on training within their own walls). Even after 1946 the part-time and correspondence-course structure remained intact, continued to develop and improve in fact; and something between 30% and 40% of librarians becoming qualified between 1946 and 1963 did so with the help of these types of course. Only after 1963 did the full-time course become general

and standard, and the other methods truly exceptional.

The unifying factor in all these types of education was the Library Association, for whose examinations part-time, correspondence-course, and after 1946 full-time students (other than those at the London University School) were being prepared. The L.A. had begun to consider educational matters as early as 1880 three years after its foundation; in 1884 the first syllabus of examinations was approved, and the first examinations were held in the following year. From the very first the L.A. saw itself as the examining and certifying body for the library profession in Great Britain and the precedent established in the 1880's hardened into a principle that remained more or less intact until the 1960's. Its position was strengthened by the granting of its Royal Charter of Incorporation in 1898; and in 1909 it set up its official "Register of Librarians". Even before 1909 the very small number of librarians who had successfully completed the examinations for the "Full Certificate" (or "Diploma") had been elected "Fellows" of the L.A. (together with a larger number of librarians who had passed no examinations librarianship, but who were "distinguised in librarianship or scholarship") and this system was placed on a firmer basis by the inauguration of the register. In 1914 it was decided to restrict admission to the Fellowship to those who had passed the whole series of examinations and obtained the Diploma; and the new category of Associate was introduced, to be awarded to those who had passed four of the six examinations that comprised the Syllabus.

The Syllabus was changed frequently between 1914 and 1936 but the principle remained the same: admission to the register of qualified librarians (except for a handful of students each year at the London University School) depended on success in the examinations of the L.A. The L.A. did not, on the other hand, after 1930 itself provide any tuition for these examinations, nor did it "accredit" particular institutions, in the sense of recognizing success in their final examinations as sufficient qualification for practising librarianship. It encouraged, fostered, even sponsored the provision of facilities for studying librarianship, but it seldom directly ran them: in fact it made a principle of the complete divorce of the examining from the teaching sides of the profession.

In adopting this approach, which had profound effects on the subsequent development of education for librarianship in this country, the L.A. was merely being realistic and following the conventional pattern of the time. In its placing of the emphasis on the establishment of the register of qualified practitioners, with the system of examinations to admit to it, the L.A. was doing what all professional bodies in this country did as a matter of course at the time. The kind of training that was regarded as important in virtually all professions was the apprenticeship-type training the assistant received on the job, not the instruction he received in the classroom in the evening or through the post. On the other hand, it was important to provide a syllabus of examinations that would ensure a national standard of competence in the profession. It would have

been unrealistic, in any case, at the time to expect that the universities - the only bodies which it would have been reasonable to "accredit" as independent schools of librarianship - would have been willing to provide tuition for librarianship at least on an adequate scale.

Education for librarianship in this country began ~~therefore~~ in fact not with the foundation of a college of librarianship but with a column in The Library entitled "Library Assistants' Corner", which began in 1895, and was written by J. J. Ogle, who ten years earlier had been one of the two successful candidates in the L.A.'s first examinations. Soon afterwards evening classes were started, first in London in 1898, then in Manchester in 1899, and subsequently in other large towns, until by 1950 part-time facilities were available for the study of librarianship in at least sixteen centres of population. They were run in different types of institution: from 1902 to 1917 for instance, courses were provided at the London School of Economics, and between the wars at University College, London (in conjunction with the full-time courses) and University College, Nottingham. The great majority, however, were provided in colleges of further education - technical colleges, colleges of commerce, polytechnics - under the control of local education authorities, and were financed from public funds. In principle they were under the complete control of the college authorities. In practice librarians in the areas they served - the local branch of the L.A. or the city librarian and his senior staff - were largely responsible for them. They pressed for their establishment,

advised the college authorities on their administration, provided the tutors from among themselves, and directed the students to them from their own staffs. Before 1946 these courses were almost entirely in the form of evening classes; but as working conditions became better, and greater emphasis began to be put on the importance of vocational education of all types after the war, day-release courses became more common.

For those who lived beyond travelling distance to the large towns, and others who could not make use of the part-time course, there was the alternative of correspondence courses. These were begun by the L.A. itself in 1904 - an exception to the general rule that it did not provide tuition - but they were wholly taken over by the Association of Assistant Librarians in 1930. Although the A.A.L. had become in that year a section of the L.A., there was a complete separation between those in the L.A. responsible for conducting the examinations and those in the A.A.L. responsible for running the correspondence courses.

The examination syllabus of the L.A. from its inception in 1884 until 1946 was inevitably geared to the part-time and correspondence-course type of study. It was constructed in such a way that it could be taken part by part over a period of years by students who were at the same time doing a full-time job and often, for that matter, working long and inconvenient hours. For many years the syllabus was specifically in the form of six sectional certificates; but even after 1933, when it was re-organised into three levels -

at the Final Level

Elementary, Intermediate and Final - individual papers could be taken and passed one by one. The emphasis of the questions was naturally on particular librarianship techniques, and on actual routines in particular libraries, rather than on principles and norms. The previous educational attainments of the majority of candidates could not be assumed to be very high, - few had progressed beyond School Certificate, and some had passed only a preliminary examination of a somewhat lower standard.

That this system of education was successful within its limits is amply shown by the number of highly competent librarians it produced, but its defects were becoming increasingly apparent. In a profession where it is highly desirable that the practitioners are well-read, broad-minded, knowledgeable over a wide range of subjects, and ideally specialists (in a modest way) in one or two subjects (other than librarianship), the system was particularly unsuitable. A typical recruit would leave school at 16, after having passed School Certificate, and take a job in a library. He might well have been a person of high intellectual potential who in post-war circumstances would have certainly gained admittance to a university; but if he were conscientious and anxious to succeed in his chosen profession he would have to devote his limited spare time to study for the L.A. examinations rather than to that wide and deep general reading, backed up perhaps by W.E.A. or other similar classes, that was the best substitute for a university education available to his class and type.

The process of completing the L.A. examinations by part-time study was a long and arduous one that placed an unfair burden on the young librarian. While studying he would more often than not be engaged on the most mechanical and routine type of library work in libraries where there was no thought of division into professional and non-professional staffs. Much of what he had to study would for that matter be more appropriate to a non-professional than a true professional. In these circumstances little advanced research in librarianship or bibliography could be fostered in this country; and it was difficult to recognise librarianship as a true profession.

Factors determining the Progress of Education for Librarianship after the War

As with all historical phenomena it is difficult to say how far the new educational pattern of 1946 came into existence more or less inevitably as a result of the new circumstances of the post-war era, and how far it was primarily the creation of one or two energetic and far-sighted individuals. Certainly, it was the changed public attitude to vocational education that made the new departure in education for librarianship possible; but little or nothing would probably have been achieved if individual librarians had not seized the opportunities that were presented. Other professions failed to seize the initiative, and failed to make use of the new circumstances to move significantly from mainly part-time to mainly full-time education.

It was the war itself that led to the rapid extension of full-time vocational education. The public accepted, at the end of the war, that full-time training for professions and trades must be provided for ex-servicemen; and the necessary funds and facilities were made available as a matter of urgent national policy by central and local government authorities. Simple justice to the ex-servicemen themselves, who had lost valuable years in their professions, and the need of the country for trained men, made it necessary to ensure that men were trained as quickly and efficiently as possible.

It was nevertheless necessary, if a particular profession was to gain the maximum benefit out of this emergency training programme, that it should have a well-worked out plan ready to put into operation as soon as the end of hostilities brought it into being. It was also necessary that it should press for the kind of programme that it considered would suit its needs, and that it should do the necessary spadework to get it established and to make sure that once established it ran smoothly. Thanks largely to one man, L.R. McColvin, then Honorary Secretary of the L.A., ably backed up by P.S.J. Welsford, Secretary, the library profession for once was well prepared in practically all these respects, and was therefore able to get an extensive full-time programme put into operation in 1946.

After the immediate post-war years the need for a much more extensive and effective system of professional and general vocational educational training in this country was increasingly felt, and more

public money began to be made available for vocational education. New universities, colleges of technology and other institutions of higher and further education were established; and existing institutions were much expanded. Grants for vocational education became more freely given and more generous. There was a movement away from the older methods of vocational education - evening and correspondence courses - and towards newer methods - day-release, block-release, sandwich and full-time courses. Universities and the other higher educational institutions became somewhat more broadminded in their attitudes to specifically vocational education.

Again, the library profession had to seize its opportunity and make use of this new climate of opinion to improve its own system of education. L. R. McColvin had always intended that the schools that were set up as emergency training centres for ex-servicemen in 1946 should be capable of developing into permament educational establishments. This was achieved, but not without the strenuous efforts of a number of dedicated and energetic librarians both in the L.A. and in the schools themselves. Throughout the fifties and early sixties the library schools continued to advance in step with the general educational advances of the times. The heads of the library schools were always a step or two ahead of the general educational advance in their thinking and planning, and even in practical terms the progress of professional education in librarianship was ahead of that in most comparable professions.

The development of improved methods of vocational education and training, including full-time, sandwich and day release courses was partly in response to changing social conditions. It was no longer regarded as tolerable, much less desirable (as it once certainly had been), that young people should have to spend long hours many evenings a week acquiring the necessary training for their jobs in their spare time. It was also recognized that a much larger proportion of the population should be given the benefit of further education of one kind or another, just as a much larger proportion were being given the opportunity to stay on at school.

The most insistent pressure, however, came from the rapidly growing needs of an increasingly complex society. Technological advance in practically all fields depended upon and in turn made necessary the production of an increasing number of more highly trained personnel on all levels from scientists, technologists and engineers to technicians and skilled craftsmen. The future prosperity of the country was seen to depend on the rapid improvement of vocational education. Nor was it only in the fields of science and technology that the need for more highly trained men was felt. Government departments, business enterprises and other administrative and commercial organizations became larger and more complex, and there was an increasing need for more economists, accountants, statisticians, lawyers and other similar professional men. New professions developed and new courses, for instance, for business managers, practitioners in advertising, public relations consultants were developed. Progress

in the social services meant that more doctors, nurses, social workers and so on were required. A more affluent and leisured society demanded an increase in entertainment and amenities generally, and professions such as acting and music also grew.

The general picture was accurately mirrored in the librarianship profession. All types of library were expanding precisely in response to the kind of pressures already outlined. Technological advance and the growing size and complexity of industrial and commercial organizations resulted in a rapid increase in the number of industrial and other special libraries. More firms became aware of the value, indeed the necessity, of an efficient information and special library service. Educational progress made necessary new or improved library services in all sectors: universities, colleges and schools. Higher educational standards in the community at large, together with an increasing amount of leisure, meant that public libraries had to expand and improve their ordinary services if they were to fulfill their social function properly.

This expansion in the number and size of libraries inevitably gave rise to an increased demand for trained librarians. More important still perhaps, the increasingly important part played by libraries, particularly in the industrial and educational fields, demanded more highly trained librarians. Libraries of all types adopted a more positive role in relation to the group they existed to serve, and more emphasis was placed on information and bibliographical services and on assistance to readers. New techniques were developed and

increasing use was made of technological developments within the library itself, for instance, in the field of mechanized information retrieval.

Main Features of the 1946 Pattern of Education for Librarianship.

The second world war undoubtedly made possible a fresh start in the education for librarianship; but, on the other hand, it is never possible to make a complete break with the past, and the shape the system took after the war owed much to what had gone before.

In the first place the L.A. was determined that it should remain the one national examining and certifying body. Its experiences with the University of London School before the war had made it even more determined in this respect; and it was particularly anxious to prevent a repetition of these on a larger scale. The London University School had never been willing to prepare its students for the L.A. examinations: as a university institution it insisted on setting its own internal examinations, and totally rejected the whole idea of external examinations for its own students, part-time as well as full-time. The L.A., for its part, was unwilling to recognize the diploma of any university (or other body for that matter) as a sufficient qualification to practice librarianship. This was not because it had no confidence in the London University School: it was simply because such a move would have threatened to undermine its position as the sole examining and certifying body. (The American system of accrediting a particular

school when it was satisfied that it was efficient was no solution to this problem: in so far as the L.A. nominated half the members of its advisory body it could hardly have been in doubt about the efficiency of the London University School.) The compromise that was finally worked out between the School and the L.A. in 1928 resulted in a system whereby those who had obtained the Diploma of the School could apply for exemption from the L.A. examinations, and therefore be elligible for admission to the Register of the L.A. as Fellows. This was totally satisfactory to the School, since it meant that its students need be prepared only for its own Diploma examinations; and it saved the face of the L.A., since in theory anyway, the successful student was entitled to practice librarianship not because he was a Diplomate of the School, but because he was an F.L.A.,

The L.A. was not really satisfied with this situation, and was determined that it should not occur again. Why were the great majority of influential members of the L.A., including L. R. McColvin himself, so insistent on this point? They were impelled by the usual mixture of worthy and not so worthy motives. The desire for a national standard qualification that would be universally accepted was probably the chief one. Under other systems there is always bound to be a variation of standards between different institutions, and the graduates of the schools with the least status are likely to be discriminated against. Librarianship was still by no means universally recognised as a true profession, and the L.A. rightly regarded the

Register as one of its chief weapons in the battle to win recognition for librarianship as a profession, particularly by employing bodies and central and local government authorities. If poor quality schools with low level examinations had come into existence their graduates would have diluted the profession, and slowed down its progress.

On the other hand there was some unreal fear, and a little plain jealousy, in the L.A.'s attitudes. British universities, and other higher educational institutions, could have been fairly safely relied upon to maintain high standards. The L.A. was in any case rather complacent about the standards of its own examinations. If the amount of sheer hard labour involved in acquiring the vast quantity of factual information required by the syllabus was any guide, then their standards were high; but there are other yardsticks of educational attainment. Most of the members of the L.A. (and the Council reflected the membership fairly accurately in this respect) had themselves left school early, and qualified by part-time study for the L.A. examinations. They were suspicious of universities, and other institutions of higher education, and could not bring themselves to trust them to educate librarians, and in particular to assess their competence by examining and certifying them.

Perhaps the most plausible case was that put forward by R. Irwin in 1944. He recognized, I think, that there was a lot to be said for the other system in principle, but he insisted that the time was not yet ripe for it. "While the foundations of our new educational system are being laid, we think it right that the Council itself should control their structure and design; this initial unity

may then grow and develop into an ordered diversity as time goes by."[4] At any rate, his ideas came close to reality, - uniformity was more or less completely maintained for 18 years from 1946 to 1964, and then diversity - one hopes "ordered" diversity - began to develop.

The importance of these attitudes lies in the fact that they, more than any other factor, determined the kind of institution in which full-time education for librarianship developed in this country after the war. L. R. McColvin and his colleagues were keen that library schools should be established in universities; but their insistence on L.A. control over examinations ensured that they would not be. There were, of course, other factors militating against the siting of library schools in universities in post-war conditions. The universities were very heavily burdened by the sudden influx of ex-servicemen, and they were not very anxious to start new courses unless there was a very good case for doing so. The kind of course in librarianship that they looked on with the most favour was undoubtedly the post-graduate one, whereas, until the rate of recruitment of graduates to the profession increased, the L.A. was only being realistic in thinking more in terms of courses for non-graduates.

British universities have never been very keen on providing vocational courses leading to diplomas for non-graduates. They have done so, however, when a really good case has been made out for them. London University provided one for librarians from 1919 to 1939 and from 1945 to 1947; University College, Nottingham would have been

willing to start one in 1945, and Queen's University, Belfast actually started to provide one in 1965. Four conditions have been insisted on in all cases: (i) general educational standards for entrance must be high (higher than those required for admission to the L.A. examinations before 1967); (ii) non-graduates could not complete the course in less than two years (full-time); (iii) the course must be run in conjunction with a post-graduate one; (iv) the students must sit for the university's own examinations. The last condition was undoubtedly the main stumbling block to the L.A., but all the others caused it anxiety.

The L.A. had one or two ideas which they thought might form the basis of a compromise. One was that the new library schools should be controlled by other bodies, but that they should work in close association with universities. By this they meant much more than that, for instance, library school students should have access to university library resources - a highly desirable aim that was achieved by informal agreement by most library schools; but precisely what they did mean was never made clear, and the idea was too nebulous ever to be translated into practical terms. Another idea was to set up a Joint Examinations Board representative of the L.A. and the universities providing schools. This also remained merely an idea; but it is easy to see that examinations provided by a Joint Board are just as much external examinations to an individual university, even if it has representatives on the board, as are examinations provided by a professional body.

The L.A. therefore had to abandon all hope of university library schools, and turn to the obvious alternative, colleges of further education under the control of local education authorities. These colleges raised no objections to the L.A.'s insistence on examining and certifying the students of librarianship; it was their normal practice to prepare students for external examinations. Later on some dissatisfaction came to be felt in the colleges with their complete exclusion from all say in the examining of their own students; but the pressure for change came from the tutors in librarianship, not from the principals and governing bodies of the colleges.

Although the L.A. thus retained complete control of the examining and certifying of students, it established no kind of control over the schools of librarianship themselves, and lacked the machinery to act effectively even in an advisory capacity. The government and administration of each school was solely the responsibility of the local education authority in whose college it was situated. The Joint Committee, representing the L.A., the Ministry of Education, and the local education authorities responsible for library schools, which was planned by the L.A. in 1943, never came to anything. There was, therefore, no adequate means of planning the development of library schools on a rational basis to meet national and regional needs, and no means of ensuring that individual library schools were kept up to standard.

The library schools themselves soon became flourishing institutions, and began to develop as highly efficient teaching bodies, each with its own individuality. In three respects, however, the system as a whole failed to develop as its chief sponsors had hoped; and features which had been adapted chiefly to suit the needs of the immediate post-war years were not changed before 1963. First, the part-time and correspondence course system continued side by side with the full-time schools and continued to produce up to 40% of trained librarians till 1963. (The proportion of people studying part-time was, of course, much larger, as the "drop out" and failure rates were much higher than in the full-time sector). It has originally been intended that from 1951 all the parts of the Registration Examination would have to be taken at one and the same sitting, and as this would have entailed studying for seven papers simultaneously, it would have made part-time study extremely difficult. This move, however, was never made, chiefly owing to pressure from what it might not be unfair to call the part-time lobby whose chief fear was that a wholly full-time system would not produce sufficient trained librarians.

Secondly, the educational standards of recruits were not raised before 1960. Only one Preliminary Examination was held after the war (in June, 1947) and that only for special cases; and the minimum educational qualification for entrance to L.A. examinations (and hence to the library schools) remained fixed at 5 "O" level G.C.E. passes, or the equivalent. Some would have liked to make

librarianship a solely graduate profession; but this would almost certainly have been unrealistic at any time in this period, since although the universities were expanding rapidly, so were the demands and opportunities for graduates. Some inducement was offered to graduates by exempting them from the Entrance (or First Professional) Examination from the introduction of the Syllabus in 1946; and in 1960 this privilege was extended to those who had obtained 2 "A" level G.C.E. passes. The door was not closed to those with lower general educational attainments, however, until after 1967, when the last Entrance Examination was held. This move did little more than recognize the fact that a much larger proportion of the school population was staying on in the sixth forms to take "A" levels than formerly.

Thirdly, the length of the basic Registration course remained fixed at one year. McColvin had planned in 1942 that once the ex-servicemen had passed through the schools they should provide two year courses for non-graduates, but this obvious necessity was for administrative and financial reasons not achieved until 1963. In the meantime tutors and students had to struggle with an examination that, so far as the amount of work it involved was concerned, would have been more suitable as the final examination of a two-year course.[6] The profession expected that its prospective practitioners should be trained up to a reasonably high level; but was unwilling to allow them the time needed to receive this training.

NOTES

1 L.A.R. Vol. 46, pp. 172 to 174. An obituary notice of J.D. Cowley.

2 ibid. Both Esdaile and Wilks were on the staff of the School.

3 The fullest account of the development of education for librarianship in Great Britain over the whole period is probably the unpublished L.A. Essay by Paul Sykes: The history and development of professional education in librarianship in Great Britain. 1951. The basic facts for the early period are readily available in J. Minto: A History of the public library movement in Great Britain ... Allen & Unwin, 1932. There are two outstanding short recent analyses: J. Clement Harrison in Library Trends for October, 1963 (Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 123 - 142) and W.H.C. Lockwood in The Lucknow Librarian, July, 1965.

4 L.A.R. Vol. 47, pp. 3 - 6

5 Library schools were in fact driven to the expedient of advising or even requiring students to pass one of the four groups of the Registration Examination (usually Group D) before beginning their courses. One-year full-time courses were also far too short for the Final Examination, and applicants for these were similarly advised to pass one part (often Part IV) before beginning their full-time courses.

PART ONE

THE SUCCESSFUL ESTABLISHMENT OF FULL-TIME SCHOOLS OF LIBRARIANSHIP AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

PART ONE

CONTENTS

Chapter I: McColvin outlines the Plan for Full-time Schools of Librarianship - September 1942.

Chapter II: The Library Association develops the Plan and takes the first steps towards the Establishment of the Schools - October 1942 to February 1944.

Chapter III: The successful Re-Establishment of the London School of Librarianship.

Chapter IV: Abortive Negotiations with University College, Nottingham for the Establishment of a second University Library School.

Chapter V: The Establishment of Schools of Librarianship in Technical Institutions: First Phase, February to October 1944.

Chapter VI: The Establishment of Schools of Librarianship in Technical Institutions: Second Phase, October 1944 to January 1947.

Chapter VII: The Establishment of the Manchester School of Librarianship.

Chapter VIII: The Reaction of the Profession to the new Educational Pattern.

I McColvin Outlines the Plan for Full-time Schools of Librarianship - September 1942.

In 1942 L. R. McColvin, City Librarian of Westminster and Honorary Secretary of the Library Association submitted his "Report on the present condition of the public library system of Great Britain with proposals for post-war reorganization".[1] In it he made it clear that the first duty of the Library Association as soon as the war was over would be to make good the effects of the war on the training of library personnel. The war had deprived servicemen of opportunities for professional education and had caused a set-back in their careers. Common justice required that they should be enabled as quickly as possible to make up the time they had lost; and the national interest demanded that the shortage of trained personnel should be made good without delay.

Preparation had to be made for intensive professional education for ex-servicemen; and to provide for this he suggested that library schools should be set up as soon as the war was over. He did not, however, advocate temporary schools for this purpose. The immediate post-war need would provide the incentive for the establishment of library schools, but once they had been established they should be perpetuated, as full-time education was also desirable in normal conditions. Ex-servicemen should have if not sole, at least priority, use of the schools for the first two or three years, but after that the schools should assume the methods appropriate to normal conditions.

At the end of 1941 there had been 1,200 members of the L.A. in the services, of whom 150 were F.L.A's and 360 A.L.A.'s. As the L.A. were aiming to increase the number of graduate librarians they

would ask that F.L.A.'s be given the opportunity to take degree courses at universities. They could meet the condition that applicants for grants under any post-war education and training scheme should not already be fully qualified, because they believed that in the future non-graduate librarians would not be so regarded.

The projected library schools would be for those who were not F.L.A.'s. There would be intensive one-year courses for A.L.A.'s to enable them to pass the Final Examination (perhaps with a new syllabus). For those who had not yet passed the Intermediate Examination, there would be courses leading to a new, more general Intermediate Examination. (The old Intermediate Examination was confined to cataloguing and classification).

The most urgent priority would be to ensure that as many fully-trained librarians as possible were produced in order to help in post-war developments. The L.A. had to take steps to make sure that as soon as the Government brought forward a scheme for post-war education and training the library profession would be in a position to benefit from it. It was not known how many ex-service librarians would want to take advantage of such a scheme, but he was confident that a high proportion would, "particularly if prospects of reorganization are such as to give new horizons to librarianship."

McColvin then went on to outline his plans for the projected library schools. In the first place he thought they should not be too big - an average of 25 to 30 students at each would be sufficient. There were likely to be more than enough ex-service

students to fill six or seven schools, but if this figure proved to be too optimistic the gaps could be filled with non-ex-service students. Schools should be in large cities with good and varied library services near at hand, and universities with which the schools could be associated. He suggested Glasgow (or Edinburgh), Manchester (or Liverpool), Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff and London. The ex-service scheme would have to be spread over about three years, partly because there would otherwise be too many students in any one year, but also because some ex-servicemen would prefer to go back to their homes and work for the first year after release.

He envisaged that either a local education authority or a university would be responsible for a particular library school; and whichever it was would have to act in close co-operation with the other. He was convinced that the schools should be teaching and not examining bodies, and that the universities would have to agree to this and not seek to award their own diplomas. He considered that there were great advantages in the association of library schools with universities: there would be facilities for courses in cognate subjects, such as literature, and all the advantages of a communal life; and in time a high proportion of the students would in any case be university graduates. On the whole therefore a university would be the better body to sponsor a library school, but if there were overriding local considerations or if a particular university were unwilling to accept external examinations, then there was no reason

why a local education authority should not provide the school. He did not foresee any financial difficulties. Very little would be needed other than the salaries of the tutors and some modest facilities in the way of lecture rooms: the ex-servicemen students would be entitled to grants from public funds that would cover college fees and their own maintenance.

The tutors would have to be men of outstanding ability and practical experience who were also capable of imparting their knowledge. To obtain such men would be one of the greatest difficulties, especially in the immediate post-war period. Only after the schools had been properly organized on a permanent basis would it be easy to recruit suitable teachers of librarianship; for the first courses they would have to use the best people obtainable. He did not envisage any-one, however, either then or later making teaching in library schools their life's work: it should rather be regarded as a valuable element in a librarian's career. He was convinced that they could not be satisfied with part-time tutors, and that the tutors should not be on the staff of any library in the area served by the school: they must be completely independent men.

Two tutors would be needed at each school - a senior and a junior. They would be competent to cover the course, as it would be a general one. There would be no need either at first or later for more. If one person could not acquire sufficient knowledge to

cover the whole course it would mean that there was something wrong with the courses. All classes would be small so there would be no undue strain. To supplement the work of the librarianship tutors university or local education authority teachers could be brought in for non-professional studies such as literature.

The first body of tutors (12 or 14) would have to be men who could seek temporary leave of absence from their employing authorities. It would be very appropriate if they were themselves ex-servicemen. Patriotic authorities might be more willing to release them, and they would be more in sympathy with ex-service students. They should be appointed immediately; in such leisure as army life afforded they could be preparing, and at the cessation of hostilities the L.A. would probably be able to secure priority of demobilization for them, so that they could take a short refresher course in preparation for their work, which could not start until a few months after the war had ended.

While the schools were being run by these ex-servicemen on leave of absence, they would have to select a number of suitable people and send them on a special course, which could be provided by the London University School of Librarianship, for the training of tutors. They would then be allotted "permanent" appointments as tutors in succession to the initial temporary tutors. McColvin insisted, however, that they should not really be permanent.

> When we say 'permanent' we do not think that this should be a life's career. We do not want it to be. On the contrary we believe that men of their ability would easily be absorbed into senior posts in the expanding service and would need to be constantly replaced. Work as a tutor would, indeed, prove a professional asset, as the hallmark of an outstanding young man of early recognized abilities.

He then went on to consider the curriculum of the new library schools. He had already insisted that they should be compelled to prepare their students for the examination of the Library Association.

> By insisting that all pass this national professional examination we shall secure uniformity and ensure that the proper standard is reached at all teaching institutions... This would not necessarily be the case if there were no such national criterion. Consequently we should fall into the grave danger of prejudicial, and perhaps prejudiced, differentiation between qualifications. This must be avoided. We have already seen how this differentiation, be it right or wrong, has militated against the absorption of the students of the one full-time school we had before the war. We must avoid any risk of invidious comparison; and we must, as a profession, keep control of our greatest responsibility - Registration.

It would be necessary for the L.A. to draw up a completely new syllabus as soon as possible, framed with two-year full-time courses at the new library schools primarily in mind. One year's intensive course would be sufficient, however, for ex-servicemen, as they would already have gained some experience before enlistment, and in many cases would have carried out some study and passed some parts of the old L.A. examinations. The regular two-year courses would include up to 50 per cent practical experience, to be gained by working in good libraries of different types in the neighbourhood of the schools.

McColvin pointed out that two complementary projects had to be kept in mind: an immediate scheme for ex-servicemen, and a permanent system of full-time training for all professional librarians.

> For the first part of the programme arrangements may be somewhat temporary, so long as they could lead to permanent bases; the great thing would be to get something that "worked". Nevertheless we should have to establish the schools on a satisfactory, "genuine" basis as we could not expect to get government recognition for schools which were patently devices, however praiseworthy, for taking advantage of grant facilities. We may, indeed, have to give reasonable guarantees that these schools will be continued and to indicate the lines on which they shall be run.

McColvin recommended that

> the Emergency Committee of the L.A. be authorized (quite regardless of any other matters in this report which may or may not prove controversial) to make all necessary enquiries and take all necessary steps to organise a system of post-war education on the lines indicated, and that they be authorized to seek, from any appropriate government department or other body, any funds which may be required for the organization of the system and any initial expenditure on equipment; further, that the Emergency Committee be instructed to prepare an appropriate syllabus of examinations for those attending such schools.

He believed that as the matter was an urgent one the Emergency Committee ought to be given full authority to proceed. "The great thing is to put a sound and eminently desirable project into active operation as soon as the time for action arises. If we have to wait until all the delaying processes of pseudo democracy have been performed we shall surely miss our opportunities and deserve to miss them."

II The Library Association Develops the Plan and Takes the First Steps Towards the Establishment of the Schools - October 1942 to February 1944.

McColvin presented his Report to the Library Association in September 1942, and at a Council Meeting on October 13th a special Committee was appointed to consider it, "and the comments of the Branch and Section Committees (these last to be requested within three months), and to bring up to the Council its recommendations for post-war re-organisation". The Chairman was Edward Sydney, it became known as the Post-War Policy Committee, and fortnightly meetings were held, mostly of two days duration, up to September 1943, when its Report was presented.

At its meeting on January 21st, 1943 the Post-War Policy Committee discussed the administration of the planned library schools.[2] It was felt that the ideal arrangement might be that they should be attached to provincial universities "contiguous to and prepared to collaborate with a large public library system, and willing to prepare students for national examinations held by the L.A." (Law and medicine were quoted as examples of cases where universities already accepted an outside examining body).[3] Students could go to the appropriate library for their technical studies and "laboratory practice" whilst attending the University for lectures in literary history, or other appropriate subjects. At the same time they would reap the benefit of university life by having the status of undergraduates, preferably being in residence. It was agreed that the best interests of the library service would be

served by having one national examining body in library subjects. It was felt that six or seven provincial schools should be set up and that communal training was infinitely preferable to any other form of tuition. The London School might be in a somewhat different position and be specially organized for research work and the training of tutors for other schools. It was noted that the Board of Education had promised to bear in mind the question of students in librarianship being provided for in the national grants scheme, and it was agreed that whenever possible appropriate steps should be taken to ensure the implementation of this undertaking.

The Report of the Post-War Policy Committee was submitted to the Council at its meeting of September 23rd, 1943. The Committee also presented a Memorandum on Future Professional Training.[4] Paragraph 10 of this Memorandum dealt with Library Schools, making the following points about them:

(a) These should be so organized that they can become permanent institutions.

(b) They should be in centres where there are suitable libraries where students can obtain adequate practical experience as an integral part of their education

(c) They should be either provided by, or operate in the closest association with, a university.

(d) The work of Library Schools throughout the country should be co-ordinated and, in general matters, controlled by a Joint Committee comprising representatives of the following :- The L.A., The "Appropriate Body" (or the Board of Education), the governing bodies of all universities maintaining Schools and the local authorities in whose areas Schools are situated if these maintain or actively participate in the management of Schools. The appointment of directors and tutors should be subject to the approval of the Joint Committee.

(e) Tuition in librarianship should be given by whole-time tutors, these being persons with thorough practical library experience selected and specially trained for this work. They will be supplemented for general subjects by tutors from the

university staff. The Director of each school should be qualified and adequately experienced in librarianship.

(f) Students should reside in the School, or an attached hostel.

(g) School students should take the appropriate L.A. examinations. There are great advantages in maintaining the L.A. as the sole examining body for Registration. If, however, it is found impracticable to insist that the Schools shall not conduct their own examinations it must be provided that all examinations are under the supervision of a Joint Examinations Board representing the L.A. and the School authorities, and that at all examinations there shall be external examiners responsible to this Joint Board, these external examiners being appointed by the L.A.

(h) In order to establish and maintain nationally uniform standards the Association will not recognize any examination, certificate or diploma in Librarianship excepting those of the Association, and those held under the conditions specified in (g) above.

On the selection and training of tutors they recommended that

suitable persons should be selected as tutors as soon as possible, and arrangements made for their release by their authorities, or their priority demobilization if in the forces. A short course of training should be arranged to prepare them for their work, such a course to start immediately on the cessation of hostilities.

They also submitted a proposed Syllabus of Examinations.

The Council approved both the Memorandum on Future Professional Training and the proposed Syllabus. A Planning Committee was appointed (a) to make known the terms of the Proposals for Post-War Reorganization and Development, and (b) to give further and more detailed consideration to certain of the more important aspects of post-war organization. It was authorized to appoint such committees as it might consider necessary, and to co-opt as consultative members of such sub-committees persons who were not members of the Council or the Association. Two sub-committees were appointed to consider

Education and Examinations respectively.

The Education Sub-Committee held its first meeting on January 12th, 1944[5]. Its terms of reference had been laid down in the Memorandum on Future Professional Education:

(i) To establish the Schools,

(ii) To arrange for the selection and training of tutors;

(iii) To secure the necessary financial assistance, grant facilities, etc.

(iv) To inform and enlist the support of members, potential students, local authorities, etc.

As they were not in a position to know how far the universities would be willing to teach vocational subjects, it was agreed to ask the Examinations Sub-Committee to finish its work as quickly as possible, and then seek advice as to how far the universities might feel able to undertake the training for such a syllabus. In order to give an approximation of the number of entrants to be expected, the Secretary undertook to analyse the last pre-war examination entry, and also to work out the probable number of qualified librarians needed per annum, if and when the Council's Proposals for the expansion of the library service came into effect.

The Secretary reported his findings at the next meeting on February 1st, 1944.[6] On the basis of the elections to Associateship and Fellowship in the years immediately preceeding the war, it was concluded that the annual entry for full qualifications would be not less than 200. On the location of schools, it was felt that several small schools were better than a few large ones, being more convenient

in reducing for candidates the distance from home; this would however, be outweighed by the heavier overhead expenses because of a smaller number of students at each school. It was felt that a reasonable number of students would be 30, and that it would be advantageous if as many tutors as possible were full-time members of the university staff, but that tutors must indispensably have had thorough training and experience as practising librarians. Tentatively the Committee considered that suitable locations for schools would be London, Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow or Edinburgh, and Cardiff or Bristol.

Debate then took place on the possibility of persuading universities to undertake the establishment of library schools but at the same time to accept either the central examinations of the L.A., or nomination by the L.A. of external joint examiners as stated in the Post War Policy Committee's Memorandum. The Committee strongly expressed the view that centralized control of the standards through the examinations was a vital point, and that if the universities were unwilling to concede this point, schools of librarianship should be established in connexion with the Colleges of Technology established by the large cities. For the purpose of a preliminary exploration of the probable views of universities, it was agreed that an interview should be sought with Sir Walter Moberly, Chairman of the University Grants Committee. Arundell Esdaile, W.C. Berwick Sayers, L.R. McColvin, C. Nowell, G.V.R. Hayward and P.S.J. Wellford were appointed to represent the Committee.

The L.A. representatives did meet Sir Walter Moberley, and also Sir Hector Hetherington, Chairman of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors, but the result was not encouraging.[7] Whilst they were not unsympathetic to the suggestion, they were quite positive that the demands being made by the Government on the accommodation, staffs and other resources at all the universities for some years after the cessation of hostilities would make it impossible for them to consider the opening of new departments, especially for vocational courses of this type.

It was (and is) true, of course, that neither the University Grants Committee nor the Committee of Vice-Chancellors had any actual authority over the policies of individual universities, and could only act in an advisory capacity. Dr. R. Offor revealed in a letter to the Library Association Record of February 1945, that at Leeds University, where he was Librarian, the Senate's Committee on Post-War Development had had before it the question of courses in librarianship.[8] This Committee had not considered such a new departure to be at all impossible, but had, on the contrary, welcomed it. The real reason why universities would not co-operate with the L.A. in establishing library schools, in his opinion, was that a syllabus and system of examinations controlled by the Council of the Library Association would not harmonize with the essential feature of university teaching, namely that the university must control its own courses and examinations.

This view is amply proved by the evidence. The Library School at University College, London, was successfully re-established in 1945,

but the control over its courses and examinations remained firmly in the hands of its own governing body. The projected Library School at University College, Nottingham, never materialized, in spite of the desire of the governing body of the College to establish one, precisely because the L.A. insisted on its preparing its students for the L.A. examinations.

The reasons why the L.A. was so adamant on this point were put forward by R. Irwin at the Conference of the Council and Branch and Section Officers at Wadham College, Oxford, on December 16th, 1944.[9]

> We believe that at the present stage of our development at least, it is advisable for the Council to retain control over its own syllabus and examinations. The time will come when that control can be safely relaxed, but at present we think it wisest that all our students should be working along the same lines, and that the Council should shape and design the syllabus that is to qualify them for registration. A diversity of approach may possibly come later, when the general lines of training have been stabilized. Diversity at this stage would, however, tend to produce a confusion of uneven and competing qualifications, which would react unfavourably on the status of the profession. We have seen this same process taking place to a striking degree in America. While the foundations of our new educational system are being laid, we think it right that the Council itself should control their structure and design; this initial unity may then grow and develop into an ordered diversity as time goes by. The universities are, however, understandably not prepared to accept this principle, nor to give tuition for an external examination.

III The Successful Re-Establishment of the London University School of Librarianship

One of the first tasks of the Education Sub-Committee was to ensure that the one pre-war School of Librarianship, that at University College, London, should actually re-open after the end of the war. That it would do so was by no means certain. The last pre-war Director of the School, J. D. Cowley, had been unfortunately killed in an accident while serving in the R.A.F., in August 1944. The L.A. asked Sir Frederic Kenyon, Director of the British Museum, to use his influence, as Honorary Visitor to the School, to get the School re-opened. He entered into correspondence with the Provost of University College, London, and pressed for the appointment of a new Director and the re-opening of the School by Easter, 1945.[10]

Late in 1944 the authorities at University College agreed to re-open the School. It was intended at that time that the London University School should be the only school in London and that it should serve both the ordinary needs of education for librarianship in the London area, and also certain specialized national needs. As a university school it would, of course, attract graduates throughout the country. It would also be in a good position to provide opportunities for advanced study and research, and courses on various special aspects of librarianship that would possibly be outside the scope of the ordinary schools. Courses for Commonwealth, European and other overseas students could also be provided. It was also envisaged that training courses for tutors for the other library schools would be carried out there.[11]

In June 1945 Raymond Irwin, County Librarian of Lancashire, and a member of the L.A. Council, the Planning Committee and the Education Sub-Committee was appointed Director of the School, and it re-opened in October, 1945. In addition to its normal diploma courses it also provided refresher courses for ex-service librarians studying for the L.A. examinations. Before the war the School had provided two types of courses for its diploma: a one year course for graduates and a two-year course for non-graduates. The School was under great pressure owing to the fact that it was providing courses for ex-servicemen a full academic year before the new library schools were opened, but the two-year diploma course for non-graduates was not continued after the first two years. The new library schools, once they had got under way, made adequate provision for non-graduates; and the London School became solely a post-graduate institution. In the immediate post-war years, however, (1945 - 1948) it did continue its "refresher" courses for non-graduate ex-servicemen in preparation for the L.A. Final examination. Part-time courses were also provided during this time, but as normal conditions returned it became solely a full-time school. About thirty graduate students were accepted each year for the one-year diploma course in librarianship for graduates from 1947 onwards, and this established itself as the normal pattern. In each of the academic years 1945/6, 1946/7 and 1947/8 ex-service students were accepted for one-year full-time courses leading to the L.A. Final Examination.[12] In 1947 a one-year

full-time course for graduates leading to a Diploma in Archives was instituted as a permanent part of the work of the School.

It was realized in the Autumn of 1945 that the London University School of Librarianship could not satisfactorily cope with all types of students of librarianship in the London area, and at its first post-war meeting of October 16th, 1945 the Education Committee resolved that a suitably situated Technical College in London, not too near University College, be considered for a second library school.[13] Such a school was in fact opened among the first batch of the new post-war schools in September, 1946. Even then it was intended that this school should confine itself to registration courses, leaving finals courses to the University School, but in the event the City of London College did provide courses for finals as well from its inception.

In 1949 the London University School established its diploma definitely on a post-graduate basis, with the approval of the L.A. ,[14] and from that time a clear division of functions has been maintained between the London University School and the Technical College schools, including the other London School.

The relationship between the Library Association and the London University School of Librarianship had been fixed in 1919 when the School was established. The government and administration of the School were the responsibility of the authorities of University College, London; but there was an advisory body, the School of Librarianship Committee, which consisted of the Provost

of the College and the Director of the School (both ex officio), six members nominated by the College Committee and six by the L.A.

The most contentious matter that arose from the relationship was the equation to be made between the Diploma examinations of the College and the L.A.'s own examinations. The bringing in of a new L.A. syllabus after the war meant that this question had to be re-opened in 1945. The matter was considered in the first place by the L.A. Assessors, and acting on their recommendations, the Education Committee, on December 5th, 1945, resolved that provided the External Examiners of the London University School of Librarianship were approved by the L.A., successful candidates for the Diploma should be granted exemption from the whole of the Registration Examination and from parts 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the Final Examination.[15]

This equation came to be regarded by many as over generous to the University School. On general grounds of principle it could hardly be denied that it tended to undermine the L.A.'s declared policy statement of December 1946, that the "Final Examination of the L.A. in its entirety be regarded as the supreme qualification for librarianship, and whilst teaching by Universities will be welcomed no diploma or degree issued by them will be regarded as a complete substitute." F. G. B. Hutchings, who was elected Chairman of the Education Committee at the meeting next after that of December 5th, 1945, and who was responsible for the December 1946 policy statement, recommended to the Education Committee in a memorandum of October 12th

1948, that in his view University College Diplomates should be granted no exemption from the L.A. Final Examination. [16]

On more personal grounds the equation came to be seen as unfair to graduate students at the new library schools. Both the full-time courses at the London University School and at the new library schools were of one year's duration for university graduates, but the latter course led to the Registration Examination while the former led to a qualification that was equated with all but one part of the Final Examination. In a Report to the Education Committee on January 27th, 1949, J. C. Harrison, Head of the Manchester Library School, expressed dissatisfaction with this state of affairs on behalf of the directors of the new library schools. He pointed out that of sixty British graduates then attending library schools thirty-five were at the new schools, almost all of them honours graduates and one a Ph.D. [17] After considering the Report the Education Committee appointed a Sub-Committee to formulate an agreed recommendation on the exemptions to be granted to Diplomates of the London University School of Librarianship and to consider the question of increased provision of post-graduate courses in librarianship. It consisted of F. G. B. Hutchings, J. C. Harrison, R. Irwin and E. Osborne. [18]

This Sub-Committee reported on March 31st, 1949. Its main recommendation was that Diplomates of the London University School should be exempted from the Registration Examination and from parts 1, 2 and 4 of the new Final Examination. It also considered the possibility of establishing a post-graduate School of Librarianship at

one of the provincial universities, and while agreeing in principle decided to delay further consideration. [19]

The provincial university that had showed the most interest in providing a library school in the immediate post-war period, had been University College, Nottingham; so it will be convenient next to outline the ultimately abortive negotiations between the Library Association and University College, Nottingham, to establish a library school there.

IV Abortive Negotiations with University College Nottingham for the Establishment of a Second University Library School

This College had already provided part-time courses in librarianship for L.A. Examinations, so the L.A. began negotiations in 1944 with the College authorities for the establishement of full-time courses there. The results of these negotiations were reported to a joint meeting held by the Emergency and Planning Committees on September 27th, [20] and to the Education Sub-Committee at its meeting of October 26th, 1944.[21] The College made two conditions, which it regarded as indispensable: (1) Although one year's tuition might be sufficient for graduates, not less than two years' for non-graduates would be consonant with the standing of a College course; and (2) The College must set its own examinations.

The latter condition in particular made it very difficult for the L.A. , which had already decided that it must be responsible itself for all examinations. The College, however, was quite keen to start a full-time course, particularly a post-graduate one. They wrote to the L.A. intimating that they were considering the establishment of a one-year full-time course for graduates leading to a Diploma of the College. They asked that recognition should be given by the L.A. to such a course; and they wanted to know whether the L.A. would be prepared to grant exemption from any part of their Final Examination in subjects of comparable standard, on condition that the L.A. were considered in the appointment of external examiners. This letter came before the meeting of the Emergency Committee held on February 8th, 1945.[22] It was resolved to inform the College that it was most unlikely that the L.A. would recognize

the proposed Diploma for the purposes of registration, or for exemption from the whole or part of its examinations. Having noted that the College prepared candidates for certain external examinations, such as those of the Institutes of Chemistry and Physics, and the Law Society, they also resolved to suggest to the College that they might do the same in the case of the examinations of the L.A.

The L.A. took a long time to make its mind up finally on this point. University College, Nottingham took no steps towards actually starting a post-graduate course in librarianship in October, 1945, but raised the matter again in 1946. By this time the L.A. had reverted to its normal peace-time constitution, and the matter was referred to the Education Committee, who discussed it at their meeting of April 3rd, 1946, under the chairmanship of F. G. B. Hutchings.[23] At this meeting it was resolved that while the internal examinations of the College would not be recognized as giving exemptions from L.A. examinations, a school of librarianship at University College Nottingham would be welcomed on the understanding that students were trained for L.A. examinations.

When Hutchings reported this resolution to the L.A. Council meeting on April 4th, 1946, however, his Committee was asked to withdraw it, and to report back on the whole question of examinations in librarianship held by universities and university colleges. The matter was therefore brought up again at the meeting of the Education Committee on July 3rd, 1946.[24] At this meeting it was moved and seconded that the setting up of other Examining Bodies in Librarianship be discountenanced, but the motion was lost by 5 votes to 8. No final

decision was reached, however, that could be reported to the Council; and it was resolved that a memorandum on the matter be prepared and presented to the next meeting by Hutchings.

University College, Nottingham was asking the L.A. to give the same recognition to any School of Librarianship it might establish as it had already accorded to the School of Librarianship at University College, London. Hutchings, in his Memorandum, argued that this precedent was not a good one to follow.[25] In the first place the parallel was not exact since University College, Nottingham, unlike London University, had no power to confer degrees, and was therefore primarily concerned with preparing students for the examination of other bodies.[26] (The fact that it might become a University was besides the point at that stage). He had been asked to report on examinations but the Committee could not have wanted him to undertake a criticism of the examinations, both past and present, of the London School; that might have been invidious. What they did require was an analysis of the question whether the L.A. should abrogate its examination rights to other agencies.

By its Charter the L.A. was the supreme authority in matters of professional qualifications, and if its influence was to be maintained and developed it must retain this authority.

The position regarding the London School of Librarianship was that although six members of its Committee were nominated by the L.A., this Committee did not, in fact, have any power in the government of the School. Both external and internal examiners were appointed by the

University without reference to the L.A., The London School had been established in 1919 with the help of the Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees as something of an experiment in full-time tuition in librarianship, with the L.A. committed to its support. It did not follow that because this had happened it was necessarily right; and doubt might be expressed whether wholesale exemption from L.A. examinations accorded to students who had obtained the Diploma was sound. Certainly, if the attitude of other professions towards their professional qualifications was considered, it would seem unwise for the L.A. to make concessions to other teaching institutions which might lead to the substitution of an outside examination for the Final Examination of the L.A.

Moreover, the L.A. was committed to a number of schools at Colleges of Commerce, and nothing should be done at that stage to lessen their effectiveness. Members of the L.A. had the right to ask whether that policy was good or bad; but it was agreed policy, and as such should not be weakened by the introduction of alternatives which might carry with them the cachet of what might be regarded as a superior teaching institution. The practical problem of the full-time schools had been finding full-time tutors. That had been largely achieved, and with it had begun the creation of a body of teaching experience which, with the School at University College, London, would form the foundation for any future developments in full-time tuition. These schools might not be the last word in professional training; but any changes which might be made should be orderly and controlled and not haphazard.

This Memorandum was presented to the Education Committee at its meeting of December 4th, 1946, and the following resolution, based on it, was passed: "Resolved to recommend that the Final Examination of the L.A. in its entirety be regarded as the supreme qualification for librarianship, and whilst teaching by Universities will be welcomed no diploma or degree issued by them will be regarded as a complete substitute."

The Council of the L.A. accepted this recommendation and it became the official policy of the Association. University College Nottingham felt obliged to abandon the idea of providing a library school, and other universities were deterred from taking up such an idea.

The profession had to wait until 1964 for a second university library school, but in the meantime schools of librarianship had been successfully established in technical institutions, and it will be convenient next to outline the negotiations that led to their establishment.

V The Establishment of Schools of Librarianship in Technical Institutions - First Phase, February to October, 1944.

As most universities were unable to consider the provision of schools of librarianship in immediate post-war circumstances, and those few who were found it impossible to meet the conditions laid down by the L.A., the L.A. was obliged to turn to other bodies.

At its meeting of February 1st, 1944 the Education Sub-Committee had already firmly made up its mind that if the universities proved unwilling to accept centralized control of examinations by the L.A., then schools of librarianship should be established in technical institutions that would be willing to accept this. Then followed the unpromising meetings with the University Grants Committee and the Committee of Vice-Chancellors, which made recourse to technical institutions inevitable.

In September 1944, L. R. McColvin and P. S. J. Welsford, Hon. Secretary and Secretary respectively of the L.A., went to Loughborough to see Dr. Herbert Schofield, Principal of Loughborough College, and Vice-Chairman of the Council, and Hon. Secretary of the Association of Technical Institutions; and put to him a plan for one-year full-time courses for the L.A. examinations in technical institutions. Schofield welcomed the plan and became an enthusiastic supporter and advocate of the whole project for library schools in technical colleges. There is no doubt that his personal backing for the project, and the energies he devoted to carrying it into practice, were a major factor in ensuring its success.

At their meeting McColvin, Welsford and Schofield drew up a list of nine technical institutions which they thought would be suitable locations for library schools. The L.A. representatives had a good idea which provincial cities would make the most suitable centres for library schools, and Schofield was able to propose actual institutions whose principals and governing bodies might be expected to receive the idea sympathetically. The Education Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee, at its meeting on February 1st, had suggested Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow or Edinburgh, and Cardiff or Bristol as suitable locations for provincial schools, but by September it was considered that from six to nine schools would be required. The actual colleges chosen at this meeting were the City of Birmingham College of Commerce, Brighton Technical College, Cardiff Technical College, North Gloucestershire Technical College (Cheltenham), Leeds College of Commerce, Loughborough College, Manchester College of Technology, Newcastle-on-Tyne Municipal College of Commerce, and the Heriot-Watt College, Edinburgh. Cheltenham was, no doubt, the nearest suitable college to Bristol, and Loughborough was Schofield's own college: otherwise the places chosen had all the necessary facilities in the way of large libraries of various kinds that the L.A. had always regarded as important. The smallest of the remaining seven was Brighton, but it was thought at the time that there should be no other school in London itself other than the one at University College, and Brighton was the most appropriate place outside London to serve the South East.

By this time the Examinations Sub-Committee had completed its work on the new syllabus, and this had been approved by the Council; so the L.A. representatives were able to put this before Schofield for his approval. One of the great virtues of technical institutions from the point of view of the L.A. was that the preparation of students for external examinations was their normal practice. Although this fact was lost sight of later, the new L.A. syllabus was drawn up with one year full-time courses for Registration particularly in mind; and although it came to be regarded as far from ideal for the purpose later, it was quite acceptable to Schofield and other technical college principals in 1944.

Another important point in favour of technical colleges was that they had had quite a lot of experience in preparing part-time students for the L.A.'s examination (under the old syllabus, which was framed for part-time study). McColvin and Welsford were able to put it to Schofield that what was involved was the same type of study, but on a more satisfactory, i.e. full-time, basis, with an extended scope and content.

Following this meeting Schofield wrote a circular letter dated September 28th, 1944, to the principals of the eight institutions, other than Loughborough, decided upon.[28] It ran as follows:

> I have been approached by the Hon. Secretary and the Secretary of the Library Association to know if it would be possible for certain of our Colleges to contemplate organising a full-time one-year course for the Intermediate Examinations of the L.A. A success in this course would enable a student to hold the Associateship of the L.A.

For the present it is contemplated that students would be those who are demobilized from the forces, into which they entered after a certain number of years in actual library service, during which time they had qualified for the Elementary Examination of the Association. Such students, on demobilization, would probably be seconded by their receiving authorities for the year's study and they would receive grants in aid under the Ex-Service scheme. After successful completion of this one-year course, students would return to the library service and there proceed to qualify for the Fellowship of the L.A., either through private reading or attendance at part-time classes.

It is thought that it ought to be possible to organize from six to nine Schools of Librarianship in suitable Technical Colleges. The L.A. would prefer the courses to be residential, but where this is not possible, it is regarded as essential that the courses should only be held where there are numbers of other full-time students taking different courses, and where there is, consequently, a student corporate life, with social and athletic amenities.

It is suggested that you might be prepared to initiate such a course in your College, and, if you agree, I am asked to invite you to attend a conference to be held at the Head Office of the L.A., Chaucer House, on Wednesday, 18th October, at 3.0 p.m.

This letter was well received by most of the principals, and all the principals appealed to either attended the Conference or sent their apologies and expressed interest in the scheme, except J. Cameron Smith, Principal of Heriot-Watt College, Edinburgh. He wrote to state that his college had not dealt with courses in librarianship in the past, and that while acknowledging the need for such courses and his sympathy with the objects of the Council, did not think he would be able to assist.[30]

The Conference took place as planned on October 18th, 1944.[31] The following principals were present: Dr. G. H. Austin, Leeds College of Commerce, E. Ivamy, North Gloucestershire Technical College, Cheltenham, J. Lamb, Newcastle on Tyne Municipal College of Commerce,

Dr. G. E. Watts, Brighton Technical College, Dr. A. Roberts, Director of the Department of Industrial Administration for the Principal, Manchester College of Technology, and Dr. H. Schofield, Loughborough College. Apologies for absence were received from the following principals: A. M. B. Rule, City of Birmingham College of Technology, and Dr. J. Stephenson, Cardiff Technical College.

The following representatives of the L.A. were present: E. Sydney, Borough Librarian of Leyton, L. R. McColvin, Hon. Secretary, R. Irwin, County Librarian of Lancashire, and P. S. J. Welsford, Secretary. Apologies were received from Dr. A. Esdaile, President, C. Nowell, Chief Librarian of Manchester, and H. M. Cashmore, City Librarian of Birmingham.

In addition, the Ministry of Education was represented by Dr. P. C. L. Thorne and G. A. C. Witheridge; and the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust by J. Wilkie.

Schofield, as Convener and Chairman, opened the proceedings by amplifying the points he had made in his letter of invitation. McColvin spoke next on behalf of the L.A. He pointed out that the L.A., over the previous few years, had been faced with one of the most serious difficulties it had ever had to face. One of its primary duties was professional education and the maintenance of the Register. Facilities before the war had been very inadequate: one full-time school, part-time courses at Technical Institutions, and "as a last resort" correspondence courses. They had not been able to keep up with the demand for qualified personnel; and it was necessary to make good the years lost by members who had joined the Forces before they

had completed their professional training. The least they could do was to enable them to complete this under the best possible conditions and as quickly as possible.

They had come to the conclusion that for proper training in librarianship tuition at full-time schools was needed. Part-time, and possibly correspondence, courses would have to continue for a time; but they hoped in time to make a full-time training as essential to the librarianship profession as it was to the teaching profession. Although there were many difficulties, there was one great advantage: a ready-made body of students in the ex-servicemen who were to be demobilized. They hoped that by setting up schools for these men, by which they did not mean exclusively for them, they would be able to establish a principle of full-time education which local authorities would come to accept as the ordinary method.

They were appreciative of the work being done in the way of part-time courses by Technical Institutions, and felt that full-time courses in them would meet their demands. They would be beginning a system that would undoubtedly expand. Some felt that a one-year course was not adequate, but they felt that if they could start a sufficient number of one-year courses for Registration, and possibly a rather smaller number for Finals, they would be doing all that was reasonable at that moment.

The L.A. examinations still in force were in three parts:- (i) Elementary, to test suitability for library work; (ii) Intermediate, which, with three years' practical experience, led to the Associateship; and (iii) Final, which qualified for the Fellowship. They had not

themselves been satisfied with that Syllabus; and the New Syllabus, which was before them, had been adopted by the Council of the Association. The Intermediate was to be replaced by a Registration Examination, which, unlike the Intermediate itself, which had been solely concerned with cataloguing and classification, would be a general examination covering most of the field of librarianship, and would justify them in regarding men who had passed it as qualified practising librarians. The Final was to cover a much more advanced stage, and would introduce special subjects such as university librarianship, children's work, archives, etc. They hoped that some of the Institutions providing training for Registration would give tuition for Final.

There were about 2,000 L.A. members in the Services, of whom 240 were F.L.A.'s and 500 A.L.A.'s. From the F.L.A.'s would come some of the teaching staff, and also some wanting refresher courses. Many of the A.L.A.'s would wish to take Finals courses. So far as the Registration courses went, if they catered for about 200 students a year for five years, they should be able to meet the bulk of the demands, and also have a reasonable hope of achieving that number of students. They needed advice on the size of the schools. Some might have 30 to 35 students and employ two full-time tutors. One or two might provide for the Registration Examination only with smaller classes of 20 to 25, and have one full-time tutor with part-time assistants. Tuition could be supplemented by other members of the College staff in subjects like literature, languages, etc. They might also have special lecturers for part-time teaching from libraries in the neighbourhood.

For tutors they wanted young men of about 30 who were fully qualified librarians with practical experience serving in the Forces. They "would come out of their work in libraries, not for ever but as a period [of up to five years] in their career during which they would be able to enlarge their own experience in the eyes of employers."

> The Students would be prepared for our examinations, which would maintain reasonable uniformity of standards, which at this stage is a desirable thing, andone of the features of our discussions which was so satisfactory was the fact that we were given to understand that you are accustomed to prepare for external examinations and had no objection whatever.

Questions of finance would have to be discussed. Ex-service students would be a great asset by giving some sort of guaranteed intake during the first years. If the first years were a success, they would have established the principle of full-time education. The L.A. was looking forward to very considerable improvements in the library service throughout the country. The Principals would be helping them, not only in the important task of training personnel, but also in the important task of achieving a proper library service for the country.

Thorne and Litheridge confirmed that the courses would have the general approval of the Ministry of Education, and that ex-service students would be qualified for grants for the courses.

All the Principals present agreed that there was no objection to preparing students for external examinations.

Ivamy raised the question of equipment. When they started a completely new course they needed some sort of figure to place before their governing body. McColvin replied that the equipment required was

obviously very moderate as regarded the library school itself. Practical work would be done in large libraries in the neighbourhood, and they would in effect be providing the most expensive part of the equipment. Close co-operation with the library in the area was absolutely essential. Austin confirmed that for their successful part-time courses in Leeds they had found they needed hardly any equipment at all.

They then went on to consider the matter of fees and costs. They worked on the basis of £500 as the cost of a course. This represented the average cost of one tutor at the current Burnham Scales. They thought that a fee of about £20 would be appropriate. Twenty students would bring in £400, and Schofield thought that there might be a deficit of £100, half of which could be paid by the Government and half by the Local Education Authority. He assumed that no L.E.A. would boggle at £50.

Lamb pointed out that everything depended on how much they would have to pay to attract tutors from library positions. Roberts was afraid that a salary of £400 would not attract sufficiently good men, but McColvin reassured the meeting by maintaining that they would be young men, and that they would not be intending to make tutoring their career. (It is nevertheless a view that hardly tied up with McColvin's original suggestion in his Report that the full-time tutors should be outstanding men).

At that time the appropriate salary scale for a full-time tutor in librarianship might have been something between £500 and £600.

Fortunately, before the posts were advertised a new scale had come into force, and the actual salaries offered were on the new Burnham Senior Assistant Scale of £600 to £750 or some similar scale. This award came in time to make all the difference.

The very difficult question of out-county fees was also raised, and Schofield pointed out that it was most important that students from say Shropshire ought to be able to go to say Birmingham, but no decision was reached.

On the question of obtaining staff McColvin felt that the simplest way would be for the Institutions to advertise, and they (the L.A.) would take steps to see that the advertisements reached all qualified librarians. The local city library might have a man available but not invariably; and, in any case, an outsider with no local obligations would perhaps do better. Austin thought a local man would get better facilities for his own library, but McColvin insisted that an outsider would do just as well.

Ivimy asked about the possibility of any other sources of income. McColvin suggested that if the Schools undertook part-time and correspondence work, which he felt ought to be allied to teaching institutions if run at all, it would bring in revenue, but also expense and other complications. Schofield thought that correspondence course work was definitely not in their field, and McColvin hoped that they would soon be doing so well that correspondence courses would become redundant.

Austin asked if there were any schemes for preparation for the Entrance Examination. McColvin replied that ex-servicemen would have

been in libraries before the war and would have taken the Elementary Examination. There was no need in any case to have tuition for the Entrance Examination. The idea was that in future a youngster would leave school at 16 to 18 and do a year's work in a library. In that time he would discover whether he liked library work, pick up knowledge, and pass the examination, which would be purely a test of whether he had used the year to the best advantage, and whether it was worth sending him to a school. They hoped they would be able to attract an increasing number of Higher Schools students, or those who had been at school till 18.

Ivamy asked if the Registration Examination was to be for women as well as men. McColvin replied that it would be, and that they would have to try to achieve a balance. The tendency was for more women to enter the profession, but they wanted to offset this if possible and maintain the existing balance.

Roberts stated that he did not think there would be any grave difficulties about the financial questions, and provided that permission was given by the Higher Authority to employ a full-time tutor he was looking forward to getting the scheme into operation by October, 1945. Austin and Lamb could say nothing definitely until they had approached their governing bodies, but they thought they could do it. Ivamy could see no difficulty. Watts had placed the scheme before his governing body and they had received it very well indeed. Most of the questions he had had it in mind to ask had been asked and answered. He had had a short preliminary talk with C. Musgrave, Chief Librarian of Brighton, and he had promised to help as much as possible.

Schofield asked if they ought to have included any-one else, and Thorne asked about London. McColvin replied that they had thought it diplomatic to leave London to the University, because they felt they ought to have a London School in operation as soon as possible. There were certain functions it could perform, including the training of allied and dominion students. They were negotiating with the University to get the London School re-established, but they did not know when this would be yet, and if the negotiations fell through they would have to ask their help again.

Schofield asked about Scotland, and Wilkie replied that the trouble there was the Block Grant. To establish a new department there would involve more expense.

Wilkie also said he was looking forward to the day when it might be possible for the Ministry of Education to establish a National Certificate in Librarianship, like those in subjects such as engineering, to be run in conjunction with the L.A. McColvin felt that they had a national certificate in their own Registration Examination, and it would be a disadvantage if local authorities had to assess the value of two certificates. Roberts pointed out that at the age when Registration was to be taken, 19 or more, a good man was already at National Certificate level, and was entering the higher level. McColvin said they had to train people also for university, school and research libraries, and they preferred in the existing state of librarianship that the examinations should not be disturbed. There were future possibilities in Wilkie's suggestions, but they would prefer to avoid any complications at that stage.

Ivamy pointed out that one difficulty about a single-year course was that there was no overlap, and that second-year students could not "bring on" first year ones. McColvin said they had determined on a one-year course chiefly because they felt it was the maximum period of leave of absence would be granted at that time. Irwin suggested that if they could persuade local authorities to start with one-year courses, they would hope in time to get on to two-year courses, and make these compulsory training for librarians.

Ivamy pointed out that the dates mentioned for starting, September and October 1945, assumed that the war would be over by the beginning of 1945. Schofield asked those Principals who had not got the consent of their governing bodies to obtain it and let him know. The L.A. would then publish a list of all the schools that would be available, get the information publicized and sent out to the Forces, and give them some indication of possible recruitment. They should have time to appoint one full-time member of the staff well in advance in order for him to be able to get all his contracts with local public libraries and so on organized.

Roberts asked if the L.A. had considered setting up a short intensive course for prospective tutors. McColvin felt that such a course would be very desirable, as those concerned would have been away from their libraries for five years. If the London School was able to start at Easter, they might have a course there: otherwise the L.A. would regard it as their duty to arrange one. There was the question of their maintenance while they were on the course, but

Schofield thought the Ministry of Education would agree to provide for this. Eight men prepared to take these jobs having a course of six to twelve weeks would cost very little compared with some of those being given. Witheridge confirmed that such a course would qualify for grants as a refresher course.

Welsford stated that there were a good many people who were Associates who would want to work for the Final, and asked which schools should give Final as well as Registration courses. McColvin thought they ought to make their views known to the general body of librarians and ask for names to be put on a waiting list. There had been many young entrants during the war years who would want to take the Registration course, and he had no doubt that local authorities, who were willing to give leave of absence to service men, could extend the scheme to other people on their staffs. For the Final they would have to have close association with good public libraries, and also with special libraries. He suggested Manchester, Birmingham or Leeds, Cardiff, and one place in Scotalnd as the most suitable locations.

Roberts said they would regard it as a public duty to do what they could in Manchester; Austin said they could possibly arrange for one; Schofield said Cardiff had agreed; and Lamb said if they ran the Intermediate they would also run the Final.

Ivamy asked whether when a man came down he would have any qualifications or not. McColvin replied that after three years' service (the School counting as one year and military service up to six months) he could be registered as a qualified librarian. This would

decide whether a man could be transferred from the clerical to the professional grades of local government staff.

Ivamy asked if they would have to consider accommodation for both sexes. Welsford replied that they would, because normal entry included rather more women than men, but a greater number of the former resigned after a few years. The L.A. regarded residence in a hall or hostel as highly desirable for students, and in view of Clause 41(3) of the new Education Act, it was hoped that many more Technical Colleges would have such provision in a few years.

The results of this Conference were reported to the Education Sub-Committee at its meeting of October 26th, 1944.[32] McColvin was able to tell the Sub-Committee that nine or so technical institutions were willing to provide full-time library schools. The prospective directors of these schools would be trained at the London University School of Librarianship: at least one full-time director would be needed at each school, and where students numbered thirty-five or more a director and a tutor. These tutors would be chosen by a combined advertisement for the whole country; the salary would be about £400 for directors, but it was envisaged that they would be young. The posts would be open to men and women then serving in the forces, and work would begin immediately the war was over and the candidates were released. As soon as possible a campaign of publicity aimed at local authorities and libraries would have to be undertaken, so that grants and/or leave of absence might be given to students. Another publicity campaign would have to be aimed at prospective students, so that they

might make their intentions clear. The L.A. would then be able to gauge the potential demand and the parts of the country from which it came. The Sub-Committee approved all these steps.

Meanwhile those Principals who had agreed to start the courses had begun the necessary negotiations with their own governing bodies, local librarians and local education and library authorities. Schofield made sure that none of them evaded their responsibilities.

VI The Establishment of Schools of Librarianship in Technical Institutions - Second Phase, October 1944 to January 1947.

On October 23rd, 1944 Schofield wrote to all the colleges who had been represented at the Conference of October 18th reminding them that they had promised to let him know as soon as ~~possible~~ their Governing Authorities had approved the institution of the full-time librarianship courses at their colleges.[33]

Manchester could not give this final assurance until the following July, and there were similar difficulties at most of the other colleges. At Leeds they were worried about whether the course would definitely rank for a government grant in the ordinary way, and they would not proceed until Schofield had obtained written confirmation from the Ministry of Education that this would be the case.[34] Brighton, Cheltenham and Loughborough were the first to obtain full approval for their courses, Newcastle obtained it towards the end of November and Leeds in December.

In February 1945 the L.A. sent a circular letter to all library authorities in the United Kingdom to seek their agreement in principle to the grant of leave for ex-service men and women to attend full-time schools of librarianship.[35] This letter informed the authorities of the plans the L.A. had made, and sought:

> to request the sympathetic practical interest of your Council on their behalf in a way which will benefit your own service as well as the individuals concerned.
>
> To minimize the hardship upon individuals through war service at a critical period in their professional training, we have arranged, with the agreement and co-operation of the Ministry of Education, for the establishment of full-time courses

in librarianship at (at present) eight colleges of technology in various provincial cities, where students will be prepared for our examinations and enabled to complete the studies they had already begun.

The courses of study for A.L.A. and F.L.A. would each take one academic year, and in some cases it might be possible to complete in one or two terms; so no-one would need to be away for more than one academic year. The schools would not be able to accommodate all ex-servicemen simultaneously, so they would have to be spread over five years or more. They understood Government assistance would be available under the Further Education and Training Scheme...

To restore the efficiency of your own staff, I am to request most earnestly that your Council will give favourable consideration to the grant of leave of absence for full-time attendance at a School. Anxiety about their professional future is worrying most of the men on service, and, whilst they express gratitude for the arrangements we have been making, they cannot be reassured until they know that they will be allowed to take advantage of them, and a decision in principle by your Council will give them ~~greater~~ the greatest encouragement in their present difficult circumstances.

At a meeting of the L.A. Emergency Committee on May 24th, 1945 the opening of the first schools, and the appointment of the necessary staff by the respective authorities, was considered; and it was decided to appoint a Sub-Committee to meet three members appointed by the Association of Technical Institutions to consider these matters.[36]

This meeting took place on July 23rd, 1945.[37] The L.A. was represented by L. R. McColvin, G. V. R. Hayward, R. Irwin, C. Nowell, and W. C. Berwick Sayers. The A. T. I. was represented by A. Roberts, E. Ivamy and H. Schofield. W. Stewart, representing the Scottish Library Association, and P. S. J. Welsford, Secretary of the L.A. were also present. Schofield was elected Chairman. Its remit was "to consider the date and place for opening the first school/ or schools

and the steps to be taken to appoint teaching staff". Welsford stated that one hundred and five local authorities had agreed in principle to grant leave of absence to members of their staffs serving in the forces to attend the proposed schools. He also reported that about twelve members had already been discharged; and that enquiries about vacancies at the schools had come from parents of new entrants and from temporary assistants. The demobilisation of the majority of members still in the forces was not likely to take place before the following year.

Schofield thought there might be sufficient demand for one school that year, but stated that courses could run from the commencement of any term during the year, and not necessarily from September only. Roberts, however, was not so happy about this sort of plan and preferred a straight September commencement.

McColvin reported that the London University School would re-open that year under the new Director, R. Irwin; and that it might be as well to open one other new school in September, one in December, one at Easter and so on, so that students could enter on demobilisation rather than return to work first, as their temporary replacements could carry on in their place for the time being.

Discussion followed on problems of costs and accommodation, and the dates by which the various schools might open. It was thought London would open in October, 1945, Loughborough at Easter 1946, and Manchester and Cheltenham in September, 1946. A Scottish School might also open in 1946. A schedule of opening dates for the schools should be made known to all members, so that the schools opening first could

advertise for tutors.

Points were discussed regarding the advisability of restricting courses at first to training for the Registration Examination, as it would not be easy to fit in short courses for the Final, the difficulty of procuring the necessary tutors, many of the possible candidates being in the forces, and the salaries that might be offered.

It was felt that £450 would not attract the best men, but the Chairman reported that under the new Burnham Scale salaries would be improved and that the "Senior Assistant" grade would be £600 x 25 to £750. McColvin said this would prove very attractive, and might well attract younger chief librarians.

The new salary scales would, however, mean that at the level of fees originally intended (about £20 per session) the courses would no longer be self-supporting, and there was much discussion on this point. Schofield emphasized that ex-service students would be grant-aided, and that the amount of the fees was not likely to be questioned. Roberts pointed out that similar training schemes instituted by the Institute of Labour Management had been "snowed under" with applications at a fee of about £25 a term. Schofield stated that government grants would be generous, and Berwick Sayers suggested that the fees should be at least £40, as it was not fair to either colleges or students that the standard should be less or the training cheap as compared with other professions. It was agreed that the scale should not vary too much between colleges, the appropriate amount being from £40 to £50, taking as a general basis the average cost for training teachers.

Stewart raised the question of the proposed Scottish School. There were many difficulties, including the location of the school and a guarantee of sufficient number of students to ensure a self-supporting school. McColvin said that probable numbers could only be ascertained after the members of theL.A. had been circularised; but that the Scottish School might be filled by taking some English students if necessary.

Ivamy asked whether an average of 360 students passing out from the schools each year could be absorbed into jobs, as he would have to be in a position to advise students; and McColvin replied that 200 was a safe figure. There might well be an increase in the number of jobs in special libraries, the libraries of industrial firms, and so on. It would be a matter of adjustment between technical colleges and the L.A. to see that no more were trained than could be absorbed.

Stewart asked what the position would be for those members desiring leave of absence and grants who had not served in the forces. McColvin replied that

> if the schools demonstrated the value of full-time training local authorities would agree to the release of library staff with pay, as they did with teachers. They must have faith to go forward, as to press the point now by specific enquiry might prejudice the future, and diplomacy was needed. The idea was not new and local authorities must be shown the value of such training when applied to the library service.

Roberts mentioned a parallel scheme in the history of the Pharmacists' Schools; and Schofield stated that there was good ground for optimism, as so many commercial firms as well as public authorities had begun to recognize their responsibility for seconding staff for full-time training that the principle was being further extended.

Ivamy asked if the L.A. would back him in his efforts to get the Ministry of Education, through the Ministry of Works, to allow him to obtain housing accommodation at Cheltenham for the students; and this was agreed.

Schofield gave an assurance that the right to a grant would not be lost by a member returning to his library work before entering a school.

It was confirmed that the announcements should be made of the opening of the schools as arranged, that every member in the forces be told of the proposals, and that notices be inserted in the L.A. Record, etc. The L.A. would also help in obtaining tutors. If the demand was great more schools might be opened in 1946.

The report of the Sub-Committee was approved at a meeting of the Emergency Committee of July 24th, 1945; and it was resolved by the Committee that as soon as the approximate dates of opening of the first schools were known a communication should be sent to all members and former members in the services informing them of the facilities available, and asking them whether they would prefer to go straight to the library school on demobilization or return to their libraries first.[38] They would also be asked which school they would desire to attend, and they would be advised to apply to their chief librarians for the necessary leave of absence.

Schofield immediately began negotiations with the Principals of the colleges concerned to get them to confirm the dates they would be willing to open.[39] Apart from Birmingham, which backed out of the whole scheme owing to some local difficulties, they were all willing

to start, but many did not want to commit themselves until a sufficient number of students was guaranteed. London University School was definitely going to start in October 1945, however, and Loughborough, Manchester, and Cheltenham committed themselves to a 1946 start. The circular letter was sent to about 3,000 members and former members in the forces in October 1945. They were asked to state their preferences from a list which comprised Brighton, Cardiff, Cheltenham, Leeds, London, Loughborough, Manchester, Newcastle and a Scottish School at Edinburgh or Glasgow. By this time Leeds was willing to open in January, Loughborough after Easter, and the rest, apart from Scotland, in September 1946. Even before the circular letter was sent out it was clear that more prospective students would opt for London as a centre than could be accommodated at the University School, and at the meeting of the Education Committee at which the draft of the circular letter was approved on October 16th, 1945 it was resolved that a suitably situated Technical College in London, not too near University College, should be considered for a second London Library School.[40]

At a meeting of the Education Committee on February 6th, 1946, Welsford reported on the replies to the circular letters.[41] Of about 3,000 questionnaires circulated to serving members and ex-members about 500 replies had by that time been received. Out of the three provincial schools that had definitely undertaken to open in 1946, there were sufficient numbers of prospective students for Manchester and Loughborough, but not for Cheltenham. About 20 had stated a preference for Leeds and Newcastle respectively, and the Committe resolved that they should both be asked to open that year. A large number wished to

study in London, and the City of London College was to be asked to consider the establishment of a school for registration only. A sufficient number had opted for a Scottish school to render its establishment desirable, and a meeting was to be convened of representatives of the Scottish Library Association, the Education and Public Libraries Committees of Edinburgh and Glasgow and the Chairman of the L.A. Education Committee. The Chairman was authorized to make arrangements with any of the other schools as soon as a sufficient number of prospective students revealed themselves.

This meeting also approved a draft advertisement for the appointment of tutors submitted by Loughborough, and this appeared in the Library Association Record in March, the first of its kind.[42] For the post of Senior Lecturer-in-Charge F.L.A.'s were required and the salary offered was on the new Burnham Technical Senior Assistant scale (£600/25/750 for men and £480/20/600 for women). For the post of Assistant Lecturer chartered librarians were required and the salary offered was on the Burnham scale £300/15/525 for men and £270/12/420 for women. The Senior Lecturer was also to be reponsible for the college library and the Assistant Lecturer was to be assistant librarian.

The L.A. was anxious that all the schools should offer similar salary scales, but they did not do so. Manchester advertised in June on the scale £475/15/602,[43] the City of London College in July on the Burnham Scale for teachers plus London allowance, and, it was hoped, a special responsibility allowance of up to £100.[44] Leeds and Brighton advertised in August, Leeds on Burnham Technical Award

plus a special responsibility payment, and Brighton on the Senior Assistant Scale £600/25/750.[45] Newcastle advertised in September on the latter scale.[46]

The L.A. went to a great deal of trouble to ensure that these advertisements met with a good response; and the Secretary and Honorary Secretary, and individual members of the Education Committee and the Council, got into contact with librarians known to them who they thought would be properly qualified, and interested in this type of work, to ask them to apply.[47] All the posts were filled.

By the April meeting of the Education Committee 100 people had stated their preference for London, and the L.C.C. and the authorities of the City of London College had agreed to open in September for a registration course, and to start a final course if and when required.[48] There was not such a big demand for Brighton, and the Principal of the Technical College there preferred to open in January of 1947 unless there was evident need for an earlier opening. Loughborough, Manchester and Leeds were all ready to open in September. There were still insufficient prospective students for either Cardiff or Cheltenham and neither of these schools came into existence.

Negotiations for the Scottish and Newcastle Schools continued. In the end Newcastle decided to do as Brighton had decided to do and to open in January 1947. On April, 16th 1946 the Scottish Library Association called a meeting of various Scottish educational and library interests to consider a recommendation that a School of

Librarianship be established in the Commercial College at Glasgow; and with the help of the L.A. were successful in persuading the Glasgow Education Committee and the College authorities to establish such a school.[49]

The Schools which actually opened in September/October 1946 were Glasgow, Leeds, Loughborough, Manchester and the City of London College; Brighton and Newcastle followed in January 1947.

In order to add depth to this account of the establishment of the new library schools I will take one particular school - Manchester - and examine its foundations in more detail.

VII The Establishment of the Manchester School of Librarianship

Schofield's letter of September 28th, 1944 was addressed in the case of Manchester to Dr. J. E. Myers, Principal of the Manchester College of Technology. Myers passed it on to Dr. A. Roberts, Director of the Department of Industrial Administration, for his observations. Roberts consulted with Nowell, Chief Librarian of Manchester, and A. Hawkes, Chief Librarian of Wigan; and Nowell was very keen on his going to the proposed Conference at Chaucer House.[50]

At that Conference, on October 18th, 1944, Roberts was one of the most active speakers on the Principal's side, and was obviously quite keen on seeing a library school started at his College. He told the Conference that they had had a successful library school on a part-time basis at Manchester for many years.

When he had seen Nowell, Nowell had been able to convince him that the old Intermediate Examination had been sufficiently enlarged to provide enough work for a full-time twelve months course. Nowell and the chiefs of surrounding libraries were extremely keen that Manchester should be well to the forefront, and they were fortunate in that they had so many libraries of various kinds in the vicinity that could and would assist with facilities for practical work. It was considered that they would require one full-time tutor, but if they had to give full tuition for the Final Examination, two. Nowell said he was quite prepared to take up to thirty or forty people and give them the necessary training in practical work in the Manchester Public Libraries. Indeed, when they had looked through the Syllabus

together, Roberts had wondered what the full-time tutor would do, because it seemed to him that four out of six papers were of a practical nature!

Manchester was quite prepared to provide a library school, but they were in a curious position because the College of Technology was at the same time the City's College and the Faculty of Technology in the University. The existing library courses were not run on the university side. Nowell had thought it would be possible to get some ex-service qualified people to spend a certain amount of time as tutors. There was the question whether Nowell's department would want some book entry for services rendered by his staff. He assumed that the full-time tutor would at once do the full-time tuition and organize a scheme of practical work of say six weeks in various sections of the main libraries. He did not think there were any grave difficulties about the financial question, and he thought the fees and tutor's salaries proposed were reasonable. Provided that permission was given by the higher authority to employ a full-time tutor, he was looking forward to getting the scheme in operation by October, 1945.

One of the things that worried Roberts, although he did not raise it at the Conference (and it seems to have worried no-one else) was that although the new Syllabus and training scheme had been approved by the L.A. Council, it had not been approved by the members of the L.A. at an annual general meeting; and, in his own words "everything depended on this."[51]

On October 23rd, 1944, Schofield wrote to Roberts and the other principals, reminding them that they had agreed to let him know as soon as their governing authorities had approved the institution of courses at their several colleges, and enclosing the official L.A. memorandum of the Conference. Roberts had already produced his own memorandum (dated October 19th) for Dr. Myers, and he sent a copy to Nowell.[52]

On October 25th Nowell wrote to Roberts to thank him for his memorandum, and continued:

> If the Principal agrees, then I presume the next step is a recommendation to the appropriate Sub-Committee of the Education Committee. I wonder if it would be wise to suggest that representatives of your Sub-Committee should meet representatives of the Libraries Committee, so that the scheme can be viewed from both angles. Perhaps that could come later when the scheme is approved in outline, subject to a subsequent report of details?
>
> I propose to report to the Libraries Committee in the hope that they will approve the scheme and recommend to the Council accordingly, but I wonder if it would be wise to do this before your Committee have agreed? Perhaps Dr. Myers would let me know, direct or through you, which he would prefer.

Nowell submitted his Report to the Libraries Committee on December 20th, but no immediate decision was taken.

In March 1945 the Town Clerk of Manchester, in common with those of all other library authorities, received the official letter from the Library Association informing them of the scheme for full-time schools of librarianship, and Nowell submitted another report, in lieu of the earlier one, in order to concentrate on the points raised in this letter.

In this report he pointed out that...

Hitherto the training of the staff of the Libraries has been mainly a personal effort on the part of each individual concerned. The facilities for combined study, for practical 'laboratory' work, for lectures, etc., have been sparse.

Organised training consisted of :
(a) Correspondence courses organized by the L.A.
(b) Lectures during the winter at the Manchester College of Technology on three of the subjects: Classification, Cataloguing and Library Administration. The class in Library Administration was intended for beginners only and did not attempt to cover more than an introduction to the work.

Correspondence courses are not recommended as anything more than an interim means of providing some tuition, and all concerned for the development of library work are agreed that systematic class instruction, with organised practical work in approved libraries within easy reach of the centre of instruction, is the only method that has a solid foundation.

As the centre of a large industrial region Manchester was chosen as an obvious centre for a School of Librarianship, and an agreed scheme will be submitted by the Head of the Department of Industrial Administration to the College of Technology Sub-Committee and (if approved) to the Education Committee.

It is impossible to estimate how soon this School could be inaugurated; all concerned with the proposal feel that the preliminary arrangements should be made without delay, and both the Ministry of Education and the L.A. are of the opinion that the proposal should be treated as one of urgency.

It is equally difficult to say when demobilization will begin and how soon the flow of ex-service librarians, male and female, will start; but it is most unlikely that all the Manchester staff members will all be released at the same time. At present there are forty men and forty-one women members of the staff serving in H.M. Forces, etc., and it is fairly certain that the majority of them, at all events, will desire to return as quickly as possible after the cessation of hostilities. It should not be impossible to feed these into the School at regular intervals, but this will, of course, involve a certain amount of continuing expenditure for temporary assistants to cover the period of the school training. On the other hand, as all the accepted Service

candidates will receive the government grant under the Hankey Scheme, no question of maintenance or fees arises.

Superannuation rights ... Doubtless the City Treasurer will have similar proposals from other departments and the Council will consider the problem as it affects the whole of their service employees.

This report was approved by the Libraries Committee on March 21st, 1945, and Nowell sent a copy to Roberts on the following day. In a covering letter he writes: "You will see that I have had to be satisfied with a war-time rehabilitation scheme, but I think this is the soundest method at the present juncture." The scheme still had to be approved by the Establishment Committee and the City Council, and this took a little time. It was approved, however, at a meeting of the Establishment Committee on July 17th, 1945.

As we have seen, demobilization after the official end of the War took place much less quickly than had been expected, so that there was in the end no question of Manchester or the other new Schools opening in 1945.[53] The L.A. was anxious, however, to get the college authorities to commit themselves to a definite start in 1946, so that it could include in the circular letter sent to members in the forces in October 1945 a list of schools from which they could choose their preferences. The college authorities, on the other hand, were naturally unwilling to commit themselves to a definite opening until a minimum number of students could be guaranteed.[54]

The authorities at Manchester were among the first to give the assurances the L.A. wanted; and by early February 1946 a sufficient number of prospective students had opted for Manchester to enable them to go ahead with an easy conscience. Some of the other principals had

been willing to open after Christmas or Easter if necessary; but Roberts had always preferred to start in September at the proper beginning of the academic year, and plans were made to open in September 1946. In June the post of Lecturer in Librarianship was advertized. J. C. Harrison, Librarian of the Branch Libraries Co-ordination Department, Liverpool Public Libraries, himself an ex-serviceman, was appointed Senior Lecturer-in-Charge; and Mrs ~~Miss~~ E. C. Gwynn, Sub-Librarian, University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, was appointed Assistant Lecturer. By September the courses were full, and the School opened on October 3rd, 1946 with 56 students (30 Registration and 28 Finals), by far the largest number at any of the Technical College Schools.

VIII The Reaction of the Profession to the New Educational Pattern

The main opposition to the Library Association's educational plans was led from the outset by the Association of Assistant Librarians. It may seem at first sight strange that the section whose chief function it was to represent the younger members of the profession should have taken up such a reactionary position. Apart from the fact that relations between the A.A.L. and the parent body had often been strained (and were still on other issues as well at this very time); it must be remembered that the A.A.L. was thinking of those members who were in the process of qualifying, and who therefore had everything to lose from a system that might make the process of qualifying more difficult. Moreover, the A.A.L. had a vested interest in the maintenance of non-full-time education as it was the body responsible for providing correspondence courses.

A. J. Walford put the arguments against full-time education for librarianship very forcibly in a letter to the Library Assistant, the official journal of the A.A.L., of January - February, 1944.[55]

> ... as to full-time library schools, Professional education has, in the past, been based largely on full-time library work in conjunction with evening study, and I can see little at fault with a system which allows the assistant, say, an afternoon and an evening per week to attend a library school or evening institute. Theory and practice then go, as they definitely should, hand in hand ... At least one year's full-time library school training divorced from practical work? That sounds to me very like a year's laze.

The A.A.L. did everything in its power to prevent the L.A. from putting its educational plans into operation. Their

constitutional means of doing so were very limited owing to the fact that the normal constitution of the L.A. was in abeyance during the war, and there were no elections and no annual general meetings. All the necessary powers were in the sole hands of the Council and the Emergency Committee. There can be little doubt that this arrangement, although it was none of their own choosing, and had been imposed on all professional associations by the Government for the duration of hostilities, suited McColvin and the inner core of the L.A. Establishment very well. It is difficult not to agree with McColvin, in spite of a belief in democracy, when he writes as follows in his Report.[56]

> As this matter is an urgent one, and in view of the impossibility during wartime of calling representative meetings, surely it is not asking too much to suggest that the Emergency Committee should be given full authority to proceed. Revisions, if necessary, can follow in the light of experience. The great thing is to put a sound and eminently desirable project into active operation as soon as the time for action arises. If we have to wait until all the delaying processes of pseudo-democracy have been duly performed we shall surely miss our opportunities - and deserve to miss them.

McColvin got his way and a direction was obtained from the Privy Council reserving to the Council all matters relating to post-war reconstruction in October 1942 at the time that his Report was received.[57]

Although it seems very likely that without some such resolute and positive policy nothing would have been achieved, one can understand the A.A.L.'s point of view that the whole procedure was undemocratic. As early as September 1942 the Council of the A.A.L.

communicated their view to the L.A. Council that any modification of the examination structure was undesirable;[58] and they submitted an unfavourable memorandum of their views to the Post-War Policy Committee that was set up to consider the recommendations of the McColvin Report. The A.A.L. point of view was more or less ignored by both Council and Committee; and when in September 1943 the Council approved the Report of the Post-War Policy Committee the A.A.L. representatives put forward a motion that no further action should be taken until an A.G.M. could be called and its approval obtained. This was defeated and the Planning Committee was set up to put the Post-War Policy Committee's proposals into effect.

The Post-War Policy Committee's Memorandum on Post-War Education was presented in September 1943 and the A.A.L. set up a Sub-Committee to consider it. The Memorandum of this Sub-Committee was approved by the Council of the A.A.L. for presentation to the L.A. in March 1944.[59] It contains some telling criticisms of the L.A.'s programme, but the positive alternatives suggested do not contain any suggestions as to how they might be put into practice. Its practicable proposals are undeniably backward-looking.

It accepts that "the major part of training should be carried out at library schools" [but] "does not agree with the method proposed, nor does it consider that library schools should entirely supersede qualification by private study."

The proposal that students should enter library schools after one year's service was quite impracticable. Very few local authorities

would be prepared to give the necessary leave of absence, or to make grants. Even if grants were conceded they might have an undesirable influence on salaries and freedom of movement. A one-year course would be quite inadequate to cover the syllabus for the Registration Examination: a period of about two years would be required, which would obviously make the proposal still more impracticable. As in the United States all full-time library school training should be completed before entry into the profession.

Two types of library school should be provided :-

(i) Universities, offering degree courses in librarianship, the examinations to be conducted by the universities since it was unthinkable that any university would allow its students to be examined by an outside body like the L.A., and

(ii) Colleges and Schools. These would offer (a) courses for external degrees in librarianship and (b) courses for examinations to be conducted by the L.A., and both full-time and part-time courses would be provided.

It proposed that part-time training should be retained and extended. The emphasis on the need for training in residential schools was exaggerated. Few could doubt that collegiate education was the highest form of education, but it was not necessary for vocational training. The main problem of library staffing was to secure the right type of entrant to the service - young men and women whose education had given them a real cultural background. Many more should be drawn from universities where they would already have had the

benefit of a collegiate education.

It was recommended that correspondence courses should be retained. In the long run the only standard by which a person's knowledge could be measured was his ability to pass an examination. It was doubted whether there would be enough library schools to cover the whole country without causing undue hardship and expense to students in sparsely populated areas. Moreover correspondence courses were an essential feature of many professions (e.g. accountancy, banking, insurance, etc.)

The L.A. took no action on this recommendation; and in December 1944 Irwin outlined the L.A.'s education programme to a Conference of the Council of the L.A. and Branch and Section Officers at Wadham College, Oxford. In it he made it crystal clear that the L.A. was going ahead: the new Syllabus was to be introduced on January 1st 1946, and steps had been taken to establish full-time schools of librarianship in tecnical institutions.

The A.A.L. decided that strong measures were needed, and they forced the L.A. to call a Special General Meeting on the requisition of fifteen members on June 21st 1945.[60] F. M. Gardner of Luton spoke first. He complained about the way the Council and the Emergency Committee were pushing through their plans without consulting the members, and claimed that there was a "deep and widening gulf between the Council and the members." In his opinion the proposed new Syllabus had so many faults that they could but "shake the confidence of members"; and he moved a resolution:

"That the projected syllabus be withdrawn for further consideration and that arrangements be made for one year courses on the present Syllabus for the Intermediate and Final Examinations."

Gardner believed that the Syllabus and Training Scheme rested on three theories, all of which were patently false:-

(i) That the Scheme would abolish leisure time study for students; but it was not envisaged that the Schools would be provided within the near or any specific future.

(ii) That Ex-Service students would benefit by the Syllabus; but it was more likely to injure them than help them, for any scheme should have been intended to help them to qualify as quickly as possible, and an ex-service student unable or unwilling to attend a full-time School of Librarianship would find his time of study lengthened.

(iii) That it would raise the standard of the profession; but no young man or woman would enter a profession in which he could not start until 19 and would not qualify till he was 27.

J. T. Gillett of Leeds, President of the A.A.L., seconded the motion, and it was supported, among others, by Miss M. Exley of Sheffield and opposed by G. B. Stephens of St. Marylebone, Lieut. R. Stokes, R.N.V.R. of Ilford, C. Nowell of Manchester and L. R. McColvin.

McColvin agreed that the new Syllabus was more difficult than the old, but it was one which covered the whole field of librarianship - not merely "one or two tricks of the trade" [cataloguing and classification]. It was better balanced and more

like other professional examinations. He continued:

> We hope that this will be a great opportunity to introduce into librarianship a gradually expanding system of full-time tuition. We are presented with a magnificent opportunity to get started without any financial expenditure. We shall never get this opportunity again unless we have another war. We opened negotiations immediately it was clear how educational experts regarded the Intermediate. It was obvious that we had to have a new Syllabus if we were to have a full-time course.

He also outlined the progress that had already been made towards getting the new scheme into operation.

After McColvin had spoken E. Cave of Southampton moved an amendment:

> That for a period of three years from January 1st, 1946, the new Syllabus and the old shall run concurrently, the old to be available only to those who have passed some of it prior to December 31st 1945. Early in 1948 a report on the working of the new Syllabus, and the Schools required for it, together with a report on local authorities' willingness to release staff for attendance at the full-time Schools, shall be presented to a meeting of the members of the Association, and this meeting shall offer direction to the L.A. Council on the most suitable syllabus of professional education.

This amendment was seconded by S. Woledge of the London School of Economics, and Gardner and Gillett withdrew their motion in favour of the amendment.

Irwin said that the amendment was not practicable, as two different syllabuses and two standards of qualification could not be current at the same time.

McColvin said that the new Entrance Examination was very similar to the old Elementary; and the Council had already agreed that those who had already passed one part of the old Intermediate should be given till the end of 1946, and a member of the Forces till 1947, to take the other part. The scope of the two Final Examinations was

was so similar that it did not "make the difference of a row of pins." They could not ask Education Authorities to maintain schools, or directors and tutors to take up appointments in them if they were only sure of three years.

The amendment was then put to the meeting and carried by 196 to 47. One being put as a substantive motion it was passed by a substantial majority.

The question of the legal authority of this meeting had already been raised at the meeting, and Sir Parker Morris, Hon. Legal Adviser to the Association, had given it as his opinion that although no Council would disregard the views of a General Meeting, it had no power to instruct the Council.

The Council considered the resolutions passed at the meeting on September 27th, 1945, and with regard to the above motion decided that "in view of the arrangements already provided for the equation of the new and existing syllabus, it was resolved that the proposal that these should run concurrently for a period of three years be not adopted."[61]

All the efforts of the A.A.L. were thus finally in vain, and the first L.A. Annual General Meeting to be held after the war, that of May 9th, 1946, gave the Council's educational programme its approval.

There is no doubt, however, that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in the profession at large with the L.A.'s educational plans; and it expressed itself in other ways as well as

through the A.A.L. This dissatisfaction took three main forms, which it might be clearer to enumerate before considering each of them in a little more detail. First, there were basic disagreements on matters of principle; the two main objections here - and it is perhaps significant that they were mutually contradictory - were : (i) full-time education was not appropriate for training librarians, and (ii) full-time education for librarianship should have been based on universities, or presumably, not be provided at all. Secondly, there were practical objections to particular provisions, particularly regarding the position of ex-servicemen about to be released. It was felt that it was most unfair that they should have to pass a more difficult examination when if they had not been called up they would already have passed an easier one of the same standing. It was true they were to be given a year's full-time course in order to enable them to pass it; but anxiety was felt on behalf of those who could not or did not wish to attend full-time courses. Thirdly, there were doubts about the practicability of the scheme, and criticisms of the way in which it was being carried out, however excellent it might appear on paper. There were the difficulties of library authorities and chief librarians in regard to the release of staff for one-year full-time courses, especially in smaller libraries; and many assistants were doubtful whether they would in fact be released. There was anxiety about whether the necessary grants would be forthcoming: even if they were fairly well assured for ex-servicemen in the immediate post-war period, what would be the future position? It was felt that there were

not going to be enough schools, especially when Birmingham, Cardiff and Cheltenham were abandoned; and there was much anxiety about the Scottish School, which very nearly did not materialize. There was also criticism of what was considered to be an unnecessarily late start.

So far as objections to the whole idea of full-time education for librarianship are concerned I should like to quote at length from the Presidential Address to the Library Association's 1947 Annual Conference by R. J. Gordon, an ex-chief librarian of Leeds. It is significant for two reasons: first, because it comes from one of the acknowledged leaders of the profession; and secondly because it gives concrete - and not unconvincing - arguments against full-time education.[62]

> We have moved far from those days when young assistants working hours of appalling length and difficulty, struggled to buy the few textbooks on librarianship then available, and once a year faced the ordeal of the L. A. Examinations. I wonder if we have moved in the right direction?... But librarianship had to follow the fashions of the day. If examinations were framed in school, university and the professions to make it possible for greater numbers to qualify, it naturally followed that the standards must be lowered. So, following the example set by educationalists, who select, somewhat casually I think, young people for a one-year course of lectures and turn them loose as teachers, we have decided that, after the Entrance Examination, one-year's instruction mainly by lectures is enough to allow a young assistant to become a Chartered Librarian. The products of our Library Schools are not, like teachers, imposing their minds on the immature, and to that extent the sketchiness of their training is not so disturbing; but it is nevertheless a serious matter, for the book is becoming more and more an instrument designed less for the objective presentation of ideas than for propaganda. The conditions today make it imperative that the public librarian, who controls what is perhaps the largest and most influential of the organizations still left to us which are concerned with the development of the individual mind, should be able to ensure that his library provides the means

whereby the citizen can obtain reliable and authoritative information on all matters of public concern. Can the librarian of the future develop the critical judgment necessary for this task if his training consists of instruction only; and if at a time when he should begin to broaden and develop his intellect, he is led to believe that he is a competent librarian? The technique of librarianship is important enough, but I believe the really vital aspects of librarianship cannot be taught; they can only be acquired through rigorous self-training, through observation, and, most important, through wide and critical reading. I do not for one moment suggest that it is either possible or wise for us to attempt to stem the swift current of educational misconceptions; we must go with the stream and provide our degrees, diplomas, and what-nots like the other fellow; but observing as we do in our work the spread of the diploma habit, let us be honest with our young colleagues and make it clear to them that when they are qualified under our scheme their real education in librarianship begins. If we want to train librarians "to have a right judgement in all things" we may well ask ourselves whether we are wise to mould our educational methods on lines which some of us believe have yet to prove their effectiveness.

Gordon's basic point, that a person cannot consider himself a mature professional librarian after one year's work in a library as a junior assistant followed by a year's full-time training at a Library School, can hardly be disputed. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why the year's full-time education should not help rather than hinder the development of those qualities which Gordon rightly regards as being of primary importance in a mature librarian.

A more common objection to full-time training was that it would be too theoretical. Frank Mason, Deputy Librarian of Wolverhampton, put this argument forward within the general context of service to readers in a paper read to a meeting of the Birmingham and District Branch of the L.A. in September 1946.[63] His general thesis was that many readers found library buildings too formidable, the catalogues and classification schemes used incomprehensible, and the

staff aloof and unsympathetic; and he went on to argue that the tendency in professional education towards full-time courses at colleges, thereby taking librarians away from contact with the public, would aggravate this situation by placing the emphasis on theoretical at the expense of practical considerations. Again, one can agree that the real needs of readers should have priority over theory and laboratory techniques; but there was no reason why lecturers and students at library schools should not be able to develop as much sympathy with readers' needs as practising librarians, perhaps more in so far as they had themselves "crossed the counter" and become library users instead of library administrators.

Quite a large and important minority of the profession thought that education for librarianship could only be carried out appropriately in universities; and some were unwilling to accept technical college courses even as the only practicable "second-best" alternative. A very forthright dismissal of the whole scheme as being on too low a level came from C. W. Musgrave, Chief Librarian of Brighton, at the Special General Meeting of June 21st, 1945, when he demanded that the new Syllabus should be withdrawn as being inadequate.[64] In his opinion it was unworthy of a profession which should be recognized as a learned profession, and "would make as many chartered librarians as Bachelors of Arts." He deplored the ~~discussion~~ dissociation of future training from the universities.

A more balanced view was put forward by Dr. R. Offor, Librarian of Leeds University, in his letter to the L.A.R. of February, 1945.[65]

There were two reasons for regretting the development of non-university training. First, there was the question of the quality of the education and the prestige of the qualification. And secondly, there was the fear that technical colleges would not be suitable agencies for training university librarians in particular:

> The university library staffs are small in comparison with public library staffs, and their work cannot be standardized as can public library work. But university libraries have witnessed a remarkable growth in recent years, and a great future is in front of them. It seems unlikely that members of university staffs would be released to attend whole-time courses at technical colleges.

Offor, however, was willing to accept the scheme as a kind of second-best, and to hope that at least one other university library school besides that at University College, London, would come into being; and this may be taken as the typical view of those who believed that ideally all courses in librarianship ought to have been university-based.

The attitude of the ex-servicemen themselves to the Scheme varied a great deal from individual to individual. An early letter in the L.A.R. put the point of view of those in favour:[66]

> When I was called up I had just completed the Intermediate Examination. The prospect of resuming the weary grind of spare-time study for the Final Examination frankly appals me. In 1940 I was unmarried; I shall return at the age of 30 with the responsibilities of a wife and child. When I entered the army I was earning £165 per annum. On 1st April this year my salary will stand at £255 per annum, including the war bonus. Being ambitious I would have hoped to have attained a higher salary than this at the age of 30 without the £50 bonus. I have lost none of my enthusiasm for a librarian's career. But I, and I feel that I speak for most in my position, would feel happier about the future if I could feel reasonably assured of two things: (1) A full-time course of training as a refresher for what I have forgotten through disuse, and to complete my formal

professional education. (2) At the end of the course promotion to a position reasonably commensurate with what I would have achieved during the years of absence.

R. J. Lee, an assistant from Reading Public Library serving in the forces, wrote that "a revised and more comprehensive syllabus will be a disadvantage to us but I believe it would be accepted as part of the price we shall all have to play for a better profession."[67]

Miss M. Mansell, an assistant from Durham County Library serving in the A.T.S. wrote to say how pleased she was with the new scheme ... "as it is only in full-time study that sufficient time is provided for social intercourse and cultural activities, and they are essential to a good librarian."[68]

Others, however, were not so happy about the scheme. A letter from R. G. Griffin of the Royal Institution made many of the points about it that were not inclined to occur to many ex-servicemen.[69] The age factor was very important. A man of 27 with family responsibilities might well view the prospect of a year's full-time course, albeit on a government grant, without enthusiasm. It also seemed unfair that while some other professions were relaxing their standards for ex-servicemen, the L.A. should be raising theirs for everyone without making any exceptions in favour of ex-servicemen.

Most of the practical anxieties about the way in which the scheme was actually working out were outlined in a letter from Roy D. Rates, Borough Librarian of Wrexham, of August 1946.[70]

He began by expressing

> considerable surprise and regret that the proposed school of librarianship at Cardiff may have to be abandoned. The

authorities made the scheme possible but the failure of a sufficient number of applicants has prevented its fulfilment.

Local authorities have, generally speaking, given verbal consent to tentative suggestions and plans for the returning servicemen of their staffs to take advantage of the Post War Training and Government Grants Scheme. Those authorities which are members of the National Joint Council are, in accordance with the terms of a circular from that body, committed to provide such facilities. But what has in fact been done, especially by smaller aithorities.

In public libraries of small towns up to 90% of trained staffs have frequently been absent on active service during the past six years. A chaotic mess is needing to be cleared up. In these circumstances it is hardly feasible to permit members leave of absence for qualifying or refresher courses, especially when such absence is up to a year. Even should one or two be allowed to go, it will be years before all have gained the same opportunity. That is why the proposed library schools are not receiving the applicants they had catered for.

The L.A. has so framed the new Syllabus that it is almost impossible to take it in one's spare time. What about the serviceman who finds himself faced with a more difficult Syllabus and no chance of taking up a Post War Training Scheme?

Some scheme of providing a pool of assistants recruited from war-time trained temporary assistants, who are now being replaced by returning servicemen, from which local authorities could draw reliefs for their ex-service staff while on the course might alleviate present troubles. The only obvious way out at present is for the determined student in the smaller libraries to resign his job to take a course. Maybe a mass exodus on these lines would force action.

It is easy to say long after the event that Rates took an unnecessarily pessimistic view of the obstacles to the success of the scheme; but there is no doubt that he was voicing real anxieties that were acutely felt at the time. So far as the objections in principle to the scheme are concerned there was no final answer as to who was right and who was wrong, and indeed the debate is still to some extent open; but so far as the practical objections are

AHIM LIB

concerned the fact was that the scheme did within its limits work well.

A sufficient number of potential students was able to get leave of absence, and in most cases grants, to enable all the schools except Cardiff and Cheltenham to open; and on the whole the balance between the number of places available at the schools and the number of candidates for them was nicely struck. No doubt a fair number of ex-servicemen, either because they did not wish to spend a year under full-time training possibly away from home, or because for various reasons they could not obtain the necessary leave of absence or grant, could not take advantage of the scheme, but in the event it did not prove impossible to take (and pass) the examinations after part-time study, and both correspondence and part-time tuition were provided as before the war. There was in any case much debate as to whether the examinations under the new Syllabus were more difficult or in fact easier than those of the old, and even the experts offered conflicting views. If it had ever been made compulsory for the whole of the Registration Examination to be taken andpassed at one sitting, as was originally intended, no doubt part-time study would really have been made more difficult; but in the event this clause was never applied.[71.]

PART I: NOTES

1 McColvin, L.R. The Public library system of Great Britain: a report on its present condition with proposals for its post war reorganization. Library Association, 1942.

2 L.A. Council Papers Ref. 13.5/1

3 These were rather misleading comparisons. Universities normally prepared law and medical students for their own degrees; and most of these students later, or sometimes at the same time, prepared for the examinations of the Royal College of Physicians, Law Society, etc., or were exempted therefrom.

4 L.A. Minute Book 1943 - 1945. ff 21 to 22.

5 L.A. Council Papers. Ref. 14(a). 2/1/2

6 ibid. Ref. 14(a) 3/1/2

7 ibid. Ref. 14(a) 5/1/2 and L.A. Minute Book 1943 - 1945. f. 103.

8 L.A.R. Vol. 47, p.4. In an article in Library Trends (Vol. 12, No. 2, Oct. 1963, p. 133) J. C. Harrison states that the University of Manchester was also approached, with Charles Nowell as the L.A.'s spokesman; but that "these semi-official negotiations proved a dismal failure."

9 L.A.R. Vol. 45, pp. 3 - 6

10 L.A. Minute Book 1943 - 1945. f. 103.

11 R. Irwin in L.A.R. Vol 45, pp 3 - 6

12 The make-up of the full-time student population for the first three academic years after the war was as follows :

	1945/6	1946/7	1947/8
One-year Diploma Course (graduates)	12	24	32
Two-year Diploma Course (non-graduates)	22 (1st yr.)	15 (2nd yr.)	0
Ex-Service Refresher Course for F.L.A.	4	22	11

13 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. 1936v.

14 ibid. 1948v., Meeting of March 31st, 1949

15 ibid. 1936v.,

16 ibid. 1948v., Meeting of January 27th, 1949

17 ibid.

18 ibid.

19 ibid. Meeting of March 31st, 1949. This meant that diplomates were exempted from 6 out of the 8 papers of the 1950 Final. They had been exempted from 5 out of the 6 papers of the 1946 Syllabus.

20 L.A. Minute Book 1943 - 1945. f.103

21 L.A. Council Papers Ref. 14(a) 51/2

22 L.A. Minute Book 1943 - 1945. f. 143.

23 L.A. Education Committee Minutes.

24 ibid. There were present at this meeting Messrs. F.G.B. Hutchings, H.M. Cashmore, L.R. McColvin, Misses M.F. Austin and M. Beattie, and Messrs. E. Cave, Duncan, Gray, G. Hayward, Gurner P. Jones, J. Revie, E.A. Savage, F. Seymour Smith, E. Wisker and R. Wright.

25 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. Meeting of December 4th, 1946.

26 The "other body" for whose examinations the College prepared most of its students was the University of London.

27 L.A. Council Papers. Ref. 14(a) 3/1/2

28 Manchester Library School Archives. Schofield to J.E. Myers.

30 ibid. Roberts's Memorandum on the Chaucer House Conference of October 18th.

31 Memorandum of a Conference with Principals of Technical Institutions held at Chaucer House... on October 18th, 1944. L.A. Ref. 12.70/1/7

32 L.A. Council Papers. Ref. 14(a) 51/2.

33 Leeds Library School Archives. Correspondence between Schofield and Austin.

34 ibid. Correspondence between Lamb and Schofield and Lamb and Austin. (J. Lamb, Principal of Newcastle College of Commerce was a friend of Austin's and he sent copies of his correspondence with Schofield to Austin.)

35 Manchester Library School Archives copy.

36 L.A. Minute Book 1943 - 1945. ff. 172-173

37 L.A. Ref. 12.81/1. Manchester Library School Archives copy.

38 L.A. Minute Book 1943 - 1945, f. 204

39 Correspondence in Manchester and Leeds Library School Archives.

40 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. This was the first meeting of the Education Committee after the end of the war, the L.A. having reverted to its normal constitutions.

41 L.A. Education Committee Minutes.

42 L.A.R. Vol. 48 (March 1946 p.i).

43 ibid. (June 1946 p.i).

44 ibid. (July 1946 p.i).

45 ibid. (August 1946 pp.i and 214).

46 ibid. (September 1946 p.242)

47 For example, Mr. W. H. C. Lockwood was approached by R. Wright, County Librarian of Middlesex, and a member of the L.A. Education Committee, as a suitable candidate for a tutor's post. (Mr. Lockwood was at that time serving in the Forces, but had been a branch librarian in Middlesex before the war). He applied for the post at Brighton and was appointed.

48 L.A. Education Committee Minutes.

49 ibid.

50 Manchester Library School Archives. Inter-College memoranda.

51 ibid. Roberts's Memorandum.

52 All further documents quoted or referred to in this chapter are in Manchester Library School Archives unless otherwise stated.

53 In a letter to G. H. Austin, Principal of the Leeds College of Commerce, of July 28th, 1945, Schofield stated that at that time 12 candidates were ready to commence. When the London University School opened in October 1945, the only one to do so in that year, the students enrolled included 26 non-graduates.

54 Manchester and Leeds Library School Archives.

55 Library Assistant, Vol. 37, Nol (Jan - Feb 1944) p.14.

56 op. cit. p. 189

57 L.A.R. Vol. 44 (Oct. 1942) pp. 142 - 3.

58 ibid.

59 Library Assistant, Vol. 37, No. 3 (May - June 1944).

60 L.A.R. Vol. 47 'July 1945) p. 126.

61 ibid. (Nov. 1945) p.224.

62 ibid. Vol. 49 (June 1947) p.141.

63 ibid. Vol. 48 (Nov. 1946) p.291.

64 ibid. Vol. 47 (July 1945) p.126.

65 ibid. (Feb.1945) p.4.

66 ibid. (May 1945) p.98. An anonymous letter.

67 ibid. (Aug. 1945) p.165.

68 ibid.

69 ibid. Vol 48 (Sept. 1946) p.229.

70 ibid. (Aug. 1946) p.206.

71 The plan was that from 1951 onwards the whole of the Registration Examination would have to be taken and passed at one sitting. The five years period of grace was intended chiefly to help the ex-servicemen, most of whom, it was hoped, would have qualified by the end of 1950. Another concession was that any-one who had already passed one part of the old Intermediate by the end of 1945 was to be given till the end of 1946 and a member of the Forces until the end of 1947 to take the other part.

PART TWO

CONSOLIDATION AND EXPANSION - THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LIBRARY SCHOOLS AND THE PATTERN OF FULL-TIME EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP 1946 - 1963

PART TWO

CONTENTS

Chapter I: The Syllabus of 1946

Chapter II: The Initial Difficulties faced by the New Schools of Librarianship.

Chapter III: The Working out of the Pattern of Full-Time Education for Librarianship in the New Schools.

Chapter IV: The Transition from the Ex-Service Function to Permanent Status as the Normal Means of Education for Librarianship.

Chapter V: The Library Schools and the Syllabus: the Establishment of Moderating Committees and the Schools of Librarianship Committee.

Chapter VI: The Development of the National System of Full-Time Education for Librarianship.

Chapter VII: Progress and Achievements, 1946 to 1963.

I The Syllabus of 1946

We saw in the first part that the Library Association set before itself in the years after 1942 two main tasks in the field of professional education; first, to establish a system of full-time schools of librarianship, and secondly to draw up a new syllabus of examinations. The syllabus was of basic importance to the L.A., because it was the means through which it intended to maintain complete control over professional education in Great Britain. It was of basic importance to the schools of librarianship because it provided the framework within which they had to work. Before going on to discuss the development of the library schools after their establishment in 1946, I propose to outline the 1946 Syllabus and the modifications made to it up to 1960 (these latter resulted in no basic change) precisely because they form, as I have said, the framework within which the library schools developed from 1946 to 1963. The 1946 Syllabus was drawn up with the needs of full-time students at the library schools that were to be established in mind; but this fact was lost sight of later, chiefly because the intention to introduce the "all-parts-at-one-sitting" rule in 1951 was abandoned, and for the whole period of its operation there were always many more part-time than full-time students sitting for it.

In the early years of their existence the library schools and their heads had little if any say in the form of the Syllabus, but this situation changed for the better later. I propose therefore after outlining the 1946 Syllabus (and subsequent modifications to it)

in this chapter, to go on to outline the early development of the library schools themselves in chapters II to IV; and then to consider the relations between the L.A. and the library schools, which were naturally chiefly concerned with the Syllabus, in chapter V. The argument, debates and negotiations that let to the new Syllabus of 1963, although they began as early as the early 1950's will be dealt with in Part III.

The Syllabus that was introduced in 1946 was undoubtedly an improvement on the pre-war one; and the most important changes were made in the second stage, which was the most important one from the point of view of the new Library Schools. The old Intermediate Examination would have been quite inappropriate as the final examination of a one year full-time course that was meant to produce chartered librarians as it was solely an examination in cataloguing and classification.

The new Syllabus comprised three stages. First came the Entrance Examination, which consisted of four papers, each of one and a half hour's duration: (i) Library Administration and Procedure; (ii) Cataloguing and Classification; (iii) Choice of Books and General Knowledge of Current English Literature, and (iv) Reference Materials and Methods. This Examination was designed to be a "simple selective test designed to control admission to the Schools."[1] The intention was that young people should leave school, take a post in a library, and then be able to sit for this Examination without any specific tuition for it after one year, and it was assumed ~~that~~

that if they were successful in this Examination they would be suitable entrants for the Library Schools. Both the intention and the assumption were open to doubts and objections, as events proved.

The Registration Examination consisted of six three-hour papers paired in three groups as follows:

Group (a)	(i)	Classification
	(ii)	Cataloguing
Group (b)	(iii)	Bibliography
	(iv)	Assistance to Readers in the Choice of Books
Group (c)	(v)	Library Organization and Administration
	(vi)	History of English Literature.

For the time being each group could be taken separately in any order, but it was intended that from 1951 the whole Examination would have to be taken and passed at one sitting. (The two papers in each group had to be taken and passed together).

The Final Examination consisted of seven parts as follows:

1. Bibliography and Book Selection.
2. Library Organization and General Librarianship.
3. Library Routine and Administration: either (a) Public libraries, (b) University and College Libraries, (c) Special Libraries and Information Bureaux.
4. Literary Criticism and Appreciation: either (a) Modern Literature, (b) Literature of Philosophy and Religion, (c) Literature of Social Sciences, (d) Literature of Science and Technology, (e) Literature of Fine Arts, (f) Literature of Music.

5. One of the following: (a) Palaeography and Archives, (b) Work with Young People, (c) Advanced Cataloguing and Classification, (d) Historical Bibliography.

6. An essay (of 5,000 to 10,000 words).

7. Viva-voce Examinations.

Parts 1 to 4 consisted of one 3-hour paper each, and each of the alternatives of part 5 consisted of two 3 hour papers making six papers in all. This Examination was designed to "test the mature judgment and specialized knowledge and experience of the candidate". It was intended for those who had had some years' experience of librarianship in a senior capacity, and was considered suitable either for one year's full-time study in a library school or for part-time study over a longer period. The parts could be taken separately in any order.

Modifications to the Syllabus, 1946 to 1960.

Irwin had pointed out at the Wadham College Conference of December 1944 that the Syllabus was "not regarded in any sense as a final scheme. Experience may show that changes in emphasis or even in structure are desirable. If so they can be made as necessary."[2] On the whole, the changes that were actually made in the years before 1964, in spite of the fact that they caused quite a stir in their day, can be regarded as changes in emphasis rather than in structure.

Perhaps the most significant change was the abandonment of the intention to make it compulsory to take the whole of the Registration Examination at one sitting from 1951. As early as the Brighton Conference of June 1947 F.G.B. Hutchings, Chairman of the

Education Committee, gave an assurance (in reply to speakers from the floor) that the Syllabus was not static, and that the Education Committee would reconsider the matter, in order that, as T.E. Callender, one of the speakers from the floor had put it, "the door might be left open for part-time study."[3]

At the Scarborough Conference of the following year the matter again came up at a Meeting of directors of library schools, tutors and examiners. E. Austin Hinton, Chief Librarian of Newcastle on Tyne, N. Dain, Head of the Leeds Library School, and R. Stokes, Head of the Loughborough Library School urged that the "one-sitting" rule should be introduced as planned. T.E. Callender, Chief Librarian of Lambeth, and W. B. Paton, Head of the Glasgow Library School, opposed this. When a vote was taken 23 favoured the abandonment of the "one-sitting" rule and 10 favoured its introduction in 1951.[4] The Education Committee itself reached the same decision, the Council approved it, and in January 1949 it was announced that "the requirement that the Registration Examination be taken as a whole after 1951 had been rescinded, and until further notice groups may be taken together or separately in any order."[5] The decision was probably inevitable in the circumstances of the time, as there seemed little hope that all or even most potential librarians would be enabled to attend full-time library schools in the near future.

A very minor anomaly that was cleared up at about this time was the quite inappropriate combination of Library Organization and Administration with History of English Literature in Group (C) of the Registration Examination. In December 1947 it was decided that

candidates sitting Group C who passed in one part should not be required to sit that part again, and this principle was made retrospective to the introduction of the Syllabus in 1946.

It was realized after only one year's working that the Syllabus needed quite a lot of adjustments and modification to make it a really efficient and practicable test of the candidates' knowledge and ability. During 1947 meetings were held between directors of library schools and tutors and the examiners; and suggestions were received by the Education Committee from the University and Research Section, Aslib, the Library Schools, and the Greater London Division of the A.A.L. for improvements. This led to the formation by the Education Committee in November of the same year of a Sub-Committee consisting of the Chairman of the Education Committee (F.G.B. Hutchings), the members of the Board of Examiners, the directors of the Library Schools, and representatives of the A.A.L., Aslib, tutors of oral classes, and the Universities and Research Section to consider the revision of the Syllabus and related matters.[6] The Sub-Committee worked for many months, and produced a draft in October, which it was intended to bring into operation in June, 1950.

The 1950 Syllabus, which came into operation as planned, brought no basic changes, but did incorporate many fairly substantial changes in the Registration and Final Examinations.

The Registration Examination now consisted of four groups as follows:

Group (a) (i) Classification Theory

(ii) Cataloguing Theory

(iii) Practical Cataloguing and Classification

Group (b) (iv) Bibliography and Documentary Reproduction

(v) Assistance to Readers

Group (c) (vi) Organization and Administration

Group (d) (vii) (a) History of English Literature

(b) Literature of Science and Technology

(c) Literature of Social and Political Ideas

All the papers were of three hours duration, and candidates had to take each of papers (i) to (vi), plus one of the alternatives in Group (d). There were these three main differences between this modified Syllabus and the original one. First, there was the fact that candidates now had to take seven papers instead of six, in itself a step in the wrong direction since there were already more than enough papers for a one year course, and the tendency towards a "cramming" course was to that extent increased. Secondly, there was the introduction of the Practical Cataloguing and Classification paper, in itself a good idea if it had not resulted in the extra paper. Thirdly, there was the introduction of the two alternatives to English Literature in Group C. This was an excellent development, and went some way towards meeting the increasing demands that were being made by Aslib, and special and non-public librarians in general, for a Syllabus more suited to their needs.

The new Final Examination consisted of four parts, each of two 3-hour papers as follows:

1. Bibliography and Book Selection.
2. Library Organization and Administration.

1st Paper: General
2nd Paper: One of the following:

(a) Public Libraries

(b) University and College Libraries.

(c) Special Libraries and Information Bureaux.

3. Subject Approach to the Literature of the Arts and Sciences.

Sixteen alternatives were provided here, including English Literature (six alternatives) Philosophy and Religion, Social Sciences, Science and Technology (four alternatives), Fine Arts, Music, Medicine, and History and Archaeology.

4. One of the following:

(a) Palaeography and Archives.

(b) Library Work with Young People.

(c) Advanced Classification and Cataloguing.

(d) Historical Bibliography.

(e) Hospital Library Work.

(f) Literature of Wales.

The most significant change here was the abandonment of the Essay, and the increase in the number of papers to be taken from six to eight. At this time the number of students preparing for the Final Examination by spending a year as full-time students at a library school was very small; but it can hardly be denied that an examination of eight three hour papers was quite inappropriate as the concluding examination of a one year course. Many librarians, moreover, with justification, regretted the abandonment of the Essay.

The other changes were of a minor nature. The number of papers on Bibliography and Book Selection was increased from one to two. This

was almost certainly a mistake: it would have been better to transfer subject bibliography wholly to the appropriate special subject papers in Part 3, especially as each of the special subject alternatives now consisted of two papers. The increase in the number of alternatives in Part 3 is perhaps less striking than at first sight appears, since five of the ten new alternatives were variations on the English Literature theme. The provision of four alternative second-paper sciences, and the inclusion of Medicine and History papers were, however, steps in the right direction, since they permitted and encouraged more first-hand acquaintance with the literature and bibliographical tools in specific subject fields.

At first sight the number of alternatives in Part 4 had been increased from four to six, by the inclusion of new papers on Hospital Library Work, and the Literature of Wales. In the same year, however, as the Syllabus came into operation, the Register and Examinations Executive Committee decided that Library Work with Young People and Hospital Library Work should be removed from the Final Examination as from June 1951. (These two subjects became "Specialist Certificates, which could be taken by chartered librarians but would not count towards the Final Examination). The net result therefore was not to increase the number of alternatives, but to replace Library Work with Young People by Literature of Wales! This part of the Finals Examination, as might be expected, continued to be regarded as one of the least satisfactory. It was meant to provide for advanced specialization in the major techniques of

librarianship and cognate disciplines; but as it stood after June 1951 it did not really provide for this need very satisfactorily. The Literature of Wales would have been more happily located in Part 3, but was included here to satisfy what may be regarded as an obvious pressure group within the Association. (Its feasibility as a choice for most candidates was still further limited by the requirement that at least two questions had to be answered in Welsh). Palaeography and Archives were an appropriate field of specialization only for a small minority of librarians working in large public and academic libraries, and in effect required prior qualifications in historical studies. This meant that most candidates had to choose between Historical Bibliography and Advanced Cataloguing and Classification. The worst placed candidates were those from scientific and technical libraries for whom only one part, that on cataloguing and classification, was really appropriate. This situation was improved from December 1959 when papers on Presentation and Dissemination of Information were introduced. In the meantime (in March 1953) it was decided to reinstate "Work with Young People", largely at the insistence of the Youth Libraries Section.

The Entrance Examination came in for increasing criticism in the early 1950's. There were two main causes for complaint. In the first place the idea that no formal tuition was needed to prepare for it was not working out in practice. It might have worked in the case of a first rate assistant in a first rate library with an efficient scheme of in-service training, but these ideal conditions

were fulfilled in practice only in a very small minority of cases. In the second place it was not working as a valid test of the candidate's ability to go on to a course for the Registration Examination. The two bodies chiefly responsible for seeking and carrying through a reform of this Examination were the Association of Assistant Librarians and the Schools of Librarianship Committee. The A.A.L. submitted a resolution to the L.A. to the effect "that the Education Sub-Committee of the L.A. be asked to re-draft the Syllabus of the Entrance Examination, defining clearly the scope and limits of the Syllabus, with the object of ensuring that this Examination will, in future, be a more effective test of the candidate's suitability to progress to the Registration Examination."[7] The S.L.C., at the same time, put forward the view that the Entrance Examination as it stood was of little or no value in respect of admission to the Library Schools. These criticisms were considered by the Education Sub-Committee in September 1952, and it was decided to ask the A.A.L. and the S.L.C. to submit definite proposals for revision. A first draft was submitted by May 1954 and the new Syllabus came into force in the summer of 1956. The examination was re-named the First Professional Examination and consisted of four papers of one and a half hours each as follows:

1. Librarianship: Purpose.
2. Librarianship: Methods.
3. Library Stock: Description and Arrangement.
4. Library Stock: Use.

It was a much more satisfactory examination than the old, requiring a deeper and wider knowledge but being a fair test for young librarians from all types of library. It was now clearly understood that a course of study was required for it.[8] At the same time the actual requirement that one year's practical experience as a full-time assistant in an approved library must be obtained before sitting the Examination was dropped.

One or two useful changes were made in individual Registration papers in order to make them fairer during the period up to the end of the operation of the Syllabus in 1963, many of them suggested and worked out with the help of Library School tutors. The Practical Cataloguing and Classification paper was given an entirely new form from June 1958, so that candidates could show their proficiency in cataloguing without having to do a lot of unnecessary writing. The Assistance to Readers paper was reshaped so that candidates could concentrate on bibliographical and reference material in two or three subjects of their own choice. The English Literature paper was divided into two alternative papers, one covering the period up to but excluding the Romantic Revival, and one the period following it up to the present day.

The academic qualifications for entering on the Library Association's Examinations had always been since the War 5 passes at Ordinary Level including English Language in the General Certificate of Education (or the equivalent School Certificate) University graduates were exempted from the Entrance Examination. From

September 1960, and this was really an anticipation of the introduction of the New Syllabus in 1964, those who held a G.C.E. with a minimum of two subjects at "A" level and 2 at 'O' level, including English Language, were also exempted from the Entrance, or as it now was, First Professional, Examination. The aim was to increase recruitment at "A" level, rather than at "O" level, by encouraging school children who were intending to take up librarianship as a career to stay on at school to take their "A" levels before entering the profession.

II The Initial Difficulties faced by the New Schools of Librarianship

The post-war schools of librarianship were born, as we have seen, only after protracted and difficult labour, and they were beset from birth by every kind of obstacle and discouragement. Their mere survival was not completely assured for many years. I shall deal separately with one of their major problems - the fact that they had to prepare their students for external examinations in whose setting and marking (and still less in the framing of the syllabus upon which they were based) they had no say. In any case in the early days, when the schools of librarianship were small and their tutors were fully occupied with the task of establishing them on a proper footing, it was probably a relief to them that the administration of the examinations system was in other hands; and before long steps were taken, as we shall see, to involve the full-time tutors in the framing of the syllabus, and to make the examinations more suitable to their needs. Here I want to deal with the other major problems that faced the library schools at the outset, taking them one by one under the headings: parent bodies, facilities, students, and staff.

(i) Parent Bodies

It is not easy for an educational unit to be more successful and effective than its parent body, and it is extremely difficult for it to do its work properly if that work is not of the kind normally undertaken and fully understood by the parent body.

The institutions in which the library schools found themselves were accepted by the Library Association, and nearly every-one else concerned, as second best, because the original idea that they should be part of the university sector had proved impracticable.

It may,however, be doubted whether the library schools were situated on the highest level even of non-university further education. In his paper of December 16th, 1944 R. Irwin had spoken in the following terms:[9]

> The larger technical colleges, situated in the big centres of population, are great and worthy institutions, admirably equipped, and indeed all but universities in themselves; in the new world of post-war education they will most certainly expand and develop to even greater importance in the life of the nation.

This was true, but unfortunately it did not help the library schools very much: it would only have done so if they had been situated (and had remained) in those colleges which were later to achieve the status of College of Advanced Technology or the equivalent. This has happened only in one case, that of the library school at the Glasgow College of Commerce, which is now part of the new University of Strathclyde. Some of the schools were originally situated in colleges that were to achieve high status, Manchester and Loughborough among them; but the library schools were among the courses transferred to lower level institutions when they did so. In the opinion of the Ministry of Education and of Local Education Authorities library schools were appropriately situated in ordinary technical and commercial colleges, and as it was they who had the power to make the decisions, it was in these institutions, not in

C.A.T.'s and their equivalents that the library schools had to develop.[10]

The use of the term "director" by the Library Association for the heads of library schools also gave a rather exaggerated idea of the status of the library schools within their parent bodies. None of them in the early days had the status of head of department, some have still not achieved it; and even the head of a department in a technical college has not the powers of independent action that the director of a university school possesses. So far as the College authorities were concerned the senior lecturer in librarianship was merely the tutor responsible for the courses in librarianship: if the title of head of the library school was extended to him it was little more than a courtesy one. The number of staff involved was, of course, very small, one or two lecturers at each school in all; but it was not only their size that kept their status low. In technical colleges the library school normally functioned as part of the department of "general" or "liberal" studies of "arts", a department whose work was regarded as ancillary to the main purposes of technical education, and which did not therefore normally enjoy a very high status within a technical institution. Those library schools that were situated in colleges of commerce were better off in this respect, as their type of work was more central to that of the institution as a whole. On the other hand colleges of commerce have not achieved as high a status as some colleges of technology, and much of their work was not on a very high level, although there has been great improvement in recent years.

(ii) Facilities

This problem follows from the previous one in so far as the facilities available in a technical institution tend to be at all times inferior to those in universities. It is a separate problem in so far as it arose from immediate post war conditions that applied to all institutions.

(a) Libraries. One major loss that resulted from the exclusion of library schools from universities was that they had no first-class libraries which their students could use as a matter of right and which were on the premises - a particularly serious drawback for a school of librarianship. The best placed schools were those in major technical institutions, some of which had good libraries, but these were in the minority, and were transferred to other institutions later.

A library school has two distinct needs in regard to libraries. First, it needs a large first-class library as, so to speak, its laboratory: in this respect a library school is uniquely dependent on a good library. Secondly, it needs, as all educational institutions do, a comprehensive and well organized collection of books and other materials relevant to the subjects studied, including above all a generous supply of text-books. In both these respects the newly established library schools were very badly placed. As regards the first need they were dependent on libraries other than those of their own institutions, in particular, of course, on their local public library, and university library if there was one. The geographical situation of most of the library schools was reasonable in this

respect, although some of the provincial schools were not ideally situated, Loughborough and Brighton in particular; and the metropolitan schools, although the location of each was changed, ~~they~~ were not in the most appropriate part of London. On the whole, both public and university library authorities, and indeed others, were co-operative; but an outside body, however willing, can never provide the same facilities to a body of students and staff as the internal library of their own institution.

So far as the provision of textbooks and other material on librarianship was concerned the situation was even worse in the short-term, as the technical college libraries just did not possess this type of material and it was very difficult for them to acquire it in immediate post-war conditions. On the other hand, it was not such a serious drawback in the long term, as it was within the means of a technical college library to build up a reasonably comprehensive collection of books on librarianship and ancillary subjects, and most of them did so, albeit rather slowly, especially in regard to serials, pamphlets and foreign material. It was on the other hand out of the question for a technical college library to build up the range of reference materials and bibliographical apparatus that students of librarianship need as their "laboratory".

Quite apart from the question of the financial and other resources of the college libraries the provision of books on librarianship was a difficult problem at that time. A large proportion of British books was out of print and not easily available

on the second-hand market; and American and other foreign books were difficult to acquire. In this respect, as in so many others, the library schools were dependent on the generosity of the public and other libraries, both in making available their resources to the schools, and by transferring to them unwanted items. The heads of library schools began to appeal to librarians for donations (including their own reports, catalogues, publicity material, etc.) soon after taking up their appointments.

A more fundamental and still less solvable problem was the paucity of suitable textbooks on librarianship to suit the needs of the students of the post-war English schools of librarianship. On many aspects of the syllabus the pre-war books were quite inadequate, and on others there were only American books, which, however admirable in some respects, were not adapted to British conditions. The Library school tutors had to spend a great deal of time tracking down and acquiring the fugitive but extremely valuable material produced by libraries and other bodies.

(b) Other facilities. A first-rate library was the major consideration in the case of a school of librarianship, but in common with other educational institutions there were other pressing needs. Among these were good accommodation in the shape of suitable lecture theatres, seminar and tutorial rooms and offices for staff, secretarial services for the head of the school, and so on. In the immediate post war conditions these facilities were in short supply in all educational institutions and for all courses, and the

improvement in subsequent years was very gradual. The demobilization of a large number of ex-servicemen to whom further education and training had been promised, and the policy of the post-war governments to make higher education available to a wider section of the community, meant that there were more students of all kinds in establishments of further education than ever before. On the other hand, war damage and the freezing of educational building during the war, and shortages, economic difficulties and the fact that housing had to be given priority in the post war years, meant that the actual accommodation available was hardly more extensive than it had been before the war.

The introduction of full-time courses for librarianship in technical colleges was one of the new post-war departures that added its admittedly minute but nevertheless typical extra burden to already overstrained further educational resources. The result was that the physical conditions in which the library schools started their work were very far from ideal and imposed a severe strain on both students and staff. Many of them had to wait a long time for any significant improvement. Classes often had to be held in makeshift accommodation, study rooms were rare, and sometimes the courses were held in temporary annexes in different parts of the town. Proper residential accommodation for the students was almost non-existent, and amenities, both cultural and recreational, were poor.

If it were not true that it is the quality and keenness of students and staff that are the things that matter in an educational

institution, and that everything else is of secondary importance, the post-war schools of librarianship would have stood little chance of proving successful.

(iii) Students

Nearly all the 240 or so entrants who made up the first batch of students at the seven new schools in 1946/7 were ex-service men and women, as indeed were most of those who entered the London University School of Librarianship in 1945 and 1946. They were, of course, students of an exceptional kind and had had to face and overcome difficulties that students do not normally have to face.

They had been away from their libraries, and in most cases from the study of librarianship (although some had been able to continue their studies in their spare time while serving in the Forces) for up to six years. It is well known that it is difficult to adjust oneself to a life of concentrated study after many years spent in a completely different type of occupation; and the war-time experiences of some of the prospective students had not been such as to make it easy for them to settle down to the full-time study of librarianship. Many of them had experienced additional anxiety by having an uncertain and unexpectedly delayed date of release, which meant that they had not been able to resume their proper careers as soon after the end of hostilities as they had hoped.

Having been released from the Forces, or from other forms of war service, and having returned in most cases to their pre-war libraries, they had then had to persuade their employing authorities

to grant them a year's leave of absence. (Some went direct to library schools from the Forces, in most cases with the approval of their authority). It was not easy to obtain this leave of absence and many who would have liked to go to full-time library schools were unable to do so. The library authorities had some justification for being unwilling to spare some of their best people at a very difficult time; but many were less generous than they need have been, and it was very difficult for those who worked for small authorities, for unenlightened ones (not all of which were small), and in non-public libraries, most of which had only very small staffs. Some of those who started the course had resigned their posts in order to do so, a brave gesture which in most cases turned out well, as there was no glut of trained librarians in post-war conditions, and new posts on completion of the course were not difficult to find.

Many of these ex-service students also had personal responsibilities that made their circumstances more difficult than normal. They were, of course, much older than the typical student, and a larger proportion than is usual were married and had family responsibilities. Having spent the war years away from their families in many cases, they had to face the possibility of another year away from them.

Their financial circumstances were, however, for students, quite favourable. In order to qualify for the Ministry of Education Further Education and Training Scheme grants they had to show that

their studies had been genuinely interrupted or postponed because of war service. Those who had worked for at least a year in a library before their war service and had passed the L.A. entrance examination (the normal entry qualifications for the schools) had no difficulty in making out a case. The grants under the scheme were reasonably generous and covered fees, maintenance and family allowances. Minor difficulties solved themselves. There was some delay in paying out the grants. Anxieties about superannuation were cleared up. Those who wanted to or had to postpone their courses for a year or two after release were assured that they would still be eligible for a grant.

In spite of all these handicaps and difficulties the majority of the ex-service entrants were good students, very highly regarded by their tutors. They possessed, as compared with ordinary students, important compensating advantages. They were mature and experienced men and women who had a real determination to make a success of their courses and thereby to make progress in their chosen career.

(iv) Staff.

Roy Stokes, who presumably was a good witness, being himself appointed first Head of the Loughborough Library School in 1946, stated much later that the "majority of tutors drifted into their posts in a thoroughly haphazard manner."[11] The trouble was that in 1946 it was urgent that the schools should be set up as quickly as possible, and yet there was no obvious source from which the heads of schools or even their assistant lecturers could be recruited.

The number of people in England with experience of full-time lecturing in librarianship was minute, and experience of running schools of librarianship was virtually non-existent. The staff of the only pre-war British School of Librarianship, that at University College London, had always been small, as much of the tuition there was given by visiting lecturers, and there was only one full-time lecturer in addition to the director. The last pre-war director of the London University School, J. D. Cowley, had been killed in an accident during the war. This meant that the only person in the country who had had experience of running a library school was Raymond Irwin, who had been appointed director of the London School in the previous year (1945), having been up to that time county librarian of Lancashire. The only other person who had had experience as a full-time lecturer in librarianship was Miss M. S. Taylor, who had been lecturer in cataloguing and classification at the London School (since 1935), and who held that post again from 1945 to 1947, when she was appointed borough librarian of Merthyr Tydfil. The possibility of attempting to recruit staff for the schools from the only English-speaking country that had a fully-developed system of education for librarianship - the U.S.A. - does not seem to have been entertained by anyone, and it would not have been very practicable in the circumstances of the time. (It might however, have been practicable and desirable to obtain the services of one of the heads of the American Library Schools as a consultant or adviser).

In these circumstances the new library school staffs necessarily had to be chosen from librarians whose experience of teaching, if any, was limited to part-time or correspondence tutoring, and who had no experience of the organization and administration of schools of librarianship. This was not regarded as a particularly serious drawback at the time, as few regarded the job of full-time lecturer in librarianship as a vocation needing specialized qualifications and experience. The idea that librarians would be seconded, as it were, from their normal jobs for a year or two to teach in the library schools, and then return to their proper function as practising librarians, was the prevalent one at the time in this country.

What the L.A. and the employing authorities under its guidance looked for in prospective full-time tutors in charge was a considerable number of years experience in a senior capacity as librarians, the full professional qualifications, and the right personal qualities, in so far as they could assess them, to make good tutors. It was also thought that they should normally be ex-servicemen so that they would share the same background as their prospective students.

The selection of the first tutors for the new schools, although it was in theory the responsibility of the governing bodies of the institutions to which they were appointed, was in practice done jointly by them and the L.A. As we have seen the advertisements for the post were approved by the Education Committee, and members of the Education Committee and of other L.A. Committees did much to

ensure that a sufficient number of the right type of candidates applied for the posts when they were advertised.

The salaries were such as to attract men in the middle ranges of the profession who might have been reasonably considering applying for posts on the level of chief librarians of small systems or deputies of medium-sized ones. (At the time the posts for senior lecturers in charge of library schools were being advertised on a salary grade of £600/750 such posts as deputy borough librarian of Croydon (£700/850) and Kensington (£625/700), and county librarian of Monmouthshire (£535/600) were being advertised). They were nearly all ex-servicemen whose careers had been frozen during the war, and who were now in their early thirties. Before call-up they had reached the status of branch librarian or higher and had just returned to similar jobs. W. B. Paton, who was appointed to Glasgow, was Burgh Librarian of Greenock, N.E. Dain, appointed to Leeds, was Borough Librarian of Penzance, J. C. Harrison, appointed to Manchester, was Librarian, Co-ordination Department, Liverpool Public Libraries; those appointed to the other schools were all branch librarians from both municipal and county systems. Two were graduates and nearly all had had some experience of teaching librarianship on a part-time or correspondence basis.

It had been hoped to run courses for them at the London University School of Librarianship, but these never materialized, and they had perforce to enter upon their new responsibilites without any formal training for them and with no previous experience of the duties involved. They were taking a considerable risk, as there was

no guarantee that the schools would prosper or even survive beyond a year or two, and their careers would have suffered a considerable setback if the schools had failed.

The fact that the schools did not fail was due in very large measure to these seven men, whose achievements in the face of every kind of difficulty have never been fully recognized by the profession. They had to start from scratch with no training and no experience, and few wholly relevant precedents, and work everything out for themselves.

Out of the seven new schools that opened in 1946 and 1947 only three appointed full-time assistant lecturers in librarianship, Loughborough, Manchester and London, and none appointed more than one. Unlike any of the tutors-in-charge two were women, and two (the same two) were from non-public libraries.[12]

III The Working Out of the Pattern of Full-time Education for librarianship in the New Schools.

The Genesis of a School

Within a month or two of its opening, Roy Stokes, its newly appointed Head, wrote an account of the Loughborough School of Librarianship which is worth quoting *in extenso* because it gives an accurate impression of a situation that was typical of all the newly established library schools:-[13]

> On the morning of Saturday, 21st September, the tutors of the Loughborough School of Librarianship pushed a wheelbarrow along one of the main roads of Loughborough. Inside it were the textbooks which had been gathered together from all quarters and with their arrival we felt that everything was more or less ready. Three days later the doors opened to admit the 42 students for the first course for the Registration Examination.
>
> The School is housed in one of the large huts on the College's spacious playing-fields. There are two lecture rooms and two smaller administrative offices, in one of which will be shelved the collection of textbooks. Lectures are given on every morning and afternoon throughout the week with the exception of Wednesday and Saturday afternoons. Apart from the main course of lectures based directly on the syllabus, there are two additional lecture-periods in every week. One is devoted to any subject of general library interest, not necessarily within the scope of the syllabus; for example, a short series of lectures on English History to form the essential background for English Literature, a discussion on a new book or an article in the Record. Saturday mornings are reserved for general debates. The first Saturday brought forward some lively discussion on the subject of fines, while the next week, a discussion on the various forms of restrictions in force in libraries yielded some wonderful examples of methods by which the public can be actively discouraged from using a library system.
>
> Towards the end of this term and throughout the next two terms we shall be visiting a number of municipal, county and university libraries in the area. We also look forward to being able to persuade a number of librarians to visit the School and, if possible, to combine their visit with a talk to the students.

> But life is not all librarianship. Our women's hockey team has been into action and gained its first win (7 - 1) of the season. Saturday afternoon hikes are being arranged, while College dances on alternate Saturday evenings, tennis, squash, swimming, badminton, fencing, ballet-dancing all tempt the student's leisure hours.
>
> When these delights fail, there is always argument - and we argue everywhere.

The Working Out of the Curriculum

In this account, besides being presented with a picture of a library school at the beginning, we see at least in embryo most of the elements that came to make up the standard curriculum of the schools of librarianship. The main element had to be lectures and tutorials given by the lecturer-in-charge, and his assistant if there was one, on subjects directly relevant to the syllabus of the L.A. examinations. The fact that the students had to be prepared in only one year for a difficult external examination that required a wide factual knowledge of many subjects, and that it was vital to the students' careers that they pass it, always severely restricted the scope of any other activities, desirable as they might have been from other points of view. It also put a considerable burden on the one or two tutors, who had to cover such a syllabus adequately in the limited time available. From the beginning, however, they were helped out in some schools by other lecturers on the staff of the parent body and by visiting lecturers. The former were able to take over non-librarianship subjects included in the L.A. syllabus such as English Literature, and printing, binding and book production. The latter, who were usually qualified senior librarians attached to

local libraries, were able to take over professional subjects such as Library Organization and Administration. (Many of the schools became responsible for providing tuition to part-time students in their areas as well as to their own full-time students, and these extra numbers increased the need for visiting lecturers). The Leeds School of Librarianship, for example, from the beginning made use of another member of the staff of the College of Commerce for literary history, and two visiting lecturers, who were librarians on the staff of Leeds Public Libraries, for classification and some sections of bibliography.[14]

Occasional visits by eminent librarians, bibliographers and other scholars, publishers and experts in the commercial and technical sides of book production were arranged by the schools from the start. Lectures by many of these could have been heard at meetings of the Library Association and similar gatherings; but there was much to be gained by getting them to visit the library schools themselves, where they could angle their material towards the needs and interests of the students, and where in the more informal atmosphere the students could be involved in the discussion. Many senior members of the profession, including those who had done much to ensure the establishment of the schools such as L. R. McColvin, accepted invitations to visit the schools and talk to the students. Such contacts were also useful in that the visiting librarians were able to see for themselves what the library schools were doing and how they set about it. F. G. B. Hutchings made it part of his duties

as Chairman of the Education Committee to visit all the schools periodically, and this function was later taken over by B. I. Palmer after his appointment as the first full-time Education Officer of the L.A. in 1948.

Most of the schools also tried to provide some background or general cultural element in the courses, in some cases as a regular feature of the time-table of say an hour a week, in others as an occasional "treat" for the students. The variety of subjects offered was very great. The English Literature paper in the L.A. Syllabus might have provided a liberalizing element in itself, but it required such an accumulation of purely factual knowledge over the whole range of English Literature that it merely increased the pressures tending, against the better judgment of the tutors, to make the courses one-year "cramming" courses for the L.A. Examinations. One of the most promising fields for background lectures and discussions was in connexion with the "Assistance to Readers" Paper, where an almost unlimited range of writers and their works could be considered.

Even within the field of librarianship itself the Syllabus exerted a restricting influence on the scope of the courses; but all the schools included tutorial and discussion periods on the broader aspects of librarianship, including topics not strictly relevant to the Syllabus, into their curricula.

The study of printing, book illustrating methods, binding and the technical side of book production generally, which constituted

a large, some would say disproportionately large, element in the L.A. Syllabus, had to be backed up by practical demonstrations if it was to make sense to the student. All the schools therefore organized visits for their students to paper mills, printing works, process engravers, binderies and similar establishments. One or two of the schools were located in technical colleges that had departments of printing, such as the North Western Polytechnic in London, and were able to make arrangements for their students to be given practical demonstrations of printing machines and methods with explanatory lectures by experts. One school, Brighton, arranged for its students to spend some time carrying out practical binding at the local College of Art under the guidance of an expert demonstrator.

The most important part of the course, together with the actual tuition in the basic librarianship subjects, was the students' own practical work in librarianship and bibliography. Much of this could, naturally, only be done in libraries, and this, for reasons we have mentioned, normally meant in libraries other than the school of librarianship's own college library. Practical work in libraries was made part of the course in two different ways: first, by sending the student away for something between one and three weeks to work full-time in one or two libraries during the year; and secondly by sending him to work in libraries for two or three hours each week for at least some part of the year. There was great variation in the pattern actually adopted from school to school, but most schools included an element of one or the other method,

often of both, in their formal programmes. In addition, or sometimes instead, the student was encouraged, merely allowed, or very occasionally compelled to spend some of his free time either in vacation or term time working in libraries.

This practical work in libraries was essential to the student in connexion both with his study of library organization and administration, and with his study of subject bibliography and reference material. A week spent working in a first-class library where the staff took a keen interest in the student's training and had sufficient time to spend on him could add a whole new dimension to his theoretical study of the organization and administration of libraries. It was, of course, true that practically all the students had spent at least a year, and often very much longer, as assistants in libraries before they began the course, but this was not necessarily of great value for three reasons: - (i) The library in question may have been too small to have had a full range of services or may have been poorly developed and badly organized; (ii) The assistant in question may have been wholly engaged in non-professional jobs of a clerical or routine nature and may have been given no professional training; and (iii) as it preceded the course the assistant would probably not yet have received any theoretical instruction to which he could relate his practical experience. It was also desirable that he gain some experience of work in libraries of a different type from his own. A session spent in a good reference library each week handling and examining the reference books and other material that the tutor was currently discussing for the Bibliography

and Assistance to Readers paper was also of immense value.

In addition to prolonged periods of work in one or two libraries the schools of librarianship also organized day visits to a variety of libraries for their students, varying say from the British Museum or the Bodleian to an interesting county branch or the library of an industrial firm in the vicinity. These visits were particularly useful in connexion with the comparative study of the aims, functions and methods of different types of library.

Some kinds of practical work could be done in the library schools' own college libraries especially as these improved the size and scope of their collections; and some could be done in the lecture room or "in the field". Practical cataloguing and classification were an integral part of the course. Mock-committees were organized and held both in connexion with administration (mock-libraries-committees) and with assistance to readers (mock-book-selection-committees.) Occasionally some schools were also able to arrange for their students to be present as observers at real libraries committee meetings.

Students.

In the first two years most of the students were people who had been released from the armed forces or from other forms of national service. In the third year (1948/1949) the proportion of ex-service people had dropped to under three-quarters, and in the fourth year (1949/50) to under a third. Thereafter only a handful of the students were ex-service, and the F.E.T. Scheme ceased to provide any students at all after about 1950.

Most of those who went to the schools, except graduates, during the whole of this period (1946 to 1963) had had some previous experience of work in libraries. The duration of this varied a great deal from individual to individual, but for the average registration students it was probably about two or three years. For the ex-service student in the early years it was probably more. The non-ex-service student was typically a person who had left school at the age of 16 or 17, after having taken School Certificate, or, as it became, G.C.E. "O" Levels, gone to work in a public library, where he studied part-time for the Entrance, or, as it became, First Professional Examination of the L.A., and applied after passing it, from the age of 17 or 18 upwards for a place at a library school. So far as general educational background goes there was not a great deal of difference between the ex-service and the non-ex-service students.

There was a tendency to discourage students who were too young from entering the schools, even if they had all the necessary qualifications. Again, many of the schools, not only or chiefly for this reason, and many L.E.A's, insisted on prospective students having passed one part of the Registration Examination before applying for places; and this delayed the age at which they could apply. On the other hand there was no upper limit, and many students were in their mid-20's and a few in their late-20's and 30's. I should estimate the average age of non-ex-service students throughout the period up to 1963 at about 19 on entry.

This meant that the students had had an average of two or three years practical work in libraries before going to the schools. This sounds a good amount but in many cases it was chiefly work of a routine and repetitive nature, whose duration was of limited educational significance.

The minimum educational standard was fixed at 5 "O" Levels (or its equivalent, School Certificate before 1951) throughout this period. There was, of course, always a proportion of people with higher than the minimum qualifications, but there are no figures on which an accurate estimate of their numbers can be based. Later on, it became official policy to encourage prospective students of librarianship to stay on at school to take "A" Levels; but this did not begin to take effect until after 1960.

There was always a number of graduates at the new library schools, and most of these went straight to the schools after graduation without any library experience. (At the University of London School, on the other hand, a year's experience as a full-time assistant in a library between graduation and entry to the school was standard practice). In the session 1948/1949 there were 35 graduates at the new schools out of a total number of registration students of 208, and in the following year there were 40 out of 266.

The Manchester School had 30 graduates on its courses in the first seven years 1946/1953; and one third of the students of the

Glasgow school during the first years of its existence were graduates. It is worth stressing that the new "non-graduate" library schools have produced very many more graduate chartered librarians since the war than the University of London Post-Graduate School.

The majority of the students were women. Accurate figures do not exist for the early years, but it is certain that during the years immediately after the war there was a higher proportion of men than there was later. In the year # 1956/57 there were 94 males out of a total number of 310 students, and in 1957/58 there were 103 out of 324. (These figures include the University of London School). We shall not go far wrong in putting theproportion of women to men at over 3 to 1 after 1949.

The students came predominantly from public libraries. Special libraries were on the whole too small to release staff for a full-time course for a whole year. (Many of the successful students of the schools, however, eventually obtained posts in non-public libraries; and most of the graduates at the Schools had had no previous experience in any type of library). The majority of the students came from medium-sized or large municipal and county libraries..

In the early years the tutors of the library schools were very disappointed with their examination results. They had clearly been expecting something like 90% successes in the whole examination,

whereas well over 50% of their students (Registration and Final) failed to pass all the parts they were taking in the first examinations held in 1947. They gradually learned to live with this, however, as part of the nature of things. Even good students would not be expected to pass every single part; and many schools preferred their students to have passed one part before coming to the school. Certainly a large proportion of those who did not succeed in passing the whole examination at the end of their year ultimately completed it, and up to 80% of the products of the schools (Registration courses) ultimately became chartered librarians. This was not, however, a satisfactory state of affairs although it remained until the 1946 Syllabus and Examinations System was changed in 1964.

This high failure rate in the Registration Examinations remained one of the chief weaknesses in the educational pattern in the whole of this period. What were the causes? First, the calibre of the students was not high enough. Increasingly the most able children were staying at school to take "A"Levels and going on to universities, whereas the Library profession was still recruiting chiefly from "O" level candidates. Secondly, the nature of the Syllabus and the Examinations System: whatever its intentions, the L.A. did not really produce in the Registration Examination a satisfactory concluding examination for a one-year full-time course, and the examiners (necessarily all external to the schools) did not (perhaps could not) efficiently assess the ability of the

students or the extent to which they had benefitted from their course. Thirdly, the library schools themselves had a long way to go before they were a wholly satisfactory means of educating librarians. We have already outlined some of the difficulties under which they had to work, and mentioned the relative inexperience of their staffs. In any case one year - or in practice nine or ten months - was much too short a time in which to train a librarian, or to prepare a student for an examination of the L.A. Registration type. There was a danger inherent in the system that the courses would become merely "cramming courses"wholly directed to getting students through the examinations, and it was much to the credit of the library school tutors that they managed to resist the pressures tending in this direction to the extent that they did.

In the years immediately after the War there was a reasonable number ofpeople at the schools studying for the Final Examination. in 1946/47 there were 51 at the new schools, and in the following four years, up to and including 1950/51, there were about 40 each year. Most of these were ex-service students who had passed the old Intermediate Examination through part-time study and had had considerable experience of library work before call-up. Some of the bigger schools - Manchester, the City Literary Institute, London and in some years Leeds, and Loughborough from 1948/9 - were able to run a proper Finals courses with over 10 students on them in each year.

After 1950/1951, however, when most of the ex-service students had passed through the schools, the number of students offering

themselves for Final courses was so small that the courses were difficult to run. In most years there were about 20 students in all, and in 1953/1954 the number was as low as 9. This meant that schools had to provide courses for two or three students, and a course for Finals with six students on it was a large one.

The L.A.A. Final Examination was even less suitable as the concluding Examination of a one-year full-time course that the Registration Examination was, and the failure rate was very high. About one third of those who took the full-time Finals courses had also been on the full-time Registration course, although there was normally a gap of several years in between. The system was not satisfactory, and in Part III we shall deal with the movement towards the system of two-year integrated courses that replaced it.

Staff

Something has already been said about the seven pioneers who became the first heads of the library schools in 1946/47, and their three assistants. In this section I want to make some general points about the men and women who were appointed to the staffs of the schools in the period up to about 1963, so that the general staffing pattern might emerge.

The first thing to notice is that McColvin's view, which was very strongly put by him and met with the full agreement of everyone to whom he put it, so far as I have been able to discover, that an appointment as a library school tutor would be a temporary one, proved to be wholly wrong as a prediction, whatever its merits as an idea. The great majority of those appointed to posts in library schools

have remained there.

Two main reasons can be put forward to account for this, one as it were essential and one accidental. First, the profession of library school lecturer requires specialized aptitudes that are somewhat different from those required by the profession of practising librarian; above all it requires a long specialized training which can only be acquired in this country by doing the job over a number of years. If McColvin's idea had been put into practice it would have meant that tutors would have been going back to practising librarianship just when they had become competent tutors, if not a little before. Secondly, from the beginning and right through the period, the salaries paid to tutors compared very favourably with those paid to senior practising librarians, with the result that there was in fact a strong financial disincentive for tutors thinking of going back to libraries. An exceptional few did move back into practising librarianship, and most of those now hold important posts.

On the other hand, the great majority of those appointed to library schools had long previous experience in libraries. Most of them were in their early thirties or older, which meant a minimum of ten years experience in libraries most of it in a realtively senior capacity. The practice of appointing younger people who had themselves been good students, after only a year or two's practical experience, was very uncommon in this period; although it is slightly commoner now. Most of those appointed had spent most of their careers in public libr ries, although in later years there were

a number from special libraries. (The number from univeristy libraries was very small). Very few of them had had experience on the highest level of library administration as chief librarians of large systems, but this was to be expected, in view of their age.

The number of university graduates was surprisingly small. In the early years most of those appointed had had no full-time education after the age of 18; but increasingly tutors have been themselves graduates of the new schools. (Very few graduates of the London University School of Librarianship became tutors in the new library schools). All, of course, were chartered librarians, and most, F.L.A.'s, a qualification which was normally insisted upon for senior appointments, and in some schools for all appointments. The proportion of women was always very small, surprisingly perhaps in view of the preponderance of women as students and in the profession as a whole. (It is, of course, true that the proportion of women in senior posts falls as one goes higher up the hierarchy in libraries, but the proportion of women lecturers in library schools is probably as low as it is in the very highest reaches of practising librarianship).

It was the bringing together of full-time students and full-time staff in an atmosphere of learning that marked the distinctive feature of the new post-war pattern of education for librarianship, and made it such a step forward from what had existed before, in spite of all the flaws in it that needed to be corrected.

IV The Transition from the Ex-Service Function to Permanent Status as the Normal Means of Education for Librarianship.

The new library schools had been established in 1946 primarily as a means of enabling ex-servicemen to be trained quickly by a one-year full-time course, in order to compensate them for the time that from a professional point of view had been wasted as a result of their war service. The Government of the day, Local Education Authorities, and public opinion generally had been willing to provide the necessary financial and other support for this and many other similar courses because of the prevailing desire to ensure that ex-servicemen suffered as little as possible in their careers, and in order to ensure that the necessary trained staff was available to man the professions and industry and commerce.

Largely owing to the foresight and drive of L. R. McColvin and a few other well-placed librarians, the system of library schools was successfully put into operation for the benefit of ex-service librarians when they were released from the Forces from 1945 onwards. The next step, which was just as vital, was to ensure that the system was continued after the needs of the ex-servicemen had been met to become the normal means of training librarians. The whole exercise, as McColvin saw from the first, was a piece of "inspired opportunism."

Three things had to be achieved if the library schools were to survive the immediate post-war period and become a permanent feature of the normal peace-time scene. First, the Local Education

Authorities and the Governors and Principals responsible for the schools of librarianship had to agree to continue and develop them as permanent institutions. Secondly, Local Education Authorities had to be willing to give grants on a sufficiently generous scale to enable non-ex-service students to attend the schools. (On both counts the approval and goodwill of the Ministry of Education was also required). And thirdly, Library Authorities had to be willing to grant their staff a year's leave of absence to attend the schools.

The first obstacle - persuading the relevant authorities to continue the library schools on a permanent peace-time basis - did not prove a very difficult one to overcome in most cases. The schools of librarianship comprised in most cases only a very small part of the work of the colleges in which they were situated, and a still smaller part, of course, of the total work of the Local Education Authorities responsible for them. The colleges were very hard pressed for accommodation, equipment and staff, but the extra strain placed on these by the continuation of the library schools was too slight to be worth taking into consideration. In other respects the courses in librarianship were looked on with favour by most of the college authorities, who were anxious to increase the proportion of their full-time to their part-time courses, and to expand their higher level work; in both these respects the schools of librarianship suited their aims.

That the transition was not automatic, however, is shown by the difficulties that arose in the case of the London (non-university)

school in 1949 when a solution was reached only after some tough negotiating between the L.A. and the L.C.C. These came to a head at a meeting held at County Hall between representatives of the two bodies on April 6th, 1949. The spokesmen for the L.C.C. made it clear that the London Library School, as it was then constituted at the City Literary Institute, was "purely temporary to meet the needs of F.E.T. /i.e. ex-service/ trainees." There was "no sanction by the L.C.C. for a permanent school of librarianship; acceptance by the London School of any students except under the F.E.T. scheme was ultra vires; and the present school must terminate when no further F.E.T. students were forthcoming - presumably in 1950."

Non ex-service students had already been accepted by the City Literary Institute and at one time the situation appeared to be so serious that the parents of one of these students was considering taking legal action against the L.C.C., and the L.A. was considering the establishment of a library school for them at their headquarters, Chaucer House. The attitude of the L.C.C. spokesman at the meeting of April 6th, however, was not completely unhelpful; and they were willing to envisage the establishment of a permanent school, provided that certain conditions were met. Their chief concern was to receive assurances that a sufficient number of prospective students would come forward to make a permanent school worthwhile, and their chief anxiety was lest other schools should be established in the Home Counties as there would probably not be a sufficient number of students from the L.C.C. area alone. On the

other hand, rather inconsistently, -

> ... the L.C.C. could not undertake to provide a school for national considerations: presence of large numbers of students in the South of England, and the needs of Commonwealth and foreign students, could not be taken into account in establishing the primary necessity for a school, although its facilities would be available to them if the demand from L.C.C. students justified its establishment.

In fact the Middlesex County Education Authority's Spring Grove Polytechnic was negotiating with the L.A. to establish a library school; but the L.A. had done its best to discourage this (unsuccessfully as it turned out), and the L.A. Council had passed a resolution on April 1st, 1949 "deprecating the proposal to establish an additional school in the Greater London Area."

In the event the L.A. was successful in persuading the L.C.C. to establish a permanent school without there being any gap between the end of the old "temporary" one and the commencement of the new "permanent" one ; but they were compelled to give way on one point, - the location of the school. The L.C.C. wished to move the school from the City Literary Institute to the North-Western Polytechnic in Kentish Town. The City Literary Institute dealt with cultural and non-vocational courses; and the Princeton Street College of Commerce, the administrative "parent" of the school of librarianship had an insufficient establishment for senior lecturers to enable an adequate basic salary to be paid to the head of the library school. The North-Western Polytechnic, on the other hand, had a large and unfilled establishment of senior lecturer posts. In addition it was already an important centre for part-time courses in librarianship.

The L.A. objected to this move partly because of the unsettling effect of frequent changes, and partly because of the unfairness to the head of the school, D.A.R. Kemp, who had not been told on appointment that his post was a temporary one, and who would now have to apply for the post of head of the North-Western Polytechnic school of librarianship. Chiefly, however, they objected to the distance of the North-Western Polytechnic from the "laboratory" libraries in central London. And they did not see any advantage in the combination of full-time with part-time courses." Size was no criterion of efficiency":-[16]

> Indeed the view is strongly held that a small school is preferable to a large one. Hence the combination of full-time and part-time tuition under the one director is not regarded as an improvement upon a school restricted to full-time students.

The final outcome was not an altogether unhappy one as the school of librarianship at the North-Western Polytechnic, which was not too unsuitable a location as the most important libraries in London tend to be on the northern side and communications are good, grew rapidly to become one of the most important library schools in the country. The negotiations themselves certainly shed some interesting light on the administrative framework within which the new library schools had to develop.

The transition in the other schools seems to have been accomplished much more smoothly, and the only anxiety of the College authorities outside London was whether a sufficient number of students would come forward: provided that they did, they were willing to continue their schools of librarianship on a permanent basis.

Everything, in fact, depended on the provision of grants, and the offer of leave of absence to as many of those non-ex-service people who wished to attend the schools as possible. There were a few of these in the first batch of students who went to the library schools in 1946; and as early as March 1947 the L.A. began to publicize the facilities available to both authorities and prospective students. There was room only for a few in the early years, but it was vital to ensure that the number of non-ex-service students aided by L.E.A. grants rose as the number of ex-service students aided by F.E.T. grants fell; and the L.A. began a long campaign to encourage in particular library authorities to take the necessary steps.

They started publishing (by the request of the Council itself) in the March 1947 L.A.R. an exact statement of the position regarding leave of absence and grants for non-ex-service students, in which they tried to meet all the objections that might occur to the bureaucratic mind.[17] Library authorities were specifically permitted by law to grant leave of absence for a period not exceeding 364 days; and this period would count as non-contributory service for the purposes of superannuation. Library Authorities were not permitted to provide grants for the purpose of full-time study, and it was doubtful whether they were entitled to grant leave of absence with pay for this purpose. (It later became clear that the latter was permissible, and later some Library Authorities made use of this method; but it has always remained exceptional). There was no doubt,

however, that Local Education Authorities were permitted to make grants to cover both fees and maintenance for students to attend courses at schools of librarianship. The L.A. also requested those Library Authorities who had granted leave of absence to non-ex-service students to notify them, so that the information could be published in the L.A.R., presumably to encourage the others.

The Government Further Education and Training Scheme ceased when the National Service Acts came into force on October 1st, 1947. This meant that those who began their national service on or after that date were not eligible for grants; but it naturally took several years to get all the ex-service men who had started their service on or before September 30th, 1947 through their courses. In the first two sessions there was a large accumulation of demobilized men and women for the library schools to cope with; but with the session of 1948 to 1949 the number began to decline until the last handful took up their grants in the session 1952 to 1953. (Students could always postpone taking up their grants for a good reason). The number of non-ex-service students in the first two years was correspondingly small; but in the session of 1948 to 1949 there were sixty non-ex-service students aided by L.E.A. grants out of a total enrolment of 248, i.e. about a quarter. (Not all the remainder consisted of ex-service students aided by F.E.T. grants: there were also some privately aided students, some graduates, separately listed whether ex-service or not, and some commonwealth and foreign students). In the following session, 1949 to 1950, the proportion of F.E.T. students had fallen to about one third. (101 as against 153 L.E.A. and 56 others).

The transition was thus safely accomplished, in spite of the fact that pessimists had foreseen the disappearance of the schools with the end of the F.E.T. grants; and much of the credit should go to the L.A., and to those enlightened library and education authorities who paved the way by being the first to grant leave of absence and financial assistance respectively.

V The Library Schools and the Syllabus: the Establishment of Moderating Committees and the Schools of Librarianship Committee.

The chief virtue of Technical and Commercial Colleges as locations for Schools of Librarianship in the eyes of the Library Association was that far from objecting to preparing students for external examinations they regarded it as the standard practice. Once established, the Library Schools became integral parts of their parent institutions, and the Library Association had no more administrative control over them than it had over the London University School of Librarianship. There were ways in which pressure could be exerted on and advice tendered to the Local Education Authorities who were responsible for them, but in the last resort the Schools were outside the control of the L.A. The only sanction the L.A. could have exercised in extreme cases would have been to refuse to recognize the students' time spent at a Library School as the equivalent of library service for fulfilling the service requirements for the A.L.A. and F.L.A.; and this was never in fact done.

This lack of administrative control was not regarded as being of any great importance, however, by most of the leading members of the L.A., as long as the L.A. remained solely responsible for the Syllabus and Examinations and success in the Examinations was regarded as being all that really mattered. From this point of view the L.A. retained real control over education for librarianship in its own hands. From the point of view of the Schools, like all teaching

institutions they were bound to gear their curricula and methods to the Examinations their students were being prepared for, and this was especially true in their case where an extensive range of papers had to be prepared for in only one year. Relations between the Schools and the L.A. were naturally therefore chiefly concerned with the syllabus and examinations.

In 1946 there was no contact between the Library Schools - the tutoring bodies - and the Library Association - the examining body; but gradually over the years something was done to establish contact.

As early as October 2nd, 1946 the Education Committee received a suggestion from J. C. Harrison, who had just begun his first year's work as Director of the Manchester School of Librarianship, that the Schools of Librarianship should have direct representation on that Committee.[18] The members were not unsympathetic, but perhaps they thought the request was premature because they deferred full consideration of the matter to October 1947. Agreement was reached, however, then; and at the meeting of January 29th, 1948 D. A. R. Kemp, Director of the Library School at the City Literary Institute, was co-opted to the Education Committee.[19] Kemp resigned in June 1949, and the Committee asked the Lecturers-in-charge of the Schools to nominate a successor. W. B. Paton of the Glasgow School was chosen, and took his seat in September.

It was also open to any Library School lecturer, as a member of the L.A. , to stand for election to the L.A. Council, and to the Committees of its branches and sections; and having been elected they

were eligible for membership of the Education Committee. J. C. Harrison became a member by this method in 1949.

From the beginning, however, the L.A. made it an absolute rule that no lecturer should be an examiner or have any direct part in the setting and marking of papers. On January 1st, 1950 a new administrative pattern in the L.A. Committees controlling education became operative. The old Education Committee was abolished and in its place there was established a Register and Examinations Executive Committee. This consisted of all those members of the L.A. Council who were Fellows: it was finally responsible for all educational matters, and its decisions were not referred to or controlled by the Council. (This ensured that non-professional-librarians, such as representatives of local authorities, had no say in these matters). It worked chiefly through two sub-committees: the Assessors' Sub-Committee and the Education Sub-Committee. The former comprised the Chairman of the Education Sub-Committee, and four other members elected by the Register and Examinations Executive Committee: it was responsible for the actual conduct of the examinations, the appointment of examiners, and the scrutiny and approval of examination papers. The Education Sub-Committee consisted of members of the Register and Examinations Executive Committee plus a few co-opted members to represent special interests. A Library School tutor could sit, and even become chairman of, the Register and Examinations Executive Committee and the Education Sub-Committee; but he could not sit on the Assessors Sub-Committee. When J. C. Harrison became Chairman

of the Register and Examinations Executive Committee and of the Education Sub-Committee, another member had to act as chairman of the Assessors Sub-Committee. By 1952 three full-time lecturers were sitting on the Education Sub-Committee.

The Library Schools played an important part in the modifications to the Syllabus that were carried out in the period 1946 to 1960; and they were consulted in May 1948 regarding the introduction of the "one-sitting" rule. The Sub-Committee set up in 1947 to revise the Syllabus included the lecturers-in-charge of the Library Schools among its members; and they played a very large part in the production of the new First Professional Examination. It is worth noting, however, that none of this implies any formal machinery of consultation: Library School Lecturers were consulted as a matter of courtesy and practical convenience, and the final decision about any of their recommendations rested with the L.A. The tutors continued to press for some more satisfactory and formal means of contact.

Establishment of the Moderating Committees and the Schools of Librarianship Committee

From the first it was realized that it would be very desirable for the heads of the Library Schools to meet every so often to discuss common problems. There were many of these, but undoubtedly the chief one was the L.A. Syllabus. The L.A. encouraged and gave facilities to the Library Schools Lecturers to hold these meetings, as it was in its interest to have a body to which it could turn for advice on matters relating to professional education. The first meeting was

held in January 1947, and it became the practice to hold a meeting at one of the Library Schools at this time of the year, and another one at the L.A. annual conference in the summer. In these early days the meetings were no more than informal discussions on matters of common interest, and there was usually no fixed agenda. The chief topic of interest was normally the questions set in the previous L.A. examinations. A meeting of directors of library schools, tutors and examiners was held at the Scarborough Conference of May 1948. A similar one was held at the Eastbourne Conference of the following year; and the Education Committee, at its June 1949 meeting, decided to take steps to have such a meeting included as a regular feature of the Conference.[20]

In 1952 two very important steps forward were taken. First, at the suggestion of the Register and Examinations Executive Committee the Library School Lecturers formalized their meetings and organized themselves into the Schools of Librarianship Committee. Secondly, the L.A. set up the first of the Moderating Committees. These steps were not in themselves of a very revolutionary nature, but they were foundations upon which much more could be, and was, built.

The purposes of the Schools of Librarianship Committee were to deal with matters which concerned the Schools and teaching, and to form a channel of communication between the Schools and the L.A. It was not, of course, a committee of the L.A., and had no official standing within the organization of the L.A., It consisted of all the full-time staff of all the full-time Schools of Librarianship,

and normally two meetings were held each year at different Library Schools, one after the June examinations and one after the December examinations, plus a third meeting during the week of the L.A. Annual Conference.

The first meeting was held at Manchester on June 9th, 1952, at which J. C. Harrison was elected Chairman, and R. N. Lock, Head of the Birmingham School, Secretary.[21] The Chairman explained the nature of the Moderating Committees. They were to consist of examiners, assessors and tutors, both full-time and part-time, representing a particular subject interest based on the L.A. Syllabus. The first one, which was to be a sort of pilot project for the rest, was to be set up for Registration Group A, i.e. Cataloguing and Classification; but the L.A. intended to extend them to cover all the main subject areas of the Final and Registration Examinations. At first it was envisaged that they would meet twice a year after the June and December examinations respectively, but later they worked on the basis that a meeting should be called whenever any one of the embers thought it necessary. It was hoped that their work would lead to a clearer understanding of the intention of the Syllabus by all parties; and a clearer appreciation of the problems of examiners by tutors and of the problems of tutors by examiners. By the end of 1953 they covered all the groups of the Registration and the more important parts of the Final Examinations.

The Schools of Librarianship Committee was responsible for nominating the representatives of the full-time tutors to the

Moderating Committees; and these representatives reported back to the full committee, so that all the Schools knew of the trend of the discussions and the nature of any decisions reached. Memoranda were also circulated. On the whole, and within their limitations, both the examining and the teaching sides seem to have found them a success. In its annual report of 1953 the Register and Examinations Executive Committee put forward its idea of their achievement: "They form the channel through which the major difficulties of interpretation found in the Syllabus by teachers may be brought to the attention of the examiners, and the examiners' difficulties made clear to teachers."[22] At its meeting of April 30th, 1953 the Schools of Librarianship Committee agreed that the Moderating Committees were "serving a most useful purpose in presenting the teaching point of view to the examiners."[23]

During the first two or three years of their existence the scope of the Moderating Committees was rather narrowly restricted. The representatives of the teaching interests were in effect limited to criticizing the examinations papers set by others in the light of a Syllabus fixed by others. They could point out that a particular question was an unfair one in that it could hardly be regarded as falling within the terms of the Syllabus. They could argue that a particular paper was unbalanced in that its questions over-stressed one part of the Syllabus at the expense of others. If, on the other hand, they found that a particular question required a wrong approach that could not or should not be taught, they could not criticize it if it was within the terms of the Syllabus. They could not criticize

the Syllabus itself.

A new step forward was achieved in 1955, however, when the Assessors agreed that, in addition to commenting on examination papers as set, the Moderating Committees and the Schools of Librarianship Committee would be entitled to submit comments which affected the structure of the Syllabus including suggestions for its reform. Most of the improvements to the Syllabus which were achieved after this time originated in this way. All these reforms were, however, of a minor nature, and by this time the feeling was growing among Library School Lecturers and others that something more radical was required. The real step forward was achieved, only after the introduction of the 1963 Syllabus, when a definite movement towards internal examining by the Library Schools was set in motion.

VI The Development of the National System of Full-Time Education for Librarianship.

The Library Association, although it kept overall control of the system of professional education by retaining in its own hands complete control of the examinations taken by all students, had no real authority over the library schools themselves, or over the development of the pattern of library schools in the country as a whole. The L.A. had been responsible for the establishment of library schools in technical institutions, and had had a large say in the setting up of the individual schools; but once they had become going concerns they functioned as integral parts of their parent institutions. The head of the library school was responsible, either through the head of his department or directly, to the principal of his college, and through him to the college governors and the local education authority, which was in theory and in fact the body in whose hands the real authority over the development of the School lay. In some cases there was also an advisory body for the library school consisting of representatives of local librarians and professional bodies. Over the whole system of technical education the Ministry of Education exercised a general oversight through its regional advisory councils for technological education and its inspectorate. The L.A. had no formal place either in the hierarchy of control or in the advisory machinery.

It was unlikely in the nature of things that the Ministry of Education would devote very much attention to the development of such

small and specialized courses as those in librarianship; and it was difficult for the L.A. to act effectively for the reasons we have mentioned, desirous and anxious to do so as they might have been. In these circumstances it was very difficult to see how a logical and progressive plan for full-time education in librarianship could be worked out and carried into effect on a national level. In the early 1950's there were two major requirements for any national plan: it was necessary to ensure that any new schools should be set up only if and where they were really needed, and it was necessary to lay down and maintain progressive standards for all the library schools.

The full implications of the situtation were brought home to the L.A. by the circumstances leading to the establishment of the new library school at the Spring Grove Polytechnic at Isleworth in 1949. The prime movers here were the Principal of the Spring Grove Polytechnic and his local education authority, the Middlesex County Council, which was anxious to have its prospective librarianship students go to a college of its own, backed up by a number of library authorities in the western environs of London. The L.A. was opposed to the establishment of another school in the Greater London Area, which was already well-served by the one at the City Literary Institute, as well as the University of London School and the one close at hand in Brighton. The L.A. was particularly anxious to avoid any harmful effects the establishment

of another school in the greater London area might have on the one at the City Literary Institute; and this was an important consideration in the negotiations between the L.C.C. and the L.A. about the future of this school in 1949.

The Principal of the Spring Grove Polytechnic proposed to the L.A. that a new full-time school of librarianship should be established there early in 1949. The L.A. Education Committee considered his proposal at its meeting of March 31st, 1949; and it was resolved to "deprecate the proposal to establish an additional school in the Greater London area"; it "would prefer to see additional schools established where there are adequate library facilities in the immediate neighbourhood."[24] (The new school at Birmingham was established with the full blessing of the L.A. in 1950; but this, of course, was an ideal situation; and it had always been intended to have a school there). J. L. Tomlinson, the Principal of the Spring Grove Polytechnic, would not, however, take "no" for an answer, went on with his preparations for opening a school, and wrote a further letter to the L.A., again demanding approval for his course, and stating that the number of libraries represented in applications already received was fourteen. The Education Committee considered this letter on June 9th, 1949, and again "deprecated" the proposal, and was again backed up by the full council of the L.A.[25] The Spring Grove Polytechnic nevertheless opened in the Autumn, and after it had done so Tomlinson again applied to the L.A. for approval. This time the Education Committee bowed to the fait accompli and approval was granted on November 24th

1949. (All the L.A. could have achieved in concrete terms by withholding its approval would have been to deprive the students of the school of their one year's equivalent of library service towards the requirements for election to the register as chartered librarians, and this they were naturally reluctant to do).

At first sight the Spring Grove affair seems to have been a severe blow to the chances of working out and implementing a national plan; but out of it there arose two hopeful signs for the future. A way of involving the official machinery of the Ministry of Education in the development of the library schools was found, and a start was made in laying down standards to govern their development.

To take the first point first, as a result of the setting up of the Spring Grove library school the L.A. wrote to the Regional Advisory Council for Technological Education for London and the Home Counties to draw their attention to the necessity for avoiding the duplication of facilities for schools of librarianship in the London and Home Counties Area.[26] The Council, after considering the matter, came to the conclusion that full-time courses in librarianship were within its terms of reference, and wrote to the L.A. to say that in general they shared the apprehension of the L.A. regarding the possibility of overprovision. They further decided to set up a committee to consider the whole question of education for librarianship (and librarianship in technical education as it turned out) in the region. This Librarianship Committee was set up as a

sub-committee of the Regional Academic Board. It consisted of three representatives of the L.A., representatives of the Education Authorities of London, Middlesex, and Brighton, one principal and one teacher of librarianship to come from Brighton and London respectively, and one representative of Aslib. The L.A. was very pleased with these developments and resolved to write to the Regional Advisory Councils for all areas where there were full-time schools of librarianship to advise them of their anxiety that overprovision of training might take place. The first meeting of the Librarianship Committee of the London and Home Counties Regional Advisory Committee took place on January 20th, 1950: it accepted as its terms of reference - "to make recommendations for a scheme of courses, full-time and part-time, in librarianship to serve the needs of the region as a whole." In 1952 the Regional Advisory Council for the North-Western Area also set up a Librarianship Committee.

The other beneficial result of the Spring Grove affair was the beginning of an attempt by the L.A., aided by the Schools of Librarianship Committee and other interested bodies, to lay down standards to govern the development of the library schools. This attempt began in 1949 with the laying down of the main points to be used by the L.A. as criteria in judging whether a potential school should be given official approval or not; but it developed into a much more ambitious programme and has remained an important issue right up to the present day.

These points were formulated in a "Memorandum on the Conditions attaching to the Approval of Full-time Schools of Librarianship", which was prepared at the request of that meeting of the Education Committee (on March 31st 1949) which received the Principal of Spring Grove Polytechnic's first letter, and was received and approved at the meeting (on June 9th, 1949) which considered his second.[27] Four conditions were contained in it:-

> 1. That the establishment of a new school shall not be prejudicial to any existing school.
>
> 2. That a full-time Director or Lecturer-in-Charge, who is an F.L.A., shall be appointed on appropriate terms.
>
> 3. That the course must extend over a full academic year.
>
> 4. That the course must include a reasonable amount of practical work, not only in the classroom but also in suitable libraries having bookstocks adequate to the full needs of librarianship. This implies the presence in the vicinity of appropriate library resources.

The Education Committee ultimately convinced themselves that the Spring Grove School would satisfy these conditions, and it was on these terms that they approved the School.

These conditions did not go very far but they were a start. On March 27th, 1952 the Education Sub-Committee (as it had become) decided to appoint a Sub-Committee to draw up a full list of standards for library schools to cover all matters such as accommodation and staffing. It was to consist of the Heads of the Library Schools, the Chairman of the Education Sub-Committee, E. Austin Hinton and C. B. Oldman.[28] In the following summer (July 9th) the Heads of the Library Schools at the suggestion of the L.A., formed themselves into the Schools of Librarianship Committee. They

considered this question of standards at their first meeting, and decided that they would have to ask for time to formulate their views on it.

They continued to think about it, talk about it at their meetings and write to one another about it, until, under pressure from their Secretary, R. M·Lock, Head of the Birmingham School, they reached some measure of agreement, about a year later.[29] On November 17th 1953 a draft report was agreed to by most of the representatives of the schools; and this was considered by a meeting of the full L.A. Standards Sub-Committee on May 26th, 1954. The Sub-Committee agreed with the main points and it was received by the Education Sub-Committee and met with its general approval. It is worth quoting in full, because it gives a good idea of the basic ideals of the Heads of the Library Schools themselves at the heyday of the one year full-time schools; and it did meet with the general approval of the L.A.[30]

> 1. Although it is considered important that those who attend Schools of Librarianship should be thereby qualified to pass the examinations of the L.A., equal importance is attached to the professional education received at the schools.
>
> 2. Number and Location of Schools
>
> It is generally agreed that larger but fewer Schools are desirable. Staff will thus be able to specialize in individual subjects, and there will be opportunity for the undertaking of special projects. Such schools should not be regarded as serving only the interests of a particular region. The following facilities should be available in the vicinity of the Schools:-
>
> (i) A large public library with a sound book stock, efficiently organized. Close co-operation with a university

library and special libraries should also be ensured. Good bibliographical provision is essential.

(ii) It is desirable to have easy access to the various book-trade industries, visits to which form a most valuable part of the teaching method.

3. Accommodation

Small classes (i.e. not more than 20) are preferred, and teaching methods will require some flexibility in the numbers and size of rooms at the disposal of the library school. It is very important to have good secretarial assistance and adequate office accommodation for the full-time members of the staff, with separate provision for the lecturer-in-charge.

4. Library Provision

There must be facilities for students to read in a comprehensive library of professional literature provided by the parent institution. Any estimate of expenditure must depend on the age of the library and the size of the student body, but it would appear that an annual minimum expenditure of £200 is needed to meet the current output of indispensable professional literature. A distinction is to be made between this reference library and the provision of multiple copies of e.g. Subject Headings and Classification Schedules.

5. Enrolment

Graduates coming straight from universities should not necessarily be assumed to be unsuitable candidates for admission to the full-time schools. Conclusions as to the selection of non-graduate students should be deferred until the effect of the new F.P.E. can be gauged.

6. Staff

It is essential to recruit full-time staff from librarians who are F.L.A.'s with the right personal qualities, who can be assisted when necessary by part-time lecturers competent in special subjects. Some training in teaching methods is desirable.

Due provision must be made for the time the Head of a School must spend on administration. Students should always be able to have access to their subject lecturers or to the

Head of the School, and in this connexion one cannot overemphasise the advantages of residential schools with good social amenities.

7. Inspecting and Accrediting of Schools

Once standards for library schools have been established by the L.A. and the Schools of Librarianship Committee it seems highly desirable that there should be appointed some body of suitably qualified persons to ensure that these standards are observed and to act in an advisory capacity towards the Schools.

The Education Sub-Committee were pleased with these standards as general pointers towards the way library schools ought to be developing, but they were anxious that the Standards Sub-Committee should make more specific proposals particularly relating to the number and location of the schools; and at their meeting of October 7th, 1954 they decided that it should remain in being for this purpose.[31] It never was able, however, to agree to any concrete proposals regarding the desirable number of schools or where they should be, for obvious reasons considering its membership, although individual members submitted their own proposals.

In formulating any national plan for education in librarianship, apart from the standards of the individual schools, and on these there was a large measure of agreement in principle even if they were very difficult to achieve in practice, two basic questions needed to be answered. First, how many students ought there to be in all the full-time schools; and secondly, how many schools ought there to be? Each of these raised a number of further questions even more basic.

The first one raised two other main ones. First, how many qualified librarians did the profession need, and secondly what

proportion of these should be produced by the full-time schools. The first question is an extremely difficult one to answer at any period. The needs of all types of libraries must be borne in mind. The extent to which the library service is likely to expand is very relevant, but very difficult to estimate, and can often owe more to the ideals of the estimator than to a reasonable prediction based on the facts available. It also needs to be decided what proportion of the staffs of libraries will be professional librarians. And there must be some estimate of the wastage of professional staff through marriage and so on. The Library Profession, in common with others, is afflicted by two recurrent and mutually contradictory nightmares that tend to alternate: first, that there will be an acute shortage of professional librarians, and the library service will as a result rapidly deteriorate, and secondly, that there will be a surplus with the result that salaries and conditions will be depressed. The second question, what proportion of qualified librarians ought to be produced by the full-time schools, is equally contentious. There was a large body of opinion from the 1940's onwards favouring the view that virtually all education for librarianship ought to be full-time; but in the period we are concerned with, before 1963, there was never any likelihood of achieving this. (In fact about 66% of those elected to the register in this period were products of the full-time schools). This meant that it was possible to advocate and work for the expansion of the full-time schools without running too great a risk of getting involved in the problem of overproduction,

because it could be assumed that any expansion of full-time education would merely be at the expense of part-time.

In 1950 the Education Sub-Committee asked its Chairman, F. G. B. Hutchings, to prepare a report on the "Absorptive Capacity of the Library Profession", and he presented it to the meeting of June 1st.[32] He estimated that the staff required to serve 50,000,000 people through public libraries was between 15,000 and 20,000, of whom one quarter should be paid on professional grades. Taking into account retirements, resignations and deaths the annual requirements for professional staff could not be less than 200. To that figure should be added 20 for Scotland, 20 for Ireland and 50 for the expansion of the library service, bringing the total up to 290. To that figure should be added 40 for university and special libraries bringing the total up to 330.

Hutchings went on to estimate that the total output of the schools (including both Registration and Final students) was approximately 170 per annum, of whom 5% were Commonwealth or foreign) giving a net 161. (There were more than 170 students at the schools, but failures had to be taken into consideration and he considered that 170 was a generous estimate of successes. We shall see in the next chapter that Caldwell estimated that 80% of library school registration students were ultimately successful, and ultimate success is the only relevant kind in this context. Hutchings was working on a basis of about 50% passes - there were about 340 students

at the schools in 1950 - but this included both Registration and Final students. It is difficult to see why Hutchings took the total figure of Registration and Final students as his basis; after all the products of Final courses did not add to the total number of professional librarians available.) His conclusion was that "on the face of it" one half of the requirements of libraries for professionally qualified staff were being met by the library schools. (This was almost certainly an underestimate: if we take the year 1949 to 1950 there were 266 Registration students at the schools. If we assume that 80% of these ultimately qualified this means that that year the schools provided 213 professionally trained staff, which was nearly two thirds of Hutchings' required annual intake of 330. This confirms Caldwell's figure of 66% as the proportion of chartered librarians who were products of the full-time schools. It also looks as if about as many professionally trained librarians were being produced as Hutchings thought to be needed, but see below).

The conclusion of the Education Sub-Committee was that the number of students at the full-time schools ought to be increased, and in the following year (1951) an enquiry was made into the capacity of the library schools, in which they were asked if they could expand. A Report on this was presented to the meeting of January 31st, 1952, which showed that all the schools were prepared to expand at once (with the exception of Brighton and Manchester) to a certain extent, if only to make up existing numbers to a full-sized class. (In the academic year 1949/50 four schools - Brighton, Spring Grove, Glasgow

and Newcastle had less than 30 students each, but the "Standards" of 1953 stated that classes of under 20 were preferred, and only two schools - Spring Grove and Newcastle had under 20). The Report showed that the existing schools could accommodate 100 more students.

The L.A. was completely unsuccessful in increasing the number of full-time students. In fact the year 1951/1952, during which the report was presented, had more Registration students in it (317) than any year before or since, until the exceptional years of 1961/1962 and 1962/1963; and in the following three years numbers actually fell until in 1955/1956 there were only 240 Registration students. If the L.A. had really wished to increase the number of potential full-time students it would have had to take one or both of two courses of action. One would have been to start a campaign to increase the number of young people of the right calibre coming into librarianship, and in particular to play its own part in attracting them by improving its syllabus and examinations system. The other would have been to cut off, or make more difficult, the alternative route to professional status through part-time study. In the circumstances of the 1950's the L.A. was unwilling to contemplate either the one or the other. Another important factor was the situation where some Local Education Authorities were unwilling to give grants for full-time courses in librarianship, and others would only give very poor ones. The L.A. had a good record in this matter, however, and did much to improve the position. They were, of course, moving with the national trend towards

better financial aid, and more encouragement in general, for full-time vocational training in colleges of further education. The fact that numbers did not substantially increase until the new system was set in motion in 1961, however, and then increased very rapidly, shows that the first two factors were the key ones.

The second question, how many schools ought there to be was, of course, closely bound up with the first. In a period (and this was the case from 1950 to 1961), when the total number of students of librarianship coming forward was not increasing, it was considered vital not to add to the number of schools unless there was some very good reason. In actual fact only one school came into existence after 1947 with the full blessing of the L.A. - that was Birmingham in 1950; and even here we find J. C. Harrison, Head of the Manchester Library School, writing in a Report to the Council of the L.A. in his capacity as Chairman of the Education Committee of the North-Western Branch: "The establishment of new schools at Birmingham, Nottingham and elsewhere would probably mean the end of the Manchester School which clearly is unable to rely on an adequate intake from the North-West alone."[33]

In the same month (October 1949) a meeting was actually held at Nottingham to consider the establishment of a library school there.[34] B. I. Palmer, Education Officer, put forward the view of the L.A., that they did not favour the establishment of a further school in the Midlands in view of the provision at Loughborough and Birmingham (to open in 1950), but if agreement could be reached between the colleges concerned and Loughborough were transferred to Nottingham

the L.A. would accept it. This did not prove practicable, but at least the L.A. were successful here, where they were not in the case of Spring Grove, in preventing the establishment of a new school where there was no very good reason for it.[35]

The geographical location of the library schools as it stood in 1950 was certainly far from perfect. The establishment of Spring Grove in 1949 (transferred to Ealing in 1954) resulted in overprovision in the Home Counties, and the distribution of these schools in the Home Counties (at Kentish Town, Ealing and Brighton) was thoroughly haphazard and bore no relation to geographical convenience or library needs. On the other hand, two important regions, the South-West of England and Wales, were without library schools. Again, the school serving the East Midlands would have been much better situated at Nottingham or Leicester. If Palmer's idea of transferring a school lock, stock and barrel from one town to another had been practicable, a very satisfactory result could have been produced by transferring not only Loughborough to Nottingham, but also Ealing to Aberystwyth and Brighton to Bristol, but this was quite beyond the bounds of practical politics. The library schools functioned as integral parts of their parent colleges, and to transfer a department or section of one college under one local education authority to another college under a different local education authority would have been an almost impossible unertaking.

Moves were made to establish schools at Bristol College of Commerce with the full approval of the L.A. in 1952 and again in

1958, but nothing came of them, and even at the time of writing (1965) there is still no library school of any kind to serve the South-West of England. In fact the only school to come into existence between 1950 and 1964 was the sandwich course at Liverpool, and this was frowned upon by the L.A. partly because they did not think that another school in Lancashire was desirable, and partly because they did not approve of the idea of sandwich courses, or at least did not approve of sandwich courses, the practical parts of which were on a very unplanned and uncoordinated basis.

As to the question of how many schools there should be, there was a strong movement from the mid-1950's onwards towards the view that the number of schools, far from being added to by the establishment of new schools, ought to be reduced. McColvin's original idea, that there should be a fairly large number of small schools with a maximum number of about thirty-five students and two staff, was being increasingly criticized in the circumstances of the 1950's. In any case, by the session of 1954/1955 two schools had already grown to a size altogether unforeseen at the time the schools were being planned. The North-Western Polytechnic Library School and the Loughborough Library School had a staff of four full-time lecturers and the former had 82 full-time students and the latter 45.

When the L.A. Sub-Committee asked the Standards Sub-Committee in 1954 to make specific recommendations on the number of schools there ought to be, it was hoping that the Heads of the schools in particular would recommend a reduction in the number of schools, and

commit themselves to saying which ones ought to go. As we have seen, they were unable as a committee to agree to do so; but one or two individual Heads did. As an example we may quote the views of W. H. C. Lockwood, Head of the Brighton Library School, as expressed in a Personal Memorandum submitted to the Education Sub-Committee in October 1955 :-[36]

> All schools should be large enough to justify the employment of at least 3 full-time staff. This provides a means of calculating a reasonable minimum of students. A reasonable maximum may also be calculated, for no school should be so large as to necessitate its students being split up into an undue number of groups for general instruction purposes. Satisfactory schools could certainly be supported in 3 places, e.g.
>
> | | | |
> |---|---|---|
> | London | 6 staff | approx. 80 students. |
> | Birmingham | 5 staff | approx. 70 students |
> | Leeds or Manchester | 5 staff | approx. 70 students. |

In point of fact, as Lockwood recognized, the difficulties involved in amalgamating schools were as formidable, and as far beyond the bounds of practical politics, and for the same reasons, as those involved in transferring schools from one place to another. Even therefore if the L.A. and the Schools of Librarianship Committee had been able to agree on a plan for a limited number of ideally situated library schools, they would have lacked the means to carry it into effect. The individual local education authorities controlling the several schools were the only bodies with the power to act, and it is difficult to see how they could have been persuaded to do so. It would have been necessary to convince them that such moves were essential, and to show them how they could be carried

out in practice.

If the L.A. was powerless to act in this matter what other body could do so? The Librarianship Committees of the Regional Advisory Councils for Technological Education did much useful work. They endeavoured to co-ordinate the full-time and part-time courses in librarianship provided by all the different institutions in their regions. They witheld their approval from courses that were thought to be superfluous or badly planned, pressed for courses to be provided where there was a need that was not being met, approved and encouraged the development of well-planned and progressive courses throughout their regions; and helped to keep standards high. Their work was, however, confined to particular regions, and they never regarded it as part of their function to make radical recommendations on the re-organization of full-time centres of education of the radical kind envisaged here. In any case it must be remembered that their powers were advisory, as indeed in principle were those of the Ministry of Education itself, in respect of the local education authorities responsible for the schools.

In a way this apparently intractable problem solved itself because when the numbers of full-time students began to expand very rapidly after 1961, it was no longer regarded as being essential that the number of schools should be reduced. Even the smallest existing schools achieved a minimum of four or five staff and fifty or sixty students; and, indeed, with the approval of the L.A., new schools - albeit of a new kind - began to be established.

VII Progress and Achievements, 1946 to 1963

The Production of Trained Librarians

After about 1950 the new full-time schools of librarianship established themselves as a permanent and essential feature of the library scene in Great Britain. There was still much criticism of their standards and achievements; but no-one, except a handful of eccentrics, any longer questioned their necessity or doubted their permanence. Although this period was undoubtedly one of consolidation, ~~however~~, it is misleading to call it one of expansion without important qualifications. Here is a table which shows the total number of students and staff at the schools each session from 1946 to 1963, that is during the whole of the seventeen years when they were preparing students for the L.A. Registration and Final examinations:-

Session beginning	Number of Students			Number of full-time staff
	Registration	Final	Total	
1946	187	51	238	10
1947	167	39	206	9
1948	208	40	248	9
1949	266	40	306	10
1950	306	40	346	15
1951	317	28	345	17
1952	278	22	300	18
1953	253	9	262	19
1954	259	18	277	20
1955	243	21	264	20
1956	250	20	270	20
1957	273	22	295	22
1958	250	20	270	23
1959	265	31	296	27
1960	305	23	328	30
1961	405	27	432	36
1962	567	44	611	47

After the 1951/52 session, when there were virtually no more ex-service men to cater for, the schools settled down to a fairly steady intake of between about 250 and 280 registration students per session. It is in fact impossible to discern any steady increase between say 1952 and 1960 . The last two sessions, 1961/62 and 1962/63 can be regarded as freak sessions, since there was an unprecedented rush of students to qualify by a one-year course under the old syllabus before the new two-year courses under the new syllabus came into force in 1963. Also from 1951 onwards, when there were virtually no more of the older ex-service men who were eligible for final courses to come forward, the numbers of final students and their proportion to the whole became alike very small. Only in the again very exceptional last session of 1962/63 did the actual numbers enrolled reach the immediate post-war figures. In the years between 1951 and 1962 there was usually an intake of between about 20 and about 30, although there was the bad year of 1953/54 when only 9 students were enrolled, and the average for these eleven years is only about twenty-two per year. There is again no question of a steady increase between 1951 and 1962, but rather of a fairly static situation with a slight upward trend in the last three years.

One of the most essential facts to discover is what was the proportion of full-time library school students to the others, that is, to part-time students at the library schools and at other technical institutions where courses were provided, correspondence course students, and those working on their own. It is, however, impossible to discover the actual figures, and difficult to arrive at an accurate estimate. At any given time there was always a very

much larger number of students preparing for the L.A. examinations while continuing to work in their libraries than there was of full-time students; but the normal practice for these students was to take the L.A. examinations part by part over a number of years, which makes comparisons between them and the full-time students very difficult.[37]

In May 1957 W. Caldwell, the Head of the Newcastle School of Librarianship, produced a very useful paper on the library schools, in which he presented the results of a thorough statistical investigation of their achievements so far.[38] He took as his basis the figures for candidates sitting the L.A. Summer Registration Examination in the eight year period, 1949 to 1956. (These excluded all the Brighton and some North-Western Polytechnic students, whose academic year ran from January to December and who took the L.A. Winter Examination.) The average percentage of these candidates who were presented by the full-time schools over the whole period was 15.2%. Caldwell argued, however, that these figures were misleading as they represented only candidates sitting the examination at the end of their full-time course, and ex-full-time students re-sitting parts were included in the grand total but not in the schools' figures.

To remedy this he made a closer analysis of the candidates for the Summer 1957 Examination. The total number of candidates who entered was 1,835 and of these 250 (i.e. 13.6%) were currently at the schools. Of the other 1,585, however, 186 were former full-time

students. If these were added the percentage from the schools rose to 23.7%

Caldwell also discovered that the candidates from the schools attempted on average 3.1 parts of the Registration Examination each, whereas the other candidates averaged only 1.2 parts each. (A large proportion of the full-time students - 40% at Newcastle - had passed one part - usually D, English Literature, before starting their courses). The parts sat by schools candidates as a percentage of the total parts sat averaged 33.7. over 1947 to 1956. Again, to get a reliable figure, it was necessary to take into account parts taken by schools candidates resitting; and Caldwell estimated that in 1957 the percentage of parts taken by schools candidates would be 37.2%

Caldwell then went on to estimate what proportion of those who became A.L.A.'s in the period were products of the full-time schools. From 1947 to 1956 2,513 students had enrolled for Registration courses at the full-time schools. At a conservative estimate 80% ultimately became chartered librarians. Deducting 5% for those who had completed the course recently and had not yet completed the Registration Examination, he estimated that 1,885 full-time students had become A.L.A.'s. During the same period 2,885 A.L.A.'s had been elected or reinstated. Deducting 35 for reinstatements, and assuming that 2,850 A.L.A.'s had been elected during the period, it followed that 66% of them were products of the full-time schools.

In view of the fact that there was no substantial change in the numbers attending the library schools or in the numbers sitting the L.A. examinations up to 1961, we can regard Caldwell's figures as applying to the whole of the period before the changes of 1963 and the two exceptional years that preceeded them. To summarize his findings: over 23% of the candidates sitting the L.A. Registration examinations had attended full-time courses; over 37% of the parts taken at these examinations were taken by candidates from the schools; and 66% of those elected to the register of the L.A. as chartered librarians were products of the full-time schools.

When we examine the figures for the full-time staffs of the library schools we see that there was a fairly steady growth from 1950 onwards, until 1961/62, when it becomes a very rapid one. Even setting aside the years after 1960, when the library schools were expanding their staffs on a big scale to be able to cope with the new syllabus, it is noticeable that the number of staff trebled (from 10 to 30) between 1949 and 1960, whereas the number of students increased only marginally (from 306 to 328). It is clear from the figures that when the number of students was static or even falling slightly the number of staff tended to increase slowly, and when the number of students increased the number of staff increased still more rapidly. These facts stand in need of explanation; and the following points are the relevant ones. First of all, the figures do not take into account two important categories: the number of visiting and non-librarianship lecturers employed by the schools, and the number of part-time students taught by the schools. In the early years the one- or at best two-man

library schools had to rely on visiting lecturers; but it was increasingly recognised that there were disadvantages in relying too much on them, and there was a tendency during the period to replace them wherever possible by full-time lecturers. Nearly all the schools made themselves responsible for part-time tuition in librarianship for their areas; and many had an ambitious and expanding programme of day-release courses for those who could not attend full-time courses. Caldwell estimated in 1957 that the full-time schools were coping with about 900 part-time students, that is about three times the number of their full-time students. Some of the schools also provided special full-time courses like the North-Western Polytechnic's courses for overseas students, and its short full-time course on Library Work for Young People.

The most important factor, however, was the attempt to improve the totally inadequate staffing arrangements of the early days. The staff-student ratio in 1950 was 1:30, a ludicrously inadequate figure: by 1960 it had improved to 1:11, a figure which brought the conditions of work for the staff and the efficiency of the teaching up to a much more satisfactory level. As well as the overall picture the growth of the individual schools must be considered. The founding of the two new schools at Birmingham and Isleworth in 1950 added a necessary minimum of two lecturers to the total full-time staffs of the schools. And it began to be realized that McColvin's original idea that one or at the most two full-time lecturers at each school was adequate no longer applied. Loughborough was the pioneer here: in 1949 they

appointed a third member of staff, in 1950 a fourth, in 1957 a fifth and in 1960 a sixth. It was, after the London School, the biggest, and its geographical situation made it rather more difficult to rely on visiting lecturers; but it was nevertheless a deliberate and enlightened policy on the part of the Head of the School and the College authorities. The London School began to expand its staff after its move to the North-Western Polytechnic: in 1951 a second and in 1952 a third member of staff was appointed, in 1954 a fourth and in 1959 ~~a sixth~~ two more. It was, of course, a very large school by the standards of the day. From 1951 the total number of full-time students never fell below 60, and in 1959 it was over 90; and there was also a large number (some 500) of part-time students.

Most of the other schools managed to bring up their total staffs to two fairly early: by 1951 there were only three one-man schools left, but further expansion was slow: in 1958 the figures were: Loughborough, 5; North-Western Polytechnic, 4; Manchester and Birmingham, 3 each; Leeds, Newcastle and Glasgow, 2 each; Brighton and Ealing, 1 each. From 1960 onwards the expansion of staff was very rapid to meet the needs of the new system: in the three years from 1960 to 1963 there was an increase of well over 100%, from 30 to 66.

In conclusion it could be said that the library schools had made a tremendous contribution in terms of skilled manpower to the rapidly developing libraries of the post-war era; and had by 1963 built up their staffs and facilities to such an extent that they provided a firm foundation for the new departures in, and vast expansion of,

full-time education for librarianship that took place after 1963.

Provision for Special Librarians

The purpose for which the library schools had really been set up was to train staff for ordinary professional duties in public and other general libraries in this country, and they were successful in achieving it. In at least two important respects, however, the educational system of 1946 to 1963 was not such an unqualified success. First, the full-time schools never really met the needs of special librarians. And secondly, they never developed as centres of higher study and research into librarianship and bibliography.

The Syllabus of the L.A. itself, even taking into account its fairly extensive provision of alternatives after 1950, never succeeded in wholly meeting the requirements of special librarians; but most of the library schools were not able even to offer courses for all the alternatives that were in the Syllabus, particularly in the Final Examination. There were many reasons for this. The 1946 System was essentially one of a large number of small units rather than a small number of large units, and small units cannot easily provide for a large number of alternative specialised studies.

In the first place there is the problem of providing the tuition. Before 1961 no school had a full time establishment of more than six, and seven of the nine schools had only one or two full time lecturers until 1957. It was manifestly impossible for these lecturers to do more than cover the main fields between them. This

meant that part-time visiting lecturers had to be engaged to cover specialized papers; but it was not easy to obtain the services of the right person, who needed to have the necessary specialized knowledge and experience and the ability to communicate it to others, - and live reasonably near the college and be willing to add this fairly heavy burden to his normal duties.

Secondly, it was difficult to find in any one school a sufficient number of students interested in a particular specialized subject to make its provision worth while. In 1957/8, apart from the North-Western Polytechnic, which had 83 full-time students (Registration and Finals), no school had more than 50 students, and four had 20 or under. Most of these students, moreover, had come from public libraries, and were already committed to the central core of basic general librarianship subjects before they came to Library School. (Special libraries found it impossible in most cases to allow their staff leave of absence to attend the full-time library schools).

In the circumstances of the time, only when it was possible to draw together a large number of part-time and full-time students was there any chance of making adequate provision for specialized needs. The school best placed to do this was the North-Western Polytechnic in London. It had the largest number of full-time students of any of the schools, and the number of part-time students (about 500) was very large indeed. It was also easier to recruit suitable visiting lecturers in London, and there was a larger number of potential students from the various types of special library in the greater London area.

The North-Western Polytechnic was quick to realize its privileged position, and to recognize the responsibilities that this entailed. Courses were provided for all the three alternative papers of Registration Group D; and the same classes for the two less popular papers, Literature of Science and Technology and Literature of Social and Political Ideas, were provided for both full and part-time students, the classes usually being held in the evenings to enable the latter to attend. This meant that the full-time students of the school, and any part-time student who could reach the school, were sure of being able to opt for and obtain tuition in these papers.

This was comparatively easy, and other schools achieved this. A more difficult task was to provide tuition in the quite large number of alternative papers provided by the Final Examination (3 alternative papers in Part 2, Paper 2, 16 in Part 3, and 5 in Part 4, plus specialist certificates). Even in London it was quite impracticable to provide courses for some 30 different papers each year; so a system of covering all the papers over a longer period was evolved. In particular most of the alternative subject papers in Part 3 were covered in three yearly cycles; and in this way the training needs of such important groups of special libraries as those in the fields of technology, medicine, social sciences, music, and so on, were met. In addition the North-Western Polytechnic provided every two years short full-time courses on library work for young people, the first time that co-ordinated training for this important aspect of library work was provided in this country.[39]

Other schools, particularly those at the centre of other large conurbations, such as Manchester, made similar efforts to provide for specialized needs, though necessarily on a smaller scale. Apart from these efforts the library schools were doing little more than catering for the needs of general libraries; and special librarians were not slow to realize this. There is no doubt, in fact, that if it had not been for the extra effort of the North-Western Polytechnic in particular to provide for special librarians in this way, under the umbrella of the L.A. syllabus, the dissatisfaction of Aslib with that syllabus, and with the whole system of professional education that had developed under the aegis of the L.A., would have been very much greater than it actually was.

Provision for Research and Advanced Studies

Although the primary purpose of an educational institution must be to teach, it cannot really achieve this purpose at all adequately, at least at the level of higher education, unless it is also concerned with research. One of the most serious criticisms of the library schools set up under the 1946 pattern was that it was almost impossible for them to engage in any kind of serious research.

This was part of the price that had to be paid when the L.A. decided to site the schools in colleges of further education. These colleges did not normally foster research activities or engage in work of a level higher than first degree; and the whole atmosphere in which the work of the colleges was carried out —

was not conducive to the development of this kind of activity in any of their departments. If individual library schools were able, much to their credit, to take a tentative step or two towards the development of genuinely advanced studies, it was in spite of the system of which they were a part.

The essential conditions were lacking. First, the staff were too fully engaged with their normal teaching duties to have sufficient time and energy left over for research. Secondly, library and other facilities were quite inadequate. Thirdly, there were no students engaged on advanced study or research. It is true, of course, that many of the schools had a small number of students studying for the Final examination of the L.A., but neither the examination itself nor the nature of the course were such as to make them productive of true research. The student had to prepare himself in the space of only one year for eight three hour papers, all of which were primarily tests of how much factual knowledge he had been able to acquire. He was unable therefore to spend very much time on following up any aspect of librarianship that stimulated his interest; and his tutors could not in fairness to him encourage him to do so, or themselves spend very much time during their course of lectures on taking a subject that interested them to a deeper level.

The exception to all this was the London University School, which, of course, was an integral part of a body that regarded research as one of its primary objectives. The staff there had a very much lighter teaching load, and had easy access to excellent library and

other facilities. They were also specialists in particular aspects of librarianship or bibliography, which it was very difficult for lecturers at the other schools, with their wide teaching burden, to be. The course for the Diploma was also re-organised after the war, so that it consisted of two parts: the first part, taken at the end of the one year course, consisted of a written examination: the second part consisted of a bibliography of an author or subject, or a thesis on some aspect of librarianship, which had to be submitted at the end of the following academic year. Each student therefore had the opportunity to carry out his own research project in a field that particularly interested him, and his tutors had to stimulate his interest, give him the necessary guidance in the principles and techniques of research, and supervise his actual work. Individual members of the staff of the London University School made valuable contributions to library studies, including the Director's papers on the history of libraries; many of the theses produced by its students were useful and original; and the series of occasional papers it sponsored were a valuable contribution to the professional literature.

In spite of their handicaps the post-war schools also made valuable contributions to the development of librarianship studies. Individual lecturers managed to carry out important research. J. Mills, for instance, of the North Western Polytechnic, was one of a small number of original thinkers who advanced the study of the principles of classification in this country; although it is significant

that in spite of being also one of the best teachers of the subject he had to leave teaching temporarily in order to be able to carry out his research. Many other examples could be quoted, but it would be invidious to mention any other specific names; and the staff of the library schools, especially towards the end of the period, when conditions became more favourable, published many valuable books, pamphlets and articles in the professional press. Some schools sponsored lectures by prominent librarians and bibliographers for the profession at large, and published the best of them. One school, the North Western Polytechnic, produced a valuable series of occasional papers.

It is not surprising, however, in the circumstancesof the time, that the main interest of the staffs of library schools was in education for librarianship. A very large part of their energies was devoted to improving their own schools, formulating plans for the improvement of the system as a whole, and in pressing for their implementation. They also devoted much thought to the principles and techniques of teaching librarianship; and it was largely owing to the original work of library school lecturers like R. C. Benge and R. Stokes that a more enlightened and fruitful approach to the teaching of librarianship was developed and finally began to be generally adopted in the 1960's. R. C. Benge also performed a very useful task in transmitting to a wider audience, including part-time tutors, some of the new thinking on teaching librarianship in the series of "Notes for Tutors" he edited, and which was published by the Standing Committee on Education for Librarianship (London Region).[4]

The fact remains that there was little organized advanced study or research in librarianship in this country during the period. The London University School was very small, its total full-time teaching staff on the librarianship side was no more than four, and it provided no courses for higher degrees in librarianship. There were no research assistants or students at any of the schools. This meant that the library schools could not make a proper contribution to the development of their subject, that they could not help libraries to progress by working out new principles, carrying out surveys, experimenting with new techniques and so on, and in the last resort that they could not become really effective instruments ofhigher education. The situation began to improve only after 1964.[41]

Provision for Overseas Students

Great Britain has felt a special obligation, particularly since the war, towards the educational needs of the developing countries of the Commonwealth; and large numbers of students from these countries have come to English educational institutions to continue their studies. The provision of good libraries of all kinds in these countries has been recognized as one of their most urgent needs, and the first essential is to train staff to establish and develop these libraries. In the long run the best solution is to establish schools of librarianship in the countries themselves; but in the meantime the British schools of librarianship have helped by training an appreciable number of librarians from overseas, and in other ways.

The London University School had about half a dozen overseas students soon after it re-opened after the War, and the new schools soon began to accept a number as well; but the total number at the British schools was not large in the 1940's - less that a dozen in all. This was partly owing to the pressure on the schools from British ex-servicemen, but also to the fact that the necessary administrative and financial arrangements had not been sufficiently developed. In the 1950's the number grew rapidly, and in the academic year 1959/60 there were 53 overseas students in the British schools.

Most of these students came from the developing regions of the Commonwealth such as the West Indies, Nigeria and Ghana, East Africa and India; but there were always a few exceptional students from elsewhere, - one or two from foreign countries such as Poland and Egypt, and one or two from the old dominions such as New Zealand and Australia. Most of them were aided by the British Council.

They needed precisely the same entrance qualifications as home students, - either a degree from a recognized university or (in the case of the new schools) the Entrance Examination of the L.A., and they were completely integrated into the normal Diploma, Registration or Finals courses. This worked well in some ways and in some cases; but it was understandably difficult for many students to adjust themselves quickly enough to the British Library scene. All the courses were of one year's duration only, they were all intended specifically for people with at least one year's experience in a

British library, and much was taken for granted by the tutors that was in fact strange to students from overseas.

For these reasons the North Western Polytechnic Library School started in January 1962 a special one-year preparatory course for overseas students. This catered for students wishing to gain a knowledge of British librarianship, as well as those intending to proceed subsequently to the Registration course. A special lecturer, with a good knowledge of the needs of overseas students and wide experience of Commonwealth libraries, was appointed to run the course, and in its first year it had 17 students.

The British library schools helped the developing countries in other ways. Some of the more enterprising of their students took jobs in Commonwealth libraries, perhaps encouraged to do so by the broader horizons that their tutors endeavoured to project in the schools. Some full-time tutors left their schools to take jobs overseas, including D.A.H. Kemp, first head of the City of London College school, who left in 1950 to become Librarian of the Macmillan Memorial Library in Nairobi. One of the most original and stimulating tutors in the British Library Schools, R. C. Benge, left the North Western Polytechnic to develop new library schools, first in the West Indies and then in Ghana.

The staffs of British Library schools also played a large part in conferences and short courses for overseas librarians. W. H. C. Lockwood, for example, head of the Brighton Library School, played a prominent part in the annual summer school organised for

overseas librarians by the British Council in Birmingham.

Whether Great Britain has played a sufficiently active part in the educational advancement of the developing countries in general is debatable; but at least the library schools have not lagged behind other British educational institutions in this respect.

PART II: NOTES

1 R. Irwin. Staff and professional qualifications. L.A.R., v.48 pp.132 - 139.

2 L.A.R., v. 47, pp. 3 - 6.

3 L.A. Conference Papers. (Brighton) June 1947, pp. 72 - 75.

4 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. 1948 volume. May 3rd, 1948.

5 L.A.R., v. 51, p. 16.

6 L.A. Annual Report, 1947.

7 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. 1948 Volume. Sept. 1952.

8 These courses were normally evening or part-time courses provided by the library schools and other technical institutions, or correspondence courses under the auspices of the A.A.L. In the session of 1959 to 1960, however, there were two students at Loughborough School of Librarianship studying full-time F.P.S. Other library schools occasionally had overseas students studying full-time for the F.P.S.

9 L.A.R., v. 47, pp. 3 - 6.

10 The status of librarianship in the eyes of the educational establishment began to rise after the introduction of the 1964 Syllabus. See Part IV.

11 The future of British library schools. L.A.R., v. 56, pp. 7 - 10.

12 The assistant lecturer appointed to the City of London College School left soon after the opening of the school, and another assistant lecturer was not appointed until 1959, when the School was transferred to the North-Western Polytechnic.

13 L.A.R., v. 48, pp. 281 - 2.

14 ibid., v. 49, p. 46.

15 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. 1948 Volume. June 9th, 1949.

16 ibid., The L.A. changed its mind on this point later.

17 L.A.R., v. 49, pp. 58 - 59, 68.

18 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. 1936 volume.

19 ibid.

20 ibid. 1948 Volume.

21 Schools of Librarianship Committee (subsequently) Association of British Library Schools). Minutes.

22 L.A. Annual Report. 1953.

23 S.L.C. Minutes.

24 L.A. Education Minutes. 1948 volume.

25 ibid.,

26 ibid. November 24th, 1949.

27 ibid.

28 ibid.

29 S.L.C. Minutes.

30 Copy of Memorandum in S.L.C. Archives.

31 L.A. Education Minutes. 1948 vol.

32 ibid.

33 ibid. November 24th, 1949.

34 ibid.

35 Similar attempts to establish new library schools in the 1950's came to nothing. The L.A. Education Sub-Committee Meeting of January 31st, 1952 was told that the Bristol College of Commerce wished to set up a School of Librarianship, but not without the approval of the L.A., and it was prepared to delay application for approval pending the availability of proper accommodation. F.G.B. Hutchings, Chairman, undertook that no application from any other prospective school made in the interim should receive his support for priority in approval.

At their meeting of May 29th, 1958 they received a letter from the Chief Librarian of Bristol unofficially raising the possible establishment of a full-time school at the Bristol College of

Commerce. They were prepared to consider an application for approval of service in such a school.

At this meeting it was reported to them that the Wales and Monmouth Branch of the L.A. had resolved that negotiations should be opened with the University of Wales for a School of Librarianship in Wales. The Sub-Committee could not support this. The policy of the L.A. was to move towards fewer and larger Schools of Librarianship; and it had never been established as L.A. policy for all Schools to be in Universities.

At their meeting of March 12th, 1953, they refused to give their approval to a move by the Principal of the Plymouth and Devonport Technical College, supported by the City Librarian of Plymouth, and the County Librarians of Devon and Somerset to establish a new library school at Plymouth.

36 S.L.C. Archives.

37 Included among those sitting the L.A. examinations as part-time students were those who were passing one or two parts of Registration or Final before entering a full-time library school and those who were completing their examinations after having attended library school.

38 Association of Assistant Librarians and Standing Conference on the Education of Librarians (London Region). Library education today. L.A., London and Home Counties Branch, 1957.

39 The first course was held from April 26th to June 4th, 1954 with 21 full-time and 2 part-time students.

40 The Standing Committee on Education in Librarianship (London Region) did very useful work. It brought together many different interests, as included on it were representatives of the branches and sections of the L.A. and the schools of librarianship in the London and Home Counties Area, including the London and Home Counties Branch, the Greater London, Kent and Sussex Divisions of the A.A.L., the London S.E. Group of the Reference, Special and Information Section, the Youth Libraries Group, and University College, North-Western Polytechnic, Ealing and Brighton Schools of Librarianship. The Education Officer of the L.A. was also a member, and there were representatives of the A.A.L. correspondence course tutors and of the L.A. Moderating Committees on it.

It tendered much useful advice to the L.A. on the co-ordination of the different facilities for education in librarianship in the Home Counties. It did much to improve the quality of part-time education in particular by organizing conferences for tutors, "open days" for students, and through its publications, many of which have been noted in this thesis. It did much to aid the implementation of the new pattern in the 1960's, and dissolved itself when this had been achieved.

41

Some of the library schools also became conscious of a responsibility to fully qualified librarians, who were always in danger of losing touch with recent developments in a rapidly advancing field. Refresher courses and series of lectures on special aspects of librarianship, such as reference work, were provided for senior practising librarians by some of the Schools, particularly by those serving the large conurbations.

PART THREE

THE INTRODUCTION OF A NEW PATTERN OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP IN 1963.

PART THREE

CONTENTS

I: Radical Criticism of the 1946 Syllabus and Examinations System.

II: The Syllabus of 1964.

III: The Establishment of the New Pattern of Two-Year Full-Time Courses at the Library Schools.

I Radical Criticism of the 1946 Syllabus and Examinations System

There developed in the early 1950's two main centres of dissatisfaction with the L.A. Syllabus and its system of examinations: the full-time lecturers at the Library Schools and Aslib, the latter acting as the representative of the interests of non-public libraries.

Two strands can be distinguished in the arguments of the full-time lecturers and their sympathisers. In the first place there was a basic criticism of the kind of questions set in the L.A. Examinations and of the whole approach of the Examiners to the subjects of the Syllabus. In the second place there was the genesis of the then revolutionary idea that the whole principle of external examining was wrong, and that the Library Schools ought to be able to conduct their own examinations. I will deal with each of these two arguments in turn, and then I will go on to consider the position of Aslib, whose activity led ultimately to the bringing in of a completely new Syllabus.

Basic Criticism of the Kind of Questions Set.

In September 1949 R. Stokes, Head of the Loughborough Library School, writing of books on librarianship pointed out that "the tendency in the profession, and hence in professional writings, seems to be to regard education as the assimilation of a series of dull and frequently irrelevant facts... The true purpose of education is to create a critical mind, and to accomplish this, it needs the benefit of experience and considered opinions."[1] The same criticisms were made of the L.A. Examinations. The questions were framed by librarians

who had no experience of full-time teaching and were concerned either to elicit from the student a string of facts, or to find out whether he could describe how to cope with a particular practical problem in library routine.

In an article of November 1954 R. C. Benge, Senior Lecturer at the North-Western Polytechnic Library School, discussed this problem in the light of a coherent philosophy of education for librarianship.[2] He started his article by pointing out that in Great Britain library schools on a national scale had developed only recently "and the implications of full-time education for librarianship are not yet wholly accepted nor always clearly understood. In particular the examination system is being adapted to a new situation somewhat slowly and without conscious direction." Benge's basic point was that although the Profession had established full-time library schools and adapted the outward form of the Syllabus to suit their needs, it still had not realized the wider implications of the acceptance of genuine full-time education as opposed to in-service and part-time training. Two things should in fact follow: first, Librarianship should become a real profession, and then necessarily it should provide genuine professional education.

Benge maintained that "the status of any profession or semi-professional group depends partly on the existence or otherwise of professional education." He quoted the American H. Lancour of the University of Illinois Library School: "Recognition of the librarian as a professional had developed largely through the emergence of

library schools accredited by the Board of Education for Librarianship". F. A. Shaw is quoted to the effect that "education is often confused with training, which produces skills, rather than breadth of training; it is concerned with the performance of specific tasks, often in a unique situation, and not with the trainee's future activities or with his work elsewhere." The history of many professions had shown a development from this form of technical training to education in the full sense. He quoted R. W. Tyler to bring out the difference between training for a job and education for a profession: "Not only does a profession utilize basic principles rather than rule-of-thumb procedures, but as the profession becomes more mature it recognizes that the principles used in the profession must be viewed in an increasingly larger context."

In Benge's view the questions set in the L.A. Examinations presupposed the primitive view:

> The Examiners are still thinking primarily in terms of training: in consequence both Examiners and Tutors tend to stop short at isolated facts and ask such questions as "Describe a book-trolley, giving measurements." We shall not wholly free ourselves from this approach until in each subject of the Syllabus an adequate framework of reference is developed, so that the facts are not treated as ends in themselves, but are given their proper significance. It is no doubt true that some Registration candidates may not be able to achieve this kind of synthesis. The purpose of a professional examination, however, is to discover those who have such ability.

Benge went on to illustrate his point from the main subjects of the Registration Syllabus. What he says about the Administration paper is typical:

> In Library Administration the difficulty is not that such matters cannot be taught but rather that principles and theory must bear a proper relationship to practice. The

relationship is the key factor and those who decry theory are no less impractical than those who ignore current techniques. To insist that a student should be tested in the examination room mainly on his knowledge of administrative methods is to misunderstand the purpose of examinations or to deny that they have any value in this subject. Some examiners have required detailed knowledge of techniques in one type of library. Such "know-how" is not even necessarily acquired by experience, and it cannot be gained from the literature since none is available. Questions of this type are provided solely for those candidates who have been fortunate enough to have had relevant experience. The professional level is not reached until the candidate is tested not only on practice in his library, nor even in other libraries, but on general practice in relation to a background of professional purpose.

He concluded :

These views are put forward as a result of experience common to all full-time tutors. If the examiner's approach is consistently, even deliberately, unsuited to those who study full-time, then library schools find their work partly nullified and their best students penalized.

It is partly to overcome such difficulties that the L.A. has set up Moderating Committees, so that tutors and examiners can exchange their respective points of view. At successive meetings of these committees arguments similar to those outlined above have been advanced by the representatives of the full-time schools. Some progress has been made, notably in Assistance to Readers and Classification and Cataloguing. In other subjects, however, there remains a clear divergence of views. It would be most unfortunate if those most closely concerned with library schools became convinced that the best remedy lies in setting up their own examination system. It is to be hoped that the Moderating Committees will become increasingly effective in dealing with this situation.

The Demand for Internal Examinations

Not all the library school lecturers were as willing as Benge to regard internal examining by the Schools as a last resort to be demanded only if it proved impossible to re-model the L.A. Examinations on a sound basis. In fact, however, one of the first to attack the principle of external examining by non-tutors was not a library school lecturer but a highly respected if somewhat unorthodox senior librarian, E. A. Savage, the former Chief Librarian of Edinburgh. In an

article in the Library Review of Spring 1950 Savage delivered a sharp attack on the whole pattern of professional education as it existed at that time.[3] It is in parts wayward and inaccurate, but its basic points were too true and important to be anything but uncomfortable for those members of the Profession who were inclined to be complacent about what had been achieved in professional education.

Savage felt very strongly that the Library Schools had bound themselves too closely to the Syllabus, and were inclined to judge their success solely by how well their students did in the Examination:

> With the new Schools has come an old evil, a foul thing to us: cram school competition ... An original head, a Duff Brown, or a Jast, might shut up a school in a session. Canny school heads will rub their noses over every stop in the sacred Syllabus; they may be out of a job if they don't ... The Syllabus, examiners' interpretation of it, and their comments (my goodness!) on their victims' answers, are read with lynx-eyed attention by tutors. New tuition is being bound to bad old tradition.

Lecturers were quick to point out that all this was very exaggerated, but clearly there was much truth in it. A more valid criticism was that Savage's attack was misdirected: it should have fallen wholly and not merely partly on the L.A. and the Profession as a whole, who were adamant that Library School tutors should have no part in assessing the quality of their own work and the success of their own students. Library School tutors knew better than anyone that there was much more in education for librarianship than cramming students for the L.A. Examinations; but the majority of Chief Librarians, Education Authorities and students were almost wholly concerned with success in L.A. Examinations.

Perhaps Savage was right in thinking that Library School tutors should have worked harder to get the system changed, and should have truckled less to it while it existed. Perhaps he himself, if he had been the Head of a Library School, would have gone his own way and "damned the consequences". There is no doubt, however, that many library school tutors were working very hard to improve matters, and that not a few other librarians were behind them.

Savage's own solution would not have been internal examining by each individual school. He wanted library school tutors to work with the L.A. examiners in assessing candidates, and he wanted the student's class-work "A surer guide to ability than examinations" to be taken into consideration. As Stokes pointed out, however, the Heads of Library Schools had made this point to the L.A. at their first meeting in January, 1947. It was not approved on the grounds that it would have been unfair to all those students who were not attending full-time library schools.

Stokes took the argument a stage further in an article on "The future of British Library Schools" of January 1954. [4] On the matter of examining he claimed that :

> It is here that the L.A. must make its biggest decision in the near future. The present position, whereby tutors lecture to a Syllabus over which they have no control at all, and where the work which is done by a student in the course of a full year is completely ignored, is frankly absurd ... In addition ... the examination system ... is costing money which can ill be spared. It has also resulted in the whole policy of membership of the profession being most unjustly geared to its examinations. Apart from this there is an alarming paucity of examiners, with results that are becoming increasingly apparent in the papers set. In any event, it is difficult to believe that any man or

woman is in a mental state to mark papers for many hours into the evening of a day when they have laboured long in a library.

> There seems to be no reason, apart from the Association's injured pride, why the Library Schools should not themselves take over the examining of their own students. There could be sufficient safeguards to enable the profession as a whole to feel that a good standard of marking was maintained. The best plan would be for the L.A. to inspect and a prove a number of schools. Such schools would be empowered to formulate their own Syllabuses and have them approved by the L.A.. At the end of the session, during which a student's practical work would have been assessed, the L.A., through a body of subject assessors, could approve the papers before they were set for the final examinations. Then from the scripts which were marked by the school staff they would take a random selection to assure themselves that no nefarious practices were being indulged in. Such a system would still give the L.A. essential control over the examinations without the elaborate machinery and cost as at present. The registration of members would still be the prerogative of the L.A., which would grant the A.L.A., and F.L.A. to graduates of approved schools. The chief objection usually raised is that it would be unfair on students unable to attend library schools. One of the reasons, however, why they are at present debarred is that Local Education Authorities occasionally refuse a grant for a full-time course if the same examination can be taken without it.

These proposals seem eminently sane and reasonable to us now, but they were revolutionary at the time, and it took another decade for similar proposals to reach the level of practical possibilities. They were not acceptable then even to all library school lecturers.

N. Dain, for instance, Head of the Leeds Library School, attacked the whole idea of internal examining root and branch.[5] P. H. Sewell, Head of the North-Western Polytechnic School of Librarianship, and R. C. Benge, pointed out some of its practical limitations, and suggested a more practicable immediate programme:[6]

It is unrealistic to suggest that all library assistants could obtain leave of absence to attend a full-time school. One suspects that unless L.A. examinations continued as alternatives to school diplomas (a situation paralleled in the architectural profession) special and government librarians would turn elsewhere for appropriate qualifications...

The immediate task is to strengthen the participation of the schools in the control of the L.A. Syllabus and examination policy. The schools are moving from training in methods, techniques and routines towards a true professional education and can make a valuable contribution here. On the other hand schools could be visited and advised by a professional board whose recommendations would carry weight with education authorities and governing bodies. There are precedents for this.

Criticism from the Non-Public Library Point of View

Aslib had two main anxieties regarding the development of professional education after the war. In the first place the slow but more or less inevitable transition from almost wholly part-time to almost wholly full-time education was bound to create problems for small library units where it was difficult to grant any assistant leave of absence for a prolonged period. In the second place Aslib was vitally interested to see that sufficient attention was paid to the requirements of special librarians in the Syllabus. It is with the latter that we are concerned here. The Library Association had never deliberately neglected the needs of special librarians in its drafting of syllabuses: indeed, it realized that it was absolutely essential to provide a basis for the education of all types of librarian if its cardinal doctrine that "Librarianship was one" was to be seriously upheld. And Aslib had been consulted by the L.A. on the 1945 Syllabus and subsequently. Nevertheless it could hardly be denied that the 1945 pattern, at least as it worked out in practice, was more suited

to the needs of public librarians than to those of other types.

The L.A. was compelled, if only by the pressure of events, to give more attention to the needs of non-public libraries as time went on. Aslib was there to see that their needs were not neglected, but most important of all, non-public libraries were becoming proportionately more important. Public Libraries, it is true, were expanding, but other types of library were expanding even more rapidly and there was an increasing demand for librarians suitably trained to man them.

Aslib was represented on the committee that was set up in 1947 to revise the 1945 Syllabus, and the 1950 Syllabus incorporated certain improvements that went some way towards meeting the requirements of special librarians. They did not go all the way, however, and active negotiations between the L.A. and Aslib continued.

In 1951 an event in the international library world brought great consternation to the L.A. The 17th Session of the International Library Committee in Rome adopted a resolution that called for separate training for librarians and documentalists. In this country a strong body of opinion in Aslib favoured this view, and had already drawn the logical conclusion, that the L.A. might remain the body responsible for qualifications in general librarianship, but that Aslib itself ought to sponsor a diploma in special librarianship, documentation, and information work. This matter was carefully considered by the L.A.'s Register and Examinations Executive Committee and its Education Sub-Committee, and in 1953 the

latter produced a Memorandum on it. They claimed that the L.A. Syllabus had been "adapted to meet the general requirements of all kinds of library;" and that "a close examination of the Syllabus will show that the L.A. has carefully considered and represented that section of librarianship known as documentation." In view of these considerations the L.A. could not accept the view that "separate training for librarians and documentalists should be created;" nor the implication that a "documentalist is anything other than a librarian who has specialized in some part of his technique.[7]

Aslib was divided on the matter. In the event, however, it was decided at the crucial Annual Conference at Nottingham in September 1953 to continue to work with the L.A. to achieve a Syllabus that would cater for the needs of all librarians, general and special.[8]

Many members of Aslib, however, continued to believe that a separation of training was inevitable. J. E. L. Farradane, for instance, stated categorically that librarians and information officers belonged to two different professions, and that if Aslib could not provide a full-time training course for information work a separate institution ought to be set up to sponsor it.[9] And Aslib itself, in an official memorandum it produced on the resolution of the International Library Committee, disagreed with the L.A. viewpoint as expressed above, stressed the difference between Librarians and Information Officers, and insisted that the latter needed special training in the techniques of exploiting information.

II The 1964 Syllabus

The L.A./Aslib Negotiations

In spite of the wide divergences of view that undoubtedly existed among special librarians, the Aslib Conference of September 1953 did unanimously agree to seek consultations with the L.A., and not to go ahead immediately with the idea of planning its own educational system for special librarians and information officers.

Aslib officially invited the L.A. to enter into joint negotiations in the following April, the L.A. immediately agreed; and in May 1954 a joint committee of the two associations was set up to consider in particular how the L.A. educational system might be modified to make it suitable for special librarians and information officers.

Work began in the Autumn, but the negotiations were protracted and difficult; it took just ten years to produce and put into operation a new Syllabus, and this was still far from satisfying even the two main elements in the profession represented by the official governing bodies of Aslib and the L.A. respectively.

In March 1956, in spite of the fact that these negotiations were proceeding, Aslib announced that it proposed to set up a Register of Information Officers, a step which the L.A. regarded as threatening the unity of the profession. In an official statement of the L.A.'s views on this published in the L.A.R. for August 1956 it was said:[10]

> The L.A. has conceded a great deal in negotiations about the Syllabus in order to maintain a united front with Aslib, and it is regretted that the modus vivendi achieved in recent years between the L.A. and Aslib is being needlessly endangered.

The L.A. was particularly incensed by Aslib's intention of using the L.A.'s examinations as one of the bases of qualification without having first discussed this with them; and this incident undoubtedly dissipated some of the good will that had been built up by the fact that the two associations were jointly discussing their educational problems.

Negotiations, however, continued, but progress was still slow, and in November 1956 we find the Chairman of the L.A. Education Sub-Committee apologizing for the long delays. The L.A. had, however, come to the conclusion in the previous month that whatever the outcome of the discussions with Aslib, some revision of the Syllabus was desirable, and the idea of a "multi-choice" Syllabus had been accepted in principle.[11]

The representatives of the L.A. and Aslib had in fact reached a large measure of agreement on the broad outline of the new Syllabus. The scope of subjects offered was to be widened; the choice of alternatives increased, wherever possible the amount of technical detail demanded was to be reduced, and the relative importance of subject knowledge was to be enhanced. There was to be a common core of three papers and a wide choice of further papers. The two sides agreed thus far, but although successive drafts were produced they could not agree on an actual draft syllabus.[12]

Agreement on a draft syllabus between the L.A. and Aslib in fact finally foundered on what at first sight seems to be a not particularly important disagreement. The L.A. insisted that general library organization must be included in the common core of compulsory subjects, while Aslib maintained that there ought to be alternative papers on the organization of different types of library.

In fact, of course, this particular disagreement was merely the indication of a basic difference of emphasis in the view of the two associations. The cardinal doctrine of the L.A. was that there was a common core of professional knowledge that all librarians should possess, that an A.L.A. should be competent to work effectively in all types of library, and that the movement of staff from one type of library to another should be encouraged. Aslib's fundamental concern was to ensure that a series of papers could be chosen from the alternatives provided that would form a suitable basis for the training of special librarians. The majority view of the Aslib side was that there was sufficient in common between special and general librarianship to make the selection of such a series of papers from a syllabus designed for all types of librarianship a reasonable proposition. Many individual members of Aslib felt, however, that even if the L.A. had given way on the general organization paper, the proposed syllabus would not have been suitable for the training of information officers, who required a different training from librarians, even from special librarians.

The 1957 Draft Syllabus

In the end the L.A. decided to adopt the draft that had met

with the widest measure of agreement in the Joint Committee as the basis for the revision of its own syllabus. With the exception of the general organization paper, this final draft had been approved by both sides as suitable for general and special librarians alike.[13]

At their meeting on Jan. 25th, 1957 the Register and Examinations Executive Committee formally adopted this draft syllabus as the basis for revision of the Registration Examination, and invited the observations of the Schools of Librarianship Committee and the Education Committees of Sections on it. (It was published in the L.A.R. for March).[14]

It consisted of three groups with the following papers:

Group A:
1. Organization of knowledge in libraries
2. Bibliographical organization.
3. Library organization.

Group B:
4. Academic libraries.
5. Special libraries and information bureaux.
6. Public (municipal and county) libraries.
7. Library service for young people.
8. Hospital library work.
9. Classification and cataloguing practice.
10. Book production.
11. History of books and printing.
12. Bibliographical method.
13. Archive administration.
14. Palaeography.
15. Dissemination of information.

Group C: Papers 16 *et seq.* consisted of applied librarianship in special subject fields.

All the three papers in Group A were compulsory, and candidates would have to choose three papers from the twelve papers of Group B, and two from the twelve or more papers of Group C, making eight papers in all.

In March 1957 the L.A. set up a Syllabus Sub-Committee, which consisted of Miss L. V. Paulin, County Librarian of Hertfordshire (Chairman), Professor R. Irwin, Director of the London University School of Librarianship, W. Caldwell, Lecturer-in-charge of the Newcastle School of Librarianship, T. E. Callander, Borough Librarian of Croydon, J. S. Davey of Edmonton Public Libraries (representing the A.A.L.), D. J. Foskett, Librarian of the London University Institute of Education, J. C. Harrison, Lecturer-in-charge of the Manchester School of Librarianship, R. J. Hoy, Deputy Librarian of the London University School of Oriental and African Studies, W. B. Paton, County Librarian of Lanarkshire, and W. E. Tyler, Head of the Glasgow School of Librarianship. It was therefore fairly representative of all elements in the profession, including the full-time lecturers in librarianship. To it were referred the draft syllabus above, and the communications received by the L.A. arising out of its publication. It took into consideration memoranda received from Branches, Sections, and individual members, and also the storm of controversy that beat itself out in the professional press.

Much of the time of the Sub-Committee was taken up with the detailed scrutiny of the individual papers, and with the framing of detailed annotations to make them clear to tutors and examiners. A more controversial side of their work was to fit the papers into a syllabus structure that would meet all the conflicting interests and claims of the different elements in the profession.

The lecturers at the full-time schools were naturally anxious to ensure that the new syllabus structure would be suited to full-time courses in librarianship. At a special meeting on March 13th, 1957 the Schools of Librarianship Committee agreed to propose that the new syllabus structure should consist of:[15]

(1) An Intermediate Examination of a standard between the existing First Professional and Registration Examinations, and

(2) A Final Examination based on the best features of the draft syllabus.

They also suggested that the A.L.A. should be awarded on the basis of their proposed Final Examination; and that the F.L.A. should be granted only to those who submitted an approved thesis or bibliography. Their intention was that two consecutive years of full-time education leading to the proposed Final Examination should become the normal method of qualification for the librarianship profession.

The Sub-Committee itself favoured this approach and as early as July 1957 it obtained the approval of the Education Sub-Committee of the principle of a one rather than a two tier structure. By the

middle of 1959 it had produced a two stage syllabus comprising a "common core" intermediate examination and a final examination consisting of a wide range of alternative specialized papers. This was submitted to the Education Sub-Committee and was approved by it.

The 1960 Proposed Syllabus

The preliminary announcements of these decisions, however, raised strong protests from a large number of influential librarians. One of the most serious objections to the abandonment of the two-tier structure was that salary and service agreements particularly in local government were geared to it. The Education Sub-Committee therefore sought the views of the Membership Committee, and the latter was convinced that it would be undesirable to disturb the existing relationships between the Syllabus and the Register of Chartered Librarians, because of the link between them and salary agreements.

The Sub-Committee was asked to modify its recommendations, and after another nine months work produced another syllabus including much the same papers but arranged in the traditional Registration and Finals form.[16] This was approved by the Education Sub-Committee and the Registration and Examination Executive Committee on May 27th 1960.

The Registration Examination was to consist of five compulsory papers as follows :-

1. The Library and the community.
2. Government and control of libraries.
3. The organization of knowledge.

4. Bibliographical control and service.

5. Bibliographical apparatus of one of nine specified subject fields.

It was intended that it should be taken and passed at one sitting.

The Final Examination was to consist of three groups of papers, A, B, and C, from each of which at least one paper had to be chosen, six papers having to be taken at all. Papers to be taken in any one group would have to be taken and passed together at one sitting, but groups could be taken together or separately in any order.

Group A was to consist of six papers concerned with the administration of types of libraries or services:

1. Academic and copyright libraries.
2. Special libraries and information bureaux.
3. Public (municipal and county) libraries.
4. Library service for young people in schools and public libraries.
5. Hospital libraries.
6. Archive administration.

Group B was to consist of ten papers concerned mainly with the techniques of librarianship:

1. Theory of classification.
2. Theory of cataloguing.
3. Practical classification and cataloguing.
4. History of books and printing.

5. History and present state of the book trade in Great Britain.
6. Analytical bibliography.
7. Technical processes in libraries.
8. Dissemination of information.
9. Palaeography and diplomatic.
10. History of libraries and librarianship.

Group C was to consist of twenty-six papers concerned with the bibliography and librarianship of various subjects.

The 1964 Syllabus

According to the constitution of the L.A., the earliest date at which the proposed syllabus could have been confirmed (after "lying on the table" for six months) was November 25th 1962. In the event, in view of the far reaching nature of the proposals and the great controversy about them in the profession, the Register and Examinations Committee decided in November that further time should be allowed for consideration of them.

The majority of the full-time lecturers in librarianship still believed that the one-tier two-stage structure (Intermediate and Final) based on a two year full-time course and leading to the A.L.A. was the only satisfactory approach, and this was the official view of the Schools of Librarianship Committee. The proposed syllabus was not nearly so suitable for a two-year full-time course, which the L.A. had officially adopted as its policy in June 1960.

Those most concerned with the needs of part-time students were no better satisfied in view of the formidable hurdle provided in the

proposed 5-paper "all-at-one-sitting" registration examination. There was also a strong body of opinion in the profession (including the Schools of Librarianship Committee) which held that for the Fellowship of the L.A. a research project would be a more appropriate requirement than a further examination that was bound to some extent at least to repeat work done at an earlier stage.

The Syllabus Sub-Committee continued to sit, and it received and considered all the views sent in to the L.A. on the new syllabus. They soon came to the conclusion that the two-stage one-tier structure, which they had always favoured on educational grounds, was after all acceptable to the majority of the profession; and after approval by the Education Sub-Committee their new proposals were confirmed by the Register and Examinations Executive Committee on April 7th, 1961.

The proposed syllabus consisted of two parts, originally called Intermediate and Final, although these terms had been dropped by the time the syllabus came into force.[17] Before the first examinations were held under it (June 1964) minor modifications had been made in it; and in order to save repetition I will give the Syllabus in the form in which it actually came into force in 1964.

The Part I Examination consisted of four papers of three hours each, all to be taken at one and the same sitting, as follows:-

1. The library and the community.
2. Government and control of libraries.
3. The organization of knowledge.
4. Bibliographical control and service.

The Part II Examination consisted of three lists, A, B, C. The candidate had to choose one and only one paper from List A, and at least one from each of lists B and C. Six papers had to be taken in all, but they could be taken and passed separately or together in any order. The papers were as follows :

List A

1. Academic and legal deposit libraries.
2. Special libraries and information bureaux.
3. Public (municipal and county) libraries.

List B

11. Theory of classification.
12. Theory of cataloguing.
13. Practical classification and cataloguing.
21. Bibliography.
22. History of libraries and librarianship.
31. Handling and dissemination of information.
32. Library service for young people in schools and public libraries.
33. Hospital libraries.
91. Archive administration.
92. Palaeography and diplomatic.

List C

consisted of over thirty papers on the bibliography and librarianship of various special subject fields, including, for instance :

101. Bibliography and librarianship of Literature in English, 1750 to date.

202. Bibliography and librarianship of Mediaeval and modern history.

304. Bibliography and librarianship of Sociology.

401. Bibliography and libraianship of Fine Arts (excluding Music)

501. Bibliography and librarianship of Mechanical engineering.

507. Bibliography and librarianship of Medicine.

This Syllabus was clearly an advance on anything the L.A. had produced before. It was meant to achieve two main aims. First, it was to be equally suitable for all types of librarianship, special, academic and public. Secondly, it was to be specially suited to the needs of full-time students, including ideally a large proportion who had gone on to library school straight from the sixth forms of grammar schools, and to the two-year integrated course. It also aimed to avoid some of the main defects of the old Syllabus: the re-examining in the same subjects at different levels, its narrowness and inflexibility, the emphasis on traditional techniques and particular experience, its remoteness from progressive thought in either librarianship or education. How far did it succeed in achieving these aims and remedying these defects?

First, it came as near to satisfying the needs of all types of library as it was possible to come. There will always be those who think that the different types of librarianship have too little in common to make common study possible at all, or even that activities that have traditionally been regarded as part of librarianship are in fact quite distinct disciplines; and it is obviously impossible

to satisfy their needs by producing any kind of standard syllabus. Any special interest whose aims fell short of this extreme found its needs reasonably well catered for.

The Syllabus for the Part II Examination consisted of about fifty alternative papers, and it was possible to build up a combination of six of them to suit the needs of work in most kinds of library. A student intending to make (or continue) a career in special libraries could choose the paper in List A on Special Libraries and Information Bureaux; and from List B two or three of these, - Theory of Classification, Theory of Cataloguing, Practical Cataloguing and Classification, Handling and Dissemination of Information - which were all useful in this type of work. In List C he could choose one or two papers from a wide choice of alternatives that would fit in with his own knowledge and experience and be useful in a particular type of special library, say medicine, mechanical, electrical or civil engineering, chemical technology, or economics and commerce. A student intending to make his career in university libraries could choose the List A paper on Academic and Legal Deposit Libraries; and in List B would find the Bibliography paper, as well as the cataloguing and classification papers and some others, relevant choices. And there were specific papers in List B for Library Services for Young People and Hospital Libraries.

This is not to say that the Syllabus catered for all kinds of library perfectly. This could hardly be expected. The Syllabus needed to be tried and improved in practice. Librarianship itself was far from static, and new needs would be bound to make themselves

felt. For instance, it did not prove to be completely adequate for the increasingly important field of librarianship in colleges of technology, commerce, education, art and so on. Paper 1 was chiefly concerned with the problems of the large research libraries in the academic field, which were quite different from those of colleges of technology, to which Paper 2 was perhaps more relevant, and certainly from those of the smaller colleges of further education.

There is no doubt that the bias towards public librarianship, which had remained a feature of all previous Syllabuses in spite of considerable improvement over the years, was finally removed. Indeed, it might be said that this type of librarianship was the only one to whose special needs there was no List B paper that was particularly relevant. It would not have been easy admittedly to devise a special paper particularly suited to work in these most general of all libraries; but a paper on the sociology of libraries might have been appropriate.

The old controversy as to how far, if at all, every trainee-librarian, whatever his specialization, should have to study the problems common to all types of library, was solved very appropriately on the level of the Intermediate or Part I examination. This was a very satisfactory solution for all parties. The old pattern where, for instance, the student who was committed to special librarianship had to go on studying the problems of public and academic libraries (although he was able to concentrate on those of special libraries) through Registration and right up to Final level, was plainly wrong; and Aslib was justified in its opposition to this kind of approach.

On the other hand, the L.A. could hardly expect anyone to take seriously its cardinal principle that librarianship was one, if through its Syllabus it allowed a student to become a professional librarian while remaining ignorant of all types of library except his own. On educational grounds, moreover, it was essential that all students should know something of the problems of librarianship in general before going on to study those of a particular type. This was particularly necessary in a Syllabus that was designed for students straight from school who were not yet committed to any particular type and had to make a choice during their first year.

Under the new Syllabus all students had to study general librarianship in their first year, although even here they could concentrate on a particular type if they wished, and this satisfied the educational and L.A. point of view. A real effort was made to make it genuine comparative librarianship, with the emphasis placed on the problems common to all types of libraries, and not just public librarianship "with frills", as such courses had always been in danger of becoming. Once the student had finished his first year's study and completed Part I, which was not a very difficult examination, he could concentrate all his efforts on one particular type of library, and in Part II, which was the main qualifying examination, the equivalent of the old Registration, he had to answer no questions outside his specialization. The old Final Examination was in effect replaced by the thesis, for the subject of which the student could choose a topic within his own field. These provisions adequately met

the legitimate requirements of the special library point of view.

Although the 1946 Syllabus had been initially designed primarily with full-time study in mind, as things worked out in practice it turned out to be a rather unsatisfactory compromise between the needs of full-time and part-time students. The 1964 Syllabus was produced specifically to suit the two-year integrated full-time course, and although nothing was done to make things difficult for the part-time student for its own sake, the needs of the full-time student were given first priority. More important still, there were no later compromises in favour of the part-time student; the Syllabus did work out in practice as a Syllabus for full-time study at the Library Schools, and any later modifications were made to suit the needs of the full-time schools.

The important part of the new Syllabus was the Final or Part II Examination, and this served very well as the concluding examination of a two year course. It consisted of six papers, as compared with the seven of the old Registration Examination; and in view of the fact that there was twice as long to prepare for it, there was now no excuse for making courses at Library Schools "cramming" courses. The level of the Part II Examination was intended to be above that of the old Registration and below that of the old Final: in practice, it was maintained at a level nearer to that of the Registration. Library Schools tutors could now devote their energies to educating their students in the full sense without being constantly preoccupied with the necessity of getting them ~~their students~~ through their examinations. The students similarly had more time to follow up their own interests beyond the strict needs of

the Syllabus, and more time for background reading and for projects and general studies. The wide choice of alternatives suited the diverse interests of individual students (and tutors) as well as those of different types of library.

The Part I Examination functioned very well as the intermediate examination of a full-time course. It was by intention a very general examination concerned with the fundamentals of librarianship in all types of library. ~~An examination of this type was particularly necessary for those who had gone on to library school straight from school with little experience of practical work in libraries; and suitably tested their preliminary studies at library school.~~ It consisted of four three-hour papers, which had to be taken and passed at one and the same sitting, except that a student might be referred in one paper and be allowed one further attempt to pass it. This did not present a very formidable obstacle to the full-time student, and the vast majority of those who failed it proved thereby that they were not of a high enough calibre to become professional librarians. The library schools endeavoured to reject such people by their own selection methods, but such methods can never be infallible, and the Part I Examination acted as a further barrier to the unsuitable entrant.

There was one respect, however, in which the structure of the Syllabus was not wholly satisfactory: it was the intention of the Syllabus that the student should study for one year on the basis of the Part I Syllabus, take and pass the Part I Examination, and then study for a further year on the basis of the Part II Syllabus. From the

start the library schools saw that this was an artificial way of running a two-year course; such a course would have been, in fact, two one-year courses running consecutively. In any case, one year's full-time study was somewhat too long merely to prepare for the Part I Examination, whereas one year was too short to prepare adequately for Part II. One or two schools planned to overcome this difficulty by taking two terms only before Part I, and four further terms before Part II. All the schools were determined to provide only two-year integrated courses for the whole Syllabus, so they could work out their own solutions to this problem. The general approach of the schools was that they were providing two year courses for Part II; and that during the course their students had to pass Part I. Courses could therefore be planned as a whole: students could be taken further in their studies during the first year than the Part I Syllabus required, and this could be taken into account when planning the courses for Part II in the second year.

One of the chief defects of all post-war L.A. syllabuses - the re-examining in the same subject at different levels - was very largely remedied. Instead of the three tiers of the old Syllabus - First Professional, Registration, Final, all of which were quite separate examinations, there was now only one tier, the Professional Examinations, which were in two stages, Part I and Part II. Librarians trying to adjust themselves to the new pattern endeavoured to work out equations between the stages of the old and new syllabuses. (For the purposes of salary awards and so on equations had to be made, but the aims and

methods of working these out are not strictly educational, and need not be considered here). They tried to equate Part I with Registration and Part II with Final, and wondered perhaps whether Part I was not nearer to F.P.E. and Part II to Registration.

Such comparisons ignored the quite different approach of the new Syllabus. Under the old pattern most students did not proceed beyond the Registration level: it was necessary therefore to ensure that this examination covered all the major aspects of a librarian's work. The Final Examination necessarily repeated these aspects at a higher level. Under the new pattern students had to pass both Part I and Part II: Part I was not a qualification in itself and it could be assumed that most of those who were sitting for Part II had passed Part I only one year previously. There was therefore no necessity for the Part I Examination to be in any sense a qualifying examination, and neither Part I nor Part II need in itself cover all aspects of library work. The relationship between the two could be much closer; and there was no need for one part to do what was adequately done by the other.

The idea worked out fairly well in practice. Part I was meant to provide for a course in basic librarianship, and the various specializations in Part II did not on the whole repeat what had already been studied for Part I. So far as the library organization and administration group of papers was concerned, i.e. Papers 1 and 2 of Part I and the List A papers of Part II, where the danger of repetition was greatest, the achievement of the new Syllabus in avoiding this danger was most notable. In both paper 1 and paper 2

of Part I the emphasis was on the basic problems common to all libraries; and Paper 1 was concerned with the history and sociology of libraries, and on the organizations serving all types of libraries. The List A papers, one on each main type of library, genuinely built on and took further rather than repeated these studies, each one being concerned with the actual administration of a particular type of library.

Paper 4 of Part I also provided a good introduction to the List C papers of Part II. For paper 4 the student had to study the general problems of bibliographical organization and control (plus the essentials of modern book production). For Part II he was able to choose one or two specific subjects and apply the principles that had been demonstrated to him in the first year to the bibliography and librarianship of those subjects.

The least satisfactory relationship was that between Paper 3 of Part I and the List B papers of Part II. Paper 3 was concerned with cataloguing and classification, and List B consisted of three cataloguing and classification papers (B11, B12, B13), and rather a miscellaneous collection of other papers. As regards the cataloguing and classification papers there was some danger of repetition here, as B11 and B12 did really only take the content of Paper 3 to a higher level. As regards some of the other papers, Archive Administration and Palaeography and Diplomatic, for instance, there was the converse danger that the student would not have had any relevant preliminary studies. For others again, the preliminary study was contained in

other Part I papers: for Bibliography, for instance, in Paper 4, for Hospital Libraries and Library Service for Young People in Papers 1 and 2.

On theoretical grounds there should not have been a paper in Part I on two specific library techniques (cataloguing and classification) and not on others. It was included for two quite different practical reasons. First, it would have been difficult to frame a satisfactory paper on fundamental library techniques of all kinds, although such a paper will perhaps have to be devised one day. Secondly, it was unthinkable to most librarians that a person should be able to become a librarian without having a reasonable knowledge of cataloguing and classification.

This raises an important point about the structure of the new Syllabus. Although it was true that every successful student of Part I was going on to study for Part II, it was still necessary to include a particular study in Part I if it was regarded as a necessary part of every librarian's education, simply because Part II consisted of a large number of alternative papers. (Another solution would have been to make certain papers compulsory in Part II, but this would have reduced the flexibility that was one of its chief virtues).

The structure of the Syllabus was necessarily a compromise between many divergent and not wholly compatible aims, and on the whole it was a successful compromise. At any rate it worked fairly well when it was put into practice.

Equally as important as the overall structure of the Syllabus, if not more so, was the content of the individual papers. In this

respect too the new Syllabus represented a real step forward, and the new approach to examining the student librarian that had been put forward by tutors like R. C. Benge and R. Stokes from the early 1950's onwards was finally adopted in the L.A.'s own Syllabus. (The fact that more and more students would be taking the examinations without having had very much in the way of practical experience in libraries at all meant that questions relating to the performance of specific routines in specific libraries were quite out of the question in any case). There was much more emphasis on the history and social background of libraries, their essential purposes and functions, and on the principles and standards that governed library techniques. The aim was to test whether the student had an adequate grasp of the principles of librarianship; and it was assumed that if he had he would then be able to apply them to specific situations in actual libraries when he began his period of practical training. The correct place to test whether he could so apply them was finally recognized to be the library and not the examination room, and questions of the "design a book trolley giving measurements" type had no part in the new Syllabus.

The scope of each paper and the questions set had to be suited to the capabilities of a young person of good intelligence and educational background, but little practical experience of librarianship, who had been studying librarianship full-time. Detailed syllabuses for each paper, and model questions, were worked out in the years between 1961 and 1963 by study groups on which the library school tutors were strongly represented; and it was at this stage that the individual

respect too the new Syllabus represented a real step forward, and the new approach to examining the student librarian that had been put forward by tutors like R. C. Benge and R. Stokes from the early 1950's onwards was finally adopted in the L.A.'s own Syllabus. (The fact that more and more students would be taking the examinations without having had very much in the way of practical experience in libraries at all meant that questions relating to the performance of specific routines in specific libraries were quite out of the question in any case). There was much more emphasis on the history and social background of libraries, their essential purposes and functions, and on the principles and standards that governed library techniques. The aim was to test whether the student had an adequate grasp of the principles of librarianship; and it was assumed that if he had he would then be able to apply them to specific situations in actual libraries when he began his period of practical training. The correct place to test whether he could so apply them was finally recognized to be the library and not the examination room, and questions of the "design a book trolley giving measurements" type had no part in the new Syllabus.

The scope of each paper and the questions set had to be suited to the capabilities of a young person of good intelligence and educational background, but little practical experience of librarianship, who had been studying librarianship full-time. Detailed syllabuses for each paper, and model questions, were worked out in the years between 1961 and 1963 by study groups on which the library school tutors were strongly represented; and it was at this stage that the individual

papers were moulded into shape. It proved possible in most papers to work out a syllabus that suited subject experts and practising librarians, and was at the same time teachable and well-suited to the kind of students that were in fact concerned.

The most original series of papers in the new Syllabus was the List C papers in Part II. Subject bibliography has always been recognized as an essential part of the librarian's job, but it was a difficult subject to teach and examine. In the old Syllabus it was examined in Paper B(ii): Assistance to Readers, but the chief drawback here was that the candidate might be asked questions on the bibliography of any subject. This was, of course, absurd, and later it was specifically agreed by the examiners that a candidate could specialize in three or so subjects of his own choice and that the questions set would be "open" enough for him to pass. This was a step forward, but not altogether satisfactory in practice. The old Final Syllabus was similarly unsatisfactory. Questions on the bibliography of any subject could be asked in Part 1: Bibliography and Book selection; Part 3 on the other hand, consisted of sixteen alternative parts on the "subject approach to the literature of the arts and sciences." Each part consisted of two papers, one of which was on the bibliography and librarianship of the subject, but the other was really a general paper on the literature of the subject itself, as were the Group D alternative papers in the Registration Examination.

Whether student librarians should be taught and examined in subjects other than librarianship has always been a debatable point,

and still is. It is clear, however, that even if they should, the way of doing so that prevailed under the old Syllabus was a very unsatisfactory one. The student was required to study the literature of the whole field, which meant that he had to do so at a very superficial level, and in practice the most successful students were those who had committed to memory the authors, titles and potted contents of as many books as possible.

It was made quite clear from the outset that the List C papers of the new Syllabus were to be concerned solely with the bibliography and librarianship of the subject. They were introduced to serve two purposes. First, to provide papers to suit the varying needs of special libraries and of special departments and sections of general libraries. And secondly, to provide papers to suit the subject specializations of the students themselves, so that they could show that they could apply the principles to subject bibliography and librarianship to particular subjects. Although the idea was an excellent one, it was difficult to work out in practice. The library schools could not afford the time to teach the subjects themselves, and it was rightly understood that subject knowledge would not be examined. On the other hand, it was bad practice to try to study the bibliography and librarianship of a subject of which the student had no real knowledge or understanding. It was true that an increasing number of students had passed "A" level examinations in two or more subjects, but this was not a solution to the problem for two reasons. First, a student does not normally gain a very good knowledge or understanding of the literature

of the subject as a whole from "A" level study. (Even degree level study is often deficient in this respect). And secondly, the vast majority of the students had studied subjects from the same limited range: English, French and German literature, History, Geography and so on; so that if students were restricted to the same subjects as they had gained "A" level passes in, very few of the alternatives of List C would ever be chosen. A similar difficulty was to see how the student could be examined on the librarianship of the subject when he had had little or no experience of practical work in an appropriate library.

A complete solution to these problems will have to await the introduction of a new pattern of education for librarianship.[18] In the meantime tutors and examiners, after much work in study groups, many articles, and one full-scale conference were able to work out satisfactory teaching programmes and examination syllabuses in most subjects. In spite of the problems this was one of the most valuable parts of the new Syllabus, and it was more important to get it working than to worry about its inherent illogicalities.

The final virtue of the new Syllabus was something less tangible than the others, and was more a matter of the changed atmosphere in British education for librarianship rather than anything necessarily contained in the new Syllabus. In the past tutors and examiners had seen themselves almost as enemies: this was now changed and both sides co-operated to frame and operate the new Syllabus as fairly and efficiently as possible. In the past it had been

regarded as inevitable that a very large number of students would fail the examinations: now it was recognized that only a small minority of hopeless cases need do so. The idea that the examiner's job was to catch out the unwary student, and that the tutor's job was to teach his students clever examination stratagems was finally abandoned. (A sign of the times was the preponderance of the "open"question in the papers set under the new Syllabus). There was no reason why a good library school with efficient selection methods and high educational standards should not get all its students through both the Part I and Part II examinations.

Admission Standards:

An important aspect of the reforms of the period, as important in a way as the actual recasting of the Syllabus, was the raising of the standards of admission to the profession. In this context this meant the raising of the pre-entry qualifications to the L.A. examinations. Traditionally this had been based on the certificate intended for those who left grammar schools at the age of 16 or thereabouts. Since the introduction of the General Certificate of Education in 1951 the L.A. minimum entry qualifications had been 5 passes at Ordinary Level, including English Language. The three-tier structure of Entrance (First Professional from 1956), Registration and Final examinations was based on this pattern, as the first tier examination was intended for those whose educational achievement (whatever their potential) was not very high. (Graduates were exempt from Entrance or F.P.E.)

Ever since 1945, and to a greater extent since 1951, the

number of children staying on at school after 16 and taking Advanced level (not all of whom went on to universities and similar institutions) had been rapidly increasing; and the more farsighted librarians realized that if the profession continued to recruit at the lower level the standard of the entrants would in real terms be lower than it was before the war.[19] In actual fact the progress of librarianship had been such that a higher not a lower standard of recruitment was required.

Many even went so far as to urge that librarianship should become a solely postgraduate profession, but this was going too far for most librarians and would in the circumstances of the time have been impracticable. It was decided to compromise by raising the entry qualification to 5 passes in the G.C.E., of which 2 must be at "A" level and one must be English Language, and this proposal was included in the 1960 syllabus. In order to encourage intending librarians to stay at school and take "A" level as soon as possible, the L.A. decided to grant holders of two "A" levels exemption from F.P.E. from September 1st, 1960.[20]

It was intended that the new syllabus structure should not include the First Professional Examination stage, and this was confirmed when the 1964 syllabus came into force. It was, however, decided in 1961 to retain the First Professional Examination as a temporary measure so as to avoid hardship to those who had left school at 16 in order to work in libraries (when they might have stayed at school to take "A" levels) before the new pattern had

become well known; and until a sufficient number of "A" level candidates was seen to be coming forward. In order to make it clear that it was not to be regarded as part of the professional examinations it was re-named Entrance Examination. The last examination was held in 1967, but from 1963 onwards the majority of the students at the library schools had a minimum of 2 "A" levels, and the students with 5 "O" levels and the F.P.E. or Entrance Examination were a declining minority.

It was thought that there would be a better chance of recruiting persons with "A" levels if the system of education was such that students were recruited straight from school instead of spending a year or two working in libraries before becoming full-time students of librarianship. This was in effect the most radical change in the pattern of education for librarianship, and had much more far-reaching implications for the future than the mere recasting of the syllabus, or even the extension of the basic full-time librarianship course from one to two years.

III The Establishment of the New Pattern of Two-Year Full-Time Courses at the Library Schools

Progress towards the New Pattern

The view that one year was too short a time in which to train a librarian had been expressed long before the 1960's. The London University School of librarianship had, in fact, ever since its foundation in 1919, insisted on a two year course for non-graduates; and L. R. McColvin, in his Report of 1942, envisaged that the courses that would be provided by the new library schools, once the needs of the ex-servicemen had been met, would be of two years' duration. It was clearly necessary that the full-time courses for ex-servicemen that were established after the war should be as short as practicable. The one-year course, however, designed for ex-servicemen was continued without modification for non-ex-servicemen and became the normal peace-time practice of the schools.

There were many pressures causing this development, and together they discouraged at first even very much discussion of the possibility of two-year full-time courses. Chief Librarians and their committees viewed with alarm any suggestion that they might second their trainee staff for two years rather than one year; and non-public librarians found it more or less impracticable to second their staff even for one year. Local education authorities would have taken a great deal of persuading to provide grants for full-time two-year courses in librarianship in the circumstances of the late 1940's and early 1950's: their grants to students for one-year courses were in

very many cases parsimonious, and some (although a gradually decreasing number) would not give grants at all for librarianship courses. Again, the conservative element in the library profession became reconciled to the idea of full-time education only very slowly, and any proposal to double the length of the courses would have met with their unyielding opposition. Finally, the young men and women who were the potential students were inclined to oppose the idea of two-year courses. Having worked in a library for a few years on full salary they were reluctant in many cases to face the possibility of two-years' existence on not very generous grants; they also feared that any recasting of the syllabus to suit two-year courses would make the examinations more difficult to pass, and raise the hurdles that barred the way to qualification and professional status and salaries.[21]

There was of course, one solution to many of these objections, that is, to re-organise the whole system so that the full-time students came direct from school and not from libraries. This, however, was much too radical a solution at that time. It was open to two chief objections. First, that recruitment to the profession would be placed in the hands of the schools; and secondly, that a year or two's practical experience of work in a library must precede any full-time course in librarianship, if that course was to have any value.

In view of all these objections, even those who felt most strongly that courses longer than one year were essential, saw that it would be expedient to wait until circumstances were more propitious before pressing their views. In any case it was realized

that any move towards lengthening the courses would mean recasting the whole L.A. Syllabus, and this could only be done very slowly and painfully and as a result of heavy pressure from many sides.

There was, however, a sizeable number of students even before 1963 who did spend two years at library schools as full-time students, i.e. those who did both Registration and Final courses. Almost invariably there was an interval of two or more years in between the two courses, and this was clearly in line with the intention of the 1946 Syllabus, which laid it down that the Final Examination was meant to test "mature judgment"and therefore presupposed considerable experience at a senior level. There was nothing in the regulations, however, to prevent students from going straight on to a full-time Final course after completing one for Registration, provided that they could obtain the necessary grants and leave of absence, and the library school was willing to allow them to do it. In 1956, indeed, the Leeds School of Librarianship caused themselves quite a lot of trouble in the profession by advocating in a supplement to their prospectus that full-time courses of study for the Registration and Final Examinations should be immediately consecutive, and encouraging library and education authorities to advise students to qualify in this way, and to provide them with the necessary facilities so that they could do so.

Nothing very much could be done, however, under the old Syllabus. The Registration Examination was quite an unsuitable examination to end the first year of an integrated course, and the Final Examination was hardly less suitable as the final examination of such

a course. It would have put a tremendous burden on the student, and the whole course would have been too obviously makeshift to gain the approval of either librarians or educationalists.[22]

The majority of librarianship tutors, and of librarians who agreed with their aims, preferred therefore to pin their hopes on the recasting of the syllabus; and their main aim during the negotiations that led up to this was to make sure that the examinations provided were designed for two-year full-time integrated courses. They also desired that the original aim, abandoned in 1948, that full-time education should be the standard and virtually the only education for librarianship should be realized in the new Syllabus; and the Schools of Librarianship Committee put these views forward to the L.A. officially on the publication of the 1957 draft Syllabus. The library school tutors were almost unanimously agreed on these points, and they continued to press them consistently throughout the complicated negotiations and the L.A.'s changes of mind between 1957 and 1961.

In May 1958 the L.A. Education Sub-Committee decided (for the second time) to set up a Joint Sub-Committee with the Schools of Librarianship Committee to formulate desirable standards for library schools, to consist of four persons nominated by the L.A. and three by the S.L.C. Its report, presented to the Education Sub-Committee in April 1959 represents, as it were, the blueprint for the development of the schools to meet the needs of the new Syllabus and the new pattern of professional education.[23]

The Report was in two parts. The first part was entitled Policy Considerations. It stated that the chief role of the Schools was the professional education of intending librarians, and not merely training in techniques. In the case of non-graduates successful work depended on : (a) an adequate general educational level in the students, and (b) the provision of adequate in-service training facilities in libraries. Full-time courses had an educational value of their own irrespective of any examinations to which they might lead. It was desirable that all student librarians (including those from special and university libraries) should attend full-time courses. Examinations should be viewed primarily not as tests of experience but as tests of knowledge and the ability to learn. For non-graduates a two-year full-time course was both necessary and desirable.

All library schools should be in a position to conduct full-time courses to the highest level required by the Syllabus. Standards should permit growth, and they should be based on the assumption that the policies of the schools would transcend the requirements of the Syllabus, and provide for refresher and special courses for trained librarians, professional investigations, case studies and research. The schools, without being empowered to conduct their own examinations, should be given greater opportunities for participating in the L.A. examinations system. The S.L.C. should appoint their Chairman to the Board of Assessors and the Moderating Committees should be improved.

The second part put forward the Recommended Standards. It stated that the fewer and larger the schools were the better, and insisted that the following facilities should be available in the vicinity: a large public library, good bibliographical provision, other types of library and book trade industries. There should be adequate accommodation at the library schools for all needs, and adequate teaching apparatus and equipment. There should be a good professional library in the parent institution; and staff should ideally be graduate F.L.A.'s. The L.A. should appoint a body to inspect and approve the schools of librarianship.

The Education Sub-Committee approved this report in general terms, and they agreed to put into force as an experiment the proposal that the S.L.C. should be represented on the Board of Assessors, and to improve the Moderating Committees to meet some of the Report's criticisms. It was clear, however, that no major steps could be taken until the negotiations on the Syllabus had reached some definitive conclusions.

Planning for the new Syllabus - The Two-Year Full-Time Integrated Course

The announcement of the final decision on the new syllabus by the L.A. in May 1961 made it possible for the library schools to begin positive planning. It was intended that the first examinations under the new syllabus should be held in the summer of 1964, so it was necessary to make preparations to enrol students for the new courses in the autumn of 1963. This gave the schools two years for the necessary planning.

The library schools were particularly anxious to ensure that from

1963 onwards the two-year integrated full-time course should become the standard pattern. It was vital, if this was to be assured, that all the schools should follow the same policy; and the S.L.C. played a very important part here, as it had during the negotiations on the syllabus itself, in bringing the heads of the schools together to thrash out a common policy. Their first meeting after the announcement of the final syllabus was at Ealing on July 4th and 5th 1961. At this meeting they resolved that "full-time preparation of non-graduates for the new Intermediate and Final Examinations should be exclusively by means of a full-time two-year course, the two-year programme forming an integral whole, and that full-time courses of one year for Intermediate and Final should not be offered."[24]

Although the heads of the library schools and their staffs were so strongly in favour of this move, it could not be made known officially to the profession at large until the Principals and the Governing bodies of the individual colleges concerned had approved it. Accordingly, at their next full meeting in December 1961, the S.L.C. instructed their Secretary to write to the Principals to ask them to let him know when a firm decision had been reached.[25]

By the summer of 1962 official decisions had been made by the Governing Bodies of all the schools, and a letter appeared in the L.A.R. of November 1962 from the Secretary of the Association of British Library Schools (which the Schools of Librarianship Committee had now become) setting out the position to the profession at large. In this letter it was pointed out that all the schools would be offering integrated courses only, except that some schools might offer one-

year courses for "transitional" students (i.e. those partially qualified under the previous syllabus). It was also made clear that this would mean that part-time courses for the Intermediate (subsequently Part I) examination could not be set up on the assumption that students could go on from these to a full-time school for the Final (subsequently Part II) examination; and that full-time Intermediate courses would not be a source of recruitment to part-time Final courses. The choice in future would therefore be between wholly full-time and wholly part-time education.

This policy was carried out by all the full-time schools with few exceptions (and those in very special circumstances); it clearly represented a significant achievement for the A.B.L.S., a body with no official status and made up of a number of highly individualistic heads of library schools (and other lecturers) representing nine completely independent colleges. It was, of course, in line with the official policy of the L.A., and met with the approval of the Regional Advisory Councils for Technological Education; but it was the Library Schools themselves who decided on this course of action and carried it through. If they had not done so the more or less complete achievement of full-time education for librarianship would have been long delayed.

Under the old syllabus most of the full-time schools of librarianship had provided part-time as well as full-time courses: indeed, in the case of some schools these part-time courses represented a substantial proportion of their work. It was common practice, especially

in the case of schools in large cities like that of the North Western Polytechnic in London, for those who had completed a full-time course for the Registration examination to go on to study for the Final examination part-time at the same school. The same classes were often open both to part-time and full-time students, particularly in the case of those for the Final Examination, but also for the less popular parts of the Registration Examination, such as the alternatives to English Literature in Group D. Some students, conversely, completed the Registration examination by part-time study and then went on to a full-time course for the Final.

The Library Schools were determined to make a complete break with their past in this respect, and so convinced were they of the virtues of full-time education that most of them decided not to provide part-time courses themselves, as well as not taking on the ex-part-time students of other instutitions. In their execution of this policy they had no wish to be unfair to individual students. They continued to provide part-time courses right up to the time when the last Registration examination was held under the old syllabus; and they were very generous in continuing to provide for part-time study by those who were genuinely "transitional" students left in an awkward situation by the changeover from one syllabus to another.

Preparation for Expansion - Students.

The first plank in the programme of the library schools was to insist on the two-year integrated full-time course; the second was to expand to meet the necessary increase in the demand for places.

They clearly had to prepare for a very large increase in the number of full-time students: the very intention to increase the length of the courses from one year to two meant that the schools would have to double their size to maintain the same output. Again, to maintain the existing output of chartered librarians from all sources, the schools would have to expand to provide places for a large proportion of those who in existing circumstances qualified by part-time or correspondence courses but would not after 1963 be doing so. (The A.A.L., the only body that provided correspondence courses for L.A. examinations, decided not to offer any for the professional examinations of the new syllabus. The nature of the new Syllabus, with its four Part I papers that had to be passed at one sitting and the wide choice of alternatives in Part II, quite apart from the attitude of the full-time schools, made it unlikely that any more than a few colleges of further education in the largest centres of population would be able to offer part-time courses for the whole syllabus).

At that time something between 34% and 40% of the total number of librarians qualifying as A.L.A.'s had passed their examinations without having been on a full-time course: to cater for the majority of these the schools needed to think in terms of increasing their numbers by half as many again. In a typical year before the exceptional years that preceded the introduction of the new syllabus the number of full-time Registration students at the library schools was about 270 (average in five-year period 1956 to 1961 was 268). If this figure is increased by half as many again and then doubled we get the figure of 810. (This

is a slight overestimate because it includes graduates, whose courses were not doubled).

This then was about the number of students the library schools would have to aim at if the existing output of chartered librarians was to be maintained. In fact, of course, the schools were aware that if they were to meet the real needs of libraries they would have to increase their output of trained librarians. Libraries of all kinds were expanding, and some categories, such as those of universities and colleges of further education, and special libraries, were expanding very rapidly. The proportion of professional to non-professional staff in many kinds of library, and in public libraries in particular, needed to be raised, and there was a great need for more specialist staff in these general libraries. Many more trained librarians were needed abroad and in particular in the underdeveloped countries of the Commonwealth. In addition, the wastage rate, in a profession in which there was an increasing preponderance of women, and in a society in which the marriage-rate and the birth-rate were rising fast, was very high.

In an article in the L.A.R. of May 1963, P. G. New, Secretary of the A.B.L.S., estimated that the schools would need to achieve an output of 800 students a year, and that the expansion plans of the existing schools would bring them near to this figure by the end of their first two-year course.[27] In fact, the total number of students who completed their courses at these schools in the summer of 1965 was 739, made up of 597 non-graduates who had completed the second year of the first two-year course and 142 graduates who had completed the second

one-year course for graduates. The total number of students at these schools in March 1965 was 1,398.[28]

To sum up these figures in order to make clear the magnitude of the expansion: the total number of students at these schools rose from 322 in 1960/1 to 1,398 in 1964/5, over a fourfold increase in four years. The total number of trained librarians being produced is more difficult to estimate: in 1961 304 students from these schools sat the Registration examination, and in 1965 739 the Part II examination. There was a much higher proportion of successes in the latter examination than in the former, but in both cases a substantial proportion of those who failed one or more parts passed them subsequently.

As it appeared in 1961, there were two ways in which this very large increase in the number of full-time students could be achieved: by expanding the existing schools or increasing their number. The former course was chosen, in line with the policy agreed upon by the 1958 Joint Sub-Committee, that the fewer and larger the schools the better. The new Syllabus clearly reinforced this policy. Only a large school could employ a sufficient number of specialist lecturers to be able to offer a reasonably wide range of the alternative papers of the new Syllabus. Similarly, only in a large school would there be likely to be enough students opting for the less popular papers to make it practicable to provide courses for them. In fact the increase in students between 1960/1 and 1964/5 was almost wholly achieved through the expansion of the existing schools. The nine pre-1962 non-university schools increased their student population from 322

to 1,398. The London University School remained static: 34 students in 1965 as against 39 in 1961. Liverpool started in 1962: in 1964/5 it had 7 full-time students proper (plus 69 on sandwich courses). Sheffield University started in 1964: in 1964/5 it had 23 students. Aberystwyth also started in 1964: in 1964/5 it had 47 students. Of the 1,595 students at library schools in 1964/5, 1,432 were at the pre-1962 schools and only 163 at the post-1962 schools.[29]

Preparation for Expansion - Staff and Accommodation

Making the necessary preparations for this expansion involved for the heads of the library schools, their staffs, principals, governing bodies and outside advisers three main tasks: the building up of staffs, the provision of sufficient accommodation and other facilities, and the planning of courses for the new Syllabus. One factor which from the administrative point of view aided this process was the quite substantial increase in the number of students doing one-year full-time Registration courses in the two years (1961 to 1963) that preceded the introduction of the new Syllabus. This was not something that had been specifically intended or desired by either the library schools themselves or the Library Association, although they expected it. It resulted from the desire of a large number of assistants working in libraries to obtain their qualifications by only one year of full-time study while they could still do so: the number of students at the nine schools rose from 322 in 1960/1 to 464 in 1961/2 and 641 in 1962/3. In an ideal world this would not have been a good thing, but in the real world of Colloges of Further Education it made the transition

much easier. Universities normally take on staff needed to start a new course well in advance of the arrival of the first intake of students, so that they can prepare the course properly. This practice is not followed in Colleges of Further Education, where staff take up their appointments on more or less the same day as the students arrive. If therefore the numbers of students had not increased before 1963 few extra staff could have been taken on until that year: as it was the schools were able to build up their staffs quite rapidly from 1960 onwards. These extra staff were able to cope with the extra Registration course students in the short term, and to prepare their courses for the introduction of the new Syllabus in 1963. It was not until the academic year 1964/5, when for the first time there were both first and second year courses running simultaneously that the new Syllabus could be said to be in full operation. Library School staff, however, had to be prepared to teach both Part I and Part II papers from 1963, as at that time graduates were exempted from Part I and did a one-year course for Part II, an unsatisfactory arrangement, always opposed by the library schools, that was soon abandoned for a proper graduate syllabus.

Library School staffs had in fact been growing slowly throughout their existence, and in 1960, before preparations began for the introduction of the new Syllabus, there were 30 lecturers at the nine schools, as compared with 15 ten years previously, when there had been in fact slightly more students. This had increased to 46 by 1962, the last year of the old-style courses, and in 1963 it was up to 66.

This rapid expansion of library school staffs, on which everything else depended, was very difficult to achieve. Just as in 1946 it was difficult to find nine or ten suitable librarians able and willing to get the full-time library schools going, in the years from 1960 to 1964 it was difficult to find forty or more librarians with the necessary abilities willing to become full-time lecturers at the library schools. The very success of the full-time schools in the intervening years had made this task easier in one respect: there was a large number of librarians, the majority in fact of the younger ones, who had themselves been educated at the full-time schools, and who therefore had first-hand knowledge of their work and appreciated their value. There was also a much larger number of librarians who had had some practical experience of the education and training of librarians - as part-time lecturers, some at the full-time schools themselves, as correspondence course tutors, as L.A. examiners, or as librarians responsible for staff training in their own libraries. There was now no risk involved in becoming a full-time lecturer, as there had certainly been in 1946; the future of the schools was assured. Salary scales of lecturers compared very favourably with those of librarians in most kinds of library.

All these factors aided the recruitment of lecturers, and the necessary expansion was in fact achieved, but there were important factors hindering this recruitment. In practice most librarians who had become lecturers had remained on the teaching side of the profession; and many practising librarians were reluctant to become lecturers because they feared that they might be committing themselves to teaching for the

remainder of their careers. It was certainly true that it was not easy to make the transition back from teaching to practising librarianship, chiefly for two reasons: first, the very attractiveness of the salaries of lecturers as compared with comparable library jobs, and secondly the fact that experience as a lecturer was not considered very suitable for top administrative posts in libraries. In the short term prospective lecturers feared that they would be unable to return to practising librarianship within a year or so, or even less, if they found the job uncongenial. In the long term those who were ambitious felt that they would be jeopardising their chances of reaching the top posts in the profession.

At least one school, the North-Western Polytechnic, sought to remove these short-term fears by a scheme of secondment. Under this scheme librarians were seconded from their libraries to full-time teaching for one year, at the end of which they could return to their libraries, or become permanent lecturers. This worked very well, and it is perhaps significant that the two librarians who took advantage of this scheme in 1961/2 and 1962/3 both opted to become permanent lecturers at the end of their year's secondment.[30] So far as the long-term fears were concerned, the solution lay in the future, since they could only be allayed by an increase in the size and the prestige of the library schools themselves. By 1966 it could hardly be doubted that responsibility for one of the larger library schools was a post comparable with responsibility for one of the larger library systems; and some heads of library schools were beginning to achieve the prestige in the profession that the Head of the London University School of Librarianship

had always enjoyed.

In fact, the staff most difficult to recruit were not librarians with good general administrative experience in public libraries, but librarians from academic libraries, and the large numbers of subject specialists that were made particularly necessary by the wide range of papers in the new Syllabus. The salary scales offered by the library schools were a strong inducement to librarians in public and in most kinds of special libraries; but they compared unfavourably with those available to experienced graduates in university libraries, and to those qualified in science and technology as special librarians and information officers. The fact that the library schools were situated in colleges of further education also acted as a disincentive to academic librarians.

The rapid increase in the size of the library schools also placed a strain on the accommodation and other facilities available in the parent colleges. From the point of view of the college authorities the expansion of full-time education for librarianship was merely one aspect of the general expansion of further education that was going on at the time, and a comparatively minor one at that. As in other sectors of the educational system, however, the increase in student and staff numbers tended to outrun the provision of extra accommodation. In the short term the library schools, many of which had functioned from the beginning in makeshift accommodation of one kind or another, found themselves expanding into still more makeshift premises. No school was actually prevented from expanding to the size necessary to provide adequate courses of the new pattern by the lack of accommodation;

but shortage of space was often the factor that limited further expansion, and the unsatisfactory nature of the accommodation certainly hindered the efficient working of the new courses. Schools would find themselves, for instance, carrying out at least part of their work in annexes at a distance from the college library and other facilities; timetables would be artificially warped by the lack of the right size of room when required, and so on. In the long term most of the local education authorities responsible for the schools had building programmes which included new college premises with specially designed and entirely adequate accommodation for their library schools; but these plans were often delayed by successive economic crises, and often turned out to be not quite adequate for the expansion that had actually taken place by the time they were completed.

Planning the New Courses.

The planning of the new courses was a major task of the library school staffs in the years from 1961 to 1963. First, they had to continue their work with the L.A. examiners and assessors to perfect the individual papers of the new Syllabus, while at the same time preparing their own teaching programmes for them. Secondly, they had to plan the courses as a whole to suit the completely new pattern.

Library School lecturers had been well represented on the Syllabus Sub-Committee that had produced the final draft of the new Syllabus in April, 1961. Four out of its ten members were heads of post-1946 schools, and of the other members, one was head of the London University School and another was an ex-head of a library school.

They also played a large part in the subsequent hammering out of the detailed syllabuses for the papers of the new Part I and Part II examinations. In order to facilitate this the old moderating committees, which had been set up to scrutinize and improve the papers of the old Syllabus, were replaced by study groups. Between 1961 and 1963 these study groups laboured to ensure that by the time the first students began to study, and the first lecturers began to teach, under the new Syllabus, it would be thoroughly workable and realistic; and students, teachers and examiners would all know exactly what was required of them. The main part of their work was done in 1962, but they were continued in existence, on a less formal basis, after the introduction of the new Syllabus in 1963, so that the Syllabus itself and the examination papers set under it could be kept under continuing review, and improvements made in the light of experience gained in the practical working of the Syllabus.

It was not possible or desirable to set up a study group for each paper of the Part I and Part II examinations; and the most important work was done by three general study groups, which were concerned with both Part I and Part II papers within the scope of their subject interest. General Study Group 1 was concerned with the Organization of Knowledge, 2 with Bibliography, and 3 with Library Administration. General Study Group 1, for example, was concerned with one Part I paper (3), and three Part II papers (B11, B12 and B13). It consisted of, on the examining side, the Subject Assessor, who acted as Chairman, the Senior Examiners for each of the four papers falling within its scope, and the Assessor

for the Part I Examination; and on the teaching side of three representatives of the full-time schools (chosen by A.B.L.S.) and one representative of the part-time tutors. The Education Officer of the L.A. and the members of the Board of Assessors were ex-officio members. There was also a general study group (No.4) for English Literature; and there were special subject groups for groups of List C papers, such as the History and Geography Group (C201-203).

The chief contribution of the library school lecturers was to ensure, as far as possible, that what would be required by the examinations would be educationally sound and practicable, that the Syllabus, in a word, would be teachable. The examiners, most of whom were practising librarians, were perhaps more concerned to ensure that the Syllabus would require the acquisition of that knowledge and expertise which they considered to be needed by a practising librarian. It was between these two poles that any conflict between the teaching and examining sides as such tended to be sparked off. As subject experts, each member of the Subject Group had his own ideas, and any conflicts here would not normally divide according to the two sides, examining and teaching.

The examining side had a clear majority on each subject group, although the actual number of members attending any particular meeting did not normally show such a preponderance of examiners over teachers as the teachers were more assiduous attenders. The decisions of each study group, in any case, had to be approved by the Board of Assessors, on which the post-1946 schools were not represented, and confirmed by the L.A. Education Committee. If the situation is compared with that which led

up to the introduction of the 1946 Syllabus, however, the difference is very striking. There was no possibility of full-time lecturers having anything to do with the framing of the 1946 Syllabus, as there were none available in the country; and it was only through the painful process of trying to teach to its requirements that its inadequacies became apparent. For this no one was to blame, least of all those responsible for drafting the 1946 Syllabus, who did a good job in the circumstances. What was much less excusable was the reluctance of the examining side to allow the teaching side to have a real say in the improvement of the 1946 Syllabus. The moderating committees were not set up until 1952, and it was not until 1955 that they were allowed to submit comments that affected the structure of the Syllabus, instead of merely being able to comment on the examination papers as set. As late as 1959, when the Joint Sub-Committee reported, much dissatisfaction was felt with the working of the moderating committees by the full-time lecturers.

Despite all the improvements that had taken place between 1946 and 1961, it was not until the study groups of 1961/2 began their work that a real change in the atmosphere can be detected. The feeling that there were two opposing sides, examiners and teachers, and that all the power resided with the examiners, began to break down; and the study groups worked as real teams with common objectives. It was realized by nearly everybody on the examining side that as most of the candidates for the examinations would be presented by the full-time schools, it would be absurd not to frame the syllabuses to serve as effectively as possible the needs of the schools; and clearly the lecturers concerned

were the best judges of what these were. In January 1963 the Council of the L.A. decided that lecturers at the full-time schools could serve at the same time as L.A. examiners. This decision would have caused an outcry in the profession in the 1950's or earlier; but in 1963 it passed almost unnoticed, and was regarded as significant not so much for what it achieved as for the new atmosphere it signified.

As well as planning their courses for the ~~industrial~~ individual papers of the new syllabus, the heads of the schools had the difficult task of planning the new courses as a whole. Under the old pattern most, but not all, had provided two separate one-year full-time courses, one for the Registration and one for the Final Examination. They had been able to assume that virtually all their students had enjoyed at least a year's practical experience in libraries. The number of alternative papers they had had to provide was very limited. There were only the three alternative papers of Group D (and by no means all of them provided all three) in the case of the Registration Examination courses, and the bulk of their students (over 90%) were Registration students. They now had to plan two-year courses for non-graduates and one-year courses for graduates. They had to cater for students with a wide range of previous library experience (from several years to nil); and they had to cater for a wide range of alternative papers. Furthermore, in the short term they had to cater for the special needs of "transitional" students.

The problem of the separate course for graduates was a particularly tiresome one. In the past graduates had been fully integrated into the one year Registration course, and that system had worked fairly well: the Registration Examination had been reasonably satisfactory as the final examination of a year's full-time post-graduate study of librarianship, and there was much to be said for bringing graduate and non-graduates together on the same course. The new Syllabus made this impossible, as it was unrealistic to expect graduates to devote two further years to the full-time study of librarianship. The library school lecturers favoured the idea of a special Post-Graduate Syllabus, and in September 1960 the L.A. Syllabus Sub-Committee asked two of its lecturer members, W. Caldwell and W. E. Tyler, heads of the Newcastle and Glasgow schools respectively, to submit proposals for such a Syllabus. The Register and Examinations Executive Committee, however, on successive occasions rejected this idea, and insisted, instead that graduates should be exempted from Part I of the new Professional Examinations and should have to pass Part II. The library schools therefore had to introduce a one-year course for graduates only leading to Part II from 1963. It was impossible in the first year to combine one year graduates with second year non-graduates, since there were as yet no second year non-graduates; and it was undesirable to do so in subsequent years since the non-graduates would have already gained a good grounding in basic librarianship while the graduates might well be completely ignorant of the subject.

There was therefore no administrative gain from the library schools' point of view in having one-year graduates and second-year non-graduates preparing for the same examination, and there was great educational loss. The Part II papers were specifically designed to suit those who had already studied librarianship for one year and had passed an intermediate examination. The graduate, for instance, was expected to choose a paper concerned with the specific administrative problems of a particular type of library without having studied the basic problems of all libraries, a situation that ran completely contrary to one of the L.A.'s most cherished principles. He also had to choose to study the bibliography of a particular subject without having studied the basic principles and techniques of subject bibliography. In effect the library schools had to plan their courses for graduates in such a way that the kind of study non-graduates had spent a year on in their first year was partly compressed into the first weeks of the first term for graduates, and partly carried on simultaneously with their work for the individual papers of Part II, a most difficult exercise. In the meantime the library schools continued to press for a special Post-Graduate Syllabus, and a Sub-Committee was set up by the L.A. to consider this in October, 1963. This produced a Syllabus: it was approved by the Council of the L.A. in October 1964 and the first examinations were held under it in 1966.[31] The first courses were provided by the library schools in 1965/6, so the schools had only two years under the totally unsatisfactory system of exemption of graduates from Part I: it was, however, an unnecessary burden placed on the library schools at a time when really necessary and fruitful tasks had to be undertaken.

Library schools had always expected a number of their graduate entrants to have had little practical experience of work in libraries before beginning their course, but these had been a small minority of the whole number of students. Under the new pattern they had to prepare for an increasing number of non-graduate entrants without previous experience. It became the declared policy of the profession to recruit sixth formers straight from school (with two or more "A" levels in G.C.E.) to the library schools. This gave rise to two administrative problems. First, the course had to be planned in such a way that these students did some practical work before beginning their theoretical study; and secondly, account had to be taken of the fact that for a long time ahead the courses would have to provide both for school-leavers and for those who had worked for a year or more in libraries. The number of school leavers proved in the event to be somewhat less than was expected (about one seventh of the total number of non-graduates recruited in the first two years) but they had to be provided for, and the assumption made that their proportion would increase.

Different schools worked out different solutions to this problem. Under one plan school-leavers began the course in September, but those who were already working in libraries did not do so until January. During this preliminary term the school-leavers were given short introductory courses at the college and then spent the remainder of the first term working under supervision in specially

selected libraries. In January all the students began their course proper, and school-leavers and ex-library assistants could reasonably study together, all having had some experience of practical librarianship. Under another plan prospective students were expected to work for a minimum of two weeks between the conclusion of their school year in July and the beginning of the college year in September. It was realized that what counted in this practical work was not so much its length as its nature: and one of the major problems was to find a sufficient number of good libraries able and willing to co-operate.

In addition to the preliminary period of practical work for school leavers, which was best regarded as part of their induction course, some practical work in libraries was an essential part of the course for all students. As the students were going to be in college for twice as long, it was more than ever necessary that they should do periods of work in libraries during their courses. Theoretical study for what is after all a practical occupation tends to become meaningless if it is completely divorced from practical experience, and students need to see how the principles they learn in the class room work out in practice in the library. Even those students who would not enter directly from school would tend to have had somewhat shorter practical experience in libraries (seldom over a year) than under the old pattern. It was also desirable to give the students some experience of work in all types of library during the

first year, so that they could more intelligently choose which set of alternative papers to study for Part II, a choice which would reflect the choice of library they would wish to make their careers in.

One of the major doubts some practising librarians had about the new Syllabus was that it was too theoretical: they feared that the people leaving the schools after having passed the Part II examination would be quite unfitted to responsible work in libraries. They were not, of course, eligible to become A.L.A.'s until they had at least gained one year's further full-time experience in libraries, but it was obviously desirable that they should do mainly the more straightforward professional or at least semi-professional work, and enjoy some responsibility, during this period. In fact the shortage of professional staff was so great in most types of library that a majority of the first output of the schools under the new pattern had of necessity to be given fairly senior posts. The Library School lecturers, for their part, were anxious to ensure that the practical work of their students did during their course was regarded as vital and an integral part of it, and was as efficiently carried out as possible. Here then was a fruitful field for close co-operation between library school heads and chief librarians; and in fact they did work together to plan this practical work very well.

Unfortunately there were many practical difficulties. The increase in the number of students, and in the amount of time each student needed to be accommodated in a library for practical

experience, meant that the library schools had to make much heavier demands on librarians. The number of libraries really suitable was limited, and the comparatively small number of large, efficient and co-operative systems had a particularly heavy burden placed upon them. Most libraries at the time were working with more or less severe staff shortages, and there were not enough professional staff with sufficient time available in most libraries to make sure that trainees in their libraries obtained the maximum benefit from their practical work there. In practice, however, most of the difficulties were overcome: all the students were accommodated in libraries, and the vast majority gained useful experience while they were there.

The larger number of alternative papers in the new Syllabus presented a unique challenge to the library schools. There were about fifty papers in the Part II examination, out of which each student had to choose six. At least one school, that of the North-Western Polytechnic in London, started out with the aim of providing tuition if required in all fifty; but it had to abandon this aim in practice. Smaller schools had to choose a representative number of papers from which a student could at least choose a set appropriate to the type of library he wished to work in, and more or less in line with his subject interests. The irreducible minimum worked out at about twenty papers: all three list A papers, so that all types of library were represented; seven or eight out of the ten list B papers (leaving out, that is, perhaps Archive Administration and

Palaeography and Diplomatic, which were probably dead-end specialisations for non-graduates); and at least eight papers in List C, so that there were at least two papers from each of the four major subject groups: Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences and Technology.

The first essential was to obtain teachers with the necessary specializations, and this was not at all easy. It was not intended wholly to dispense with the services of part-time or visiting lecturers, who had played an essential part under the old pattern; but it was desired to cover as many of the alternatives as possible by the use of full-time staff. If it was decided that one lecturer could cope with at the most two Part II papers, this meant a minimum of ten full-time lecturers at even the smallest school; and it meant that they had to be recruited very carefully if all the necessary specialists were to be obtained. For reasons already outlined, the teachers most difficult to obtain were specialists for the paper on Academic and Legal Deposit Libraries, and for the papers on the Bibliography and Librarianship of particular subjects. In the absence of recruits from university or national libraries, lecturers with public, special or college library experience had to acquire the necessary knowledge by reading and visiting the appropriate libraries. The head of one library school suggested that one solution to this problem might be to second lecturers from library school teaching to practising librarianship in a university library for a year, but administrative difficulties prevented this idea from being put into practice.

In the case of the List C papers, one practice which helped was to make use of the services of lecturers in the appropriate subject already on the staff of the parent institution. A grave difficulty was that subject experts are not always well acquainted with the bibliography of their subject, or even very well aware of the problems involved in it, and can hardly be expected to be experts on its librarianship. At least some subject lecturers, however, had the right approach, and worked out with the library school lecturers satisfactory courses in which ideally both a subject lecturer and a librarianship lecturer would be involved.

For certain List C papers many schools did plan to use outside librarians. Small groups of students only were normally involved in each subject, and one useful practice was to send the students to the subject expert's own library for a time each week instead of having him come to give formal lectures in the college.

Even if a school could plan to have available, either from its own staff or from outside, tutors capable of teaching every one of the fifty or so papers of the new Syllabus; it did not follow that in any particular year it would be able to offer all these papers. College authorities might well regard the provision of a course for one or two students only as an intolerably uneconomic use of resources. Again, the difficulties of timetabling tended at some stage to become insuperable, bearing in mind the possible permutations and combinations, if say 150 students were given a completely free choice of five papers out of a possible 50. No school in practice could allow its students

a choice of any paper, but the larger schools, and in particular the North-Western Polytechnic in London, offered a much wider choice than the smaller ones.

It was realized that one of the great virtues of the new pattern would be lost if students were not allowed a fairly wide choice of alternatives, and all the schools in practice managed to satisfy the individual requirements of the vast majority of their students. What was more difficult was to provide for the odd student who for a perfectly valid reason wanted to opt for one or more of the more out-of-the-way alternatives. One solution would have been for each library school, as well as offering the main popular alternatives, to have specialized in one or two of the least popular subjects. With the help of a measure of co-ordination, at least complete national coverage of all the alternatives could then have been achieved, and the prospective student could have taken this into account when choosing the schools to which to apply. Such a scheme was discussed at A.B.L.S. meetings, as well as one for a central clearing house for admissions to library schools, which would have helped to make it practicable, but they were never worked out in detail, still less put into operation.

In spite of very minor failures of this kind, the library schools were very successful in working out their plans; and, especially considering the far-reaching nature of the changes, the new pattern came into operation in 1963 almost without a hitch, and began to function successfully from the start.

PART 3: NOTES

1 L.A.R., v. 51, p. 282.

2 L.A.R., v. 56, pp. 430-432.

3 Library Review, v. 93, pp. 276-280.

4 L.A.R., v. 56, pp. 7 - 10.

5 L.A.R., v. 56, pp. 98 - 103. Correspondence stimulated by Stokes's article.

6 ibid.

7 L.A.R., v. 55, p. 219.

8 R. Stokes played a key role in getting this decision made.

9 Research, v. 6, pp. 327-330 (August 1953). See Part IV Chapter 1 for subsequent developments in education for information science.

10 L.A.R., v. 58, pp. 314 - 315.

11 L.A.R., v. 58, p. 438.

12 Annual Report of L.A. for 1956, pp. 8 - 9.

13 L.A.R., v. 59, pp. 97 - 98.

14 ibid.

15 S.L.C. Minutes.

16 L.A.R., v. 62, pp. 215 -219 Revision of Syllabus: A Statement by Miss L. V. Paulin, Chairman of Syllabus Sub-Committee.

17 L.A.R., v. 63, pp. 165 - 171. The Final Revision of Syllabus: A Statement, by Miss L. V. Paulin.

18 See Part IV for further discussion of this problem in the light of subsequent developments.

19 During the eight years to 1963 there was an increase of 108% in the number of school leavers with two or more "A" level passes. Department of Education and Science: Statistics of Education 1963, Part 3.

20 A strange side effect of this decision was that from this date until the introduction of the new Syllabus in 1963 a university degree in practice entitled its holder to no exemption from any part of the L.A. Examination Syllabus. For a general discussion of general education standards for librarians see Part IV Chapter III.

21 This raising of the standard of the basic qualifying examination would also have made it more difficult for part-time students and was therefore opposed by those who represented their interests.

22 Another practice that was adopted by one school, Loughborough, was to enrol students for two consecutive years for an integrated course that led to the First Professional Examination at the end of the first year and the Registration Examination at the end of the second. The original Entrance Examination, introduced as part of the 1946 Syllabus, was not meant to be a simple test of suitability for library work and was not thought to require any formal tuition: the new First Professional Examination, introduced in 1956, was drawn up with formal study in mind, and was not wholly unsuitable for full-time students, although really intended for and almost wholly taken by part-time students.

Before 1956 the Entrance Examination could only be taken by those who had gained at least one year's full-time experience of library work, but this requirement was waived from January 1956. There was thus no formal barrier to students proceeding direct from school to a course such as the one at Loughborough. (There were no experience pre-conditions for entry to the Registration or Final examinations, although, of course, there were for admission to the Register).

The number of students taking this course was very small: in the academic year 1959/60 there were two full-time students for F.P.E. at Loughborough. The idea was sounder in practice than the Leeds plan, and more like what was actually brought into being in 1963, but the practical difficulties were formidable.

The North-Western Polytechnic's one-year course for overseas students, introduced in 1962, could be immediately followed by a one-year course for Registration; and thus constitute a two-year course.

23 L.A. Education Committee Minutes. 1958 Vol. April 2nd, 1958.

24 S.L.C. Minutes.

25 ibid.

26 L.A.R., Vol. 64, pp. 431-2.

27 L.A.R., Vol. 65, pp. 187 - 191.

28 L.A.R., Vol. 67, pp. 203-4. Full-time Students' Census.

29 The university schools were not, of course, concerned with the new Syllabus; but they were an essential part of the expansion of full-time education for librarianship that was taking place.

30 See the article by R. Sturt: Secondment: Leave to teach, in L.A.R., Feb., 1964, Vol. 66, pp. 57 - 61.

31 L.A.R. January 1965, Vol. 67, pp. 16 - 18.

PART FOUR

THE PRESENT STATE OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP

PART FOUR

CONTENTS

Introduction

I: The Same Basic Course for all Types of Librarianship.

II: The College-Based Full-Time Course.

III: General Educational Standards.

IV: The Pattern of the Course: Academic and Practical.

V: The Content of the Course.

VI: The National Structure.

Introduction

The pattern of education for librarianship that was established in Great Britain in 1946, whatever else might be thought of it, showed remarkable powers of endurance; and although it was developed and much improved throughout the subsequent seventeen years it was recognizably the same pattern in 1963 immediately before the first courses under the 1964 L.A. Syllabus were introduced. From the vantage-ground of 1966 it is possible to regard these seventeen years as the cradle-period of full-time education for librarianship in this country; and this point of view will, I think, be confirmed by students of the subject in the future, who will have the advantage of an even longer perspective. As in the case of all cradle-periods, its chief significance will be seen to reside in the main lines of development that were established during it, and how these affected the later development of education for librarianship.

The new pattern that was established in 1963 will not endure for anything like the same length of time, - indeed already, after only four years, it shows every sign of change and development. In this final section I propose to isolate one by one the main lines of development that were established in the period 1946 to 1963, and to show in each case how they are being modified or changed in the new circumstances of the present period. The latter task can only lead to tentative conclusions, as the situation in education for librarianship in Great Britain at present is more fluid than would have been considered possible before 1963, and it is therefore unwise to do any more than hazard a guess about future developments.

I The Same Basic Course for all Types of Librarianship

This educational principle follows from one of the most fundamental articles in the creed of the L.A., and of the main body of professional opinion in this country, that librarianship is one. Certainly from the 1870's this ideal has been one of the distinguishing marks of what might be called the Anglo-American conception of librarianship. In many continental countries, on the other hand, there has developed a much sharper cleavage between the different types of librarianship: scholarly, with the emphasis on bibliography and palaeography; special, with the emphasis on documentation; and public, or rather, popular; and this has been reflected in the often quite different standards, syllabuses and institutions for education in the different types.

Even in the United States and Great Britain, however, and particularly in the latter, a completely united profession with one single esprit de corps, merely with groups of members working in rather different circumstances, has been something to be aimed at, rather than something that has ever been completely achieved. Fortunately, one of the factors that has always tended towards its achivement in both countries has been the system of education for librarianship.

The first system of education for librarianship to be provided in this country was that introduced by the L.A. in the 1880's;

and it was intended to serve equally the needs of all types of library. In practice, however, it served chiefly the municipal libraries, which were expanding rapidly at the time as a result chiefly of Carnegie's benefactions. It was not that the other main group of libraries at the time - the scholarly national, academic and society libraries - had their own system, but rather that they saw no need of one. They insisted on a high standard of general education, and relied on training in their own individual libraries for the rest. One way of looking at the subsequent development of education for librarianship in this country is as the gradual acceptance of the need for education for librarianship, as opposed to, or rather in addition to, general education and in-service training, by an ever widening range of libraries.

So far as the L.A.'s own system was concerned, it remained in practice largely a public library educational system until after the new pattern was introduced in 1946. Most of the students preparing for the L.A. examinations were assistants in public libraries; and by the end of the period most senior personnel in public libraries held L.A. qualifications. Nevertheless, the L.A. never lost sight of the principle that librarianship was one; and the content and intention of its syllabus was never confined to the field of public librarianship. Many of those who obtained their qualifications through the L.A. system while working in public libraries transferred to non-public libraries later on; and many of the senior posts in special libraries were (and still are) occupied

by people of this background.

The University of London School of Librarianship was established in 1919 to serve the needs of all libraries, and to teach librarianship as a unified discipline (while naturally allowing the individual student to specialize when he came to do his more advanced work); and this precedent has been followed by all later British library schools right up to and including the most recent ones. It is true that a disappointingly small proportion of the diplomates of the London University School went on to work in public libraries; but this was chiefly owing to the reactionary views of municipal librarians; and it is significant that the products of the University School were given a much warmer welcome in county libraries, which dated from the same period (and incidentally shared the same benefactor, the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust).

The new schools established in 1946 played a major role in breaking down the barriers between the different types of library. The L.A. Syllabus of 1946 honestly tried to serve the interests of all types of library; and if it did not entirely succeed in this, subsequent improvements brought it much nearer to doing so. The Schools themselves always stressed their function as educators in librarianship, and not in public or any other particular kind of librarianship. The bulk of the students tended to come from public libraries, but this was chiefly for practical reasons, i.e. because they were large enough and had the necessary machinery to second staff for a year. In any case there was always a sizeable minority

of graduates at the schools, many of whom had come straight from university. More significant still is the fact that a large proportion of the products of the schools, either immediately after concluding their course, or after having gone back to their public library for a year or so first, obtained posts in other types of library. There are no actual figures available, but it might well be that over half of those trained at the library schools since 1946, and still working full-time in library work, are now employed in non-public libraries. (The proportion of chartered librarians educated at the schools, and the proportion of chartered librarians employed in non-public libraries have alike risen rapidly in recent years).

All this means that librarians working in different kinds of libraries at least share a similar (library) educational background. This must make it easier for them to communicate with one another, to understand one another's problems, and to bring their libraries into closer co-operation with each other. It also makes it much easier for an individual librarian to move from one type of library work to another. These are all very desirable ends, and the contribution made by the library schools towards achieving them must rank as one of their most valuable services to the profession.

The number of libraries of any type that deliberately stand outside the system of full-time education for librarianship is now

very small. (It is in fact confined to two or three academic libraries, although a city librarian will still be occasionally heard to express his belief in apprenticeship-type training as the only truetype). Nevertheless there are still dangers to the unity of professional education; and two in particular still give cause for anxiety. First, there is the danger that training for academic librarianship, based on high general educational standards, may develop as a separate self-contained system. And secondly, there is the danger that special librarianship, along with information science, may become a different discipline altogether.

Let us consider the first danger. Two developments would need to take place to bring about the complete separation of academic librarianship. There would need to be a sufficient number of university schools with enough places to meet all the needs of academic libraries; and these schools would have to restrict themselves to the study and teaching of academic librarianship and the production of staff for academic libraries. Until 1964, when there was only one university school of librarianship, it was obviously quite impossible for it to provide all the recruits needed for professional posts in university libraries; but now (1966) that there are four it looks at first sight as if it might be possible. On the other hand the demand for university library staff has increased enormously within the last five years. New universities have been established on an unprecedented scale, and existing

universities have expanded their library services. There has also been the rapid development of institutions of higher and further education of a type different from the traditional university; these range from the technological universities and polytechnic institutions to colleges of education and colleges of further education of all types. The dividing line between university librarianship proper and academic or higher educational librarianship in general (and for that matter between these fields and special librarianship in the case of colleges of technology) is not very clear cut. All these libraries are in urgent need of suitably qualified staff; and unlike their pre-war predecessors practically all of them expect their professional assistants to have been trained at full-time schools of librarianship. For at least the foreseeable future therefore universities and colleges will need to recruit staff from both university and non-university schools of librarianship.

The new university schools of librarianship, like the London University School, are all providing courses based on the assumption that librarianship is essentially one discipline; and they all expect their students to find posts in all types of library. The question of pre-entry educational qualifications will be considered later; but it is worth noting in this context that many of the students at the non-university schools are graduates; and that many of the students at two of the four university schools are non-graduates. (In the academic year 1964/1965 there were 41

graduates at the North-Western Polytechnic as compared with 34 at London University, the largest of the graduate university schools; while there were 154 non-graduates as against 25 graduates at Strathclyde University).[1]

So far as academic librarianship is concerned therefore, it can safely be assumed that it will remain an integral part of the general system of education for librarianship. Some schools, because they are attached to universities and because they restrict their entry to graduates, will no doubt place a larger proportion of their students in academic libraries than schools not so attached or restricted; but this is a very long way from setting up a separate system of education for academic librarianship.[2]

What of special librarianship? Here there are both dangerous and hopeful signs from the point of view of one who believes in the essential unity of library studies. So far as the former are concerned, the controversy within the ranks of special librarians themselves as to the status and affiliations of their craft, which I have touched on in previous chapters, still continues. There are those who hold that its affiliations are more with information science than with general librarianship; and there are others who hold that its affiliations are with academic librarianship, and that academic and special librarianship comprise a distinct discipline with a higher status than general (public or even "popular") librarianship. (Both views are sometimes held by the same authority, although they are clearly inconsistent).

The view that information science is different from librarianship, both general and special, at least has the merit of being consistent; and this view is the only one that has been put into practice on the level of education and training. The desirability of special training for information work (as distinct from education in librarianship) was felt by some members of Aslib as early as the 1940's; and a plan to set up a special syllabus to provide for this was only narrowly rejected at an Aslib conference as early as 1948. A further attempt to persuade Aslib to set up a special syllabus for information work was begun in 1950; and was only abandoned in 1957, when another Aslib conference rejected the idea.[3]

After this defeat the supporters of the special syllabus, led by J. Farradane, decided to proceed with their project outside the Aslib framework. In 1958 a new professional association, the Institute of Information Scientists, was formed, solely as a professional qualifying body. A syllabus was worked out by 1960, and a two-year evening course was started in 1961 at the Northampton College of Advanced Technology (now City University), London. In 1963 a one-year full-time postgraduate course was started.

J. Farradane, the organizer of the course in information science and the Honorary Secretary of the Institute of Information Scientists, is very firmly of the opinion that information science is a completely different profession from librarianship. For him

the essential points of difference are that the information scientist is a specialist in the use of libraries and other sources of information, and that he needs scientific training and the outlook of the research scientist in order to be able to evaluate his sources. (His course is restricted to those with degrees in science, or an equivalent scientific or technological qualification).

As long as information science is regarded as a completely different profession from librarianship, the existence of a completely separate association, qualification and training course for information scientists cannot be regarded as a threat to the unity of the library profession. Nevertheless, it is difficult to separate the two professions completely, and Farradane himself recognizes that there is "a continuous spectrum, with the purely custodian duties of a librarian at one end, and the information scientist engaged in research on information retrieval at the other end."[4] In between the two extremes are all the different types of librarianship with special librarianship and documentation tending towards the information side. Now if education and training for the whole spectrum polarized at the two extremes of traditional library studies and information science, it seems likely that much of what is now regarded as special librarianship would become part of information science. It also seems likely that the more responsible and important posts in special libraries would be held by information scientists.

These developments can therefore be seen as threatening in the long run the unity of the profession. Fortunately there are more hopeful signs. In particular the schools of librarianship seem better fitted to meet the needs of special libraries than ever before. The 1963 L.A. Syllabus, which is the basis of the courses at the non-university schools, makes ample provision for the interested and suitably qualified student to specialize in studies appropriate to work in special libraries. The state of affairs where many students are recruited direct from school or university should mean in the long run that the grave handicap of special libraries as compared with public libraries as regards the secondment of staff to full-time courses will no longer be of such great importance. It should also make somewhat easier the recruitment of trainee-librarians with academic qualifications in science and technology.

Perhaps even more important is the development of schools of librarianship specially fitted to provide the right kind of education for special librarians. The new library school at the University of Sheffield is perhaps the most important example; but some of the non-university schools, including for instance the North-Western Polytechnic, have done their best to develop courses for students intending to specialize in special library work. Under the re-organization of higher education that is taking place many library schools will find themselves attached to (or

rather integral parts of) high-level technological institutions. The Glasgow School of Librarianship has become part of the University of Strathclyde, a predominantly technological institution; and the Brighton School of the Brighton College of Technology. All these schools will be well placed to develop courses suitable for librarians in scientific and technological libraries.

These schools, moreover, are all committed to the view that documentation and information work are essentially specializations within the field of librarianship. W. L. Saunders, Director of the Sheffield Postgraduate School of Librarianship, made it clear from the outset that the course for those intending to specialize on the technological side would be "firmly based on ... core subjects".[5] Whether librarianship remains a united profession or not in this country will depend to a large extent on which approach to the training of staff for work in scientific and technological libraries proves to be the more fruitful, that represented by Farradane at the City University or that represented by Saunders at Sheffield University.

II The College-Based Full-time Course

One of the most significant achievements of the period from 1946 to 1963 was to establish as the normal standard pattern of education for librarianship the college-based full-time course. Up to 1946 the great majority of public librarians obtained their qualifications by taking correspondence courses or attending part-time classes in their own spare-time while working full-time as assistant librarians. Some assistants in non-public libraries qualified in the same way, but the large academic library was normally confident that it could train its own staff without outside help. By 1963 practically all libraries accepted the need for college-trained librarians, and the full-time pattern was generally accepted as the only satisfactory one.

When the establishment of schools of librarianship was being considered in the 1940's the view that they should be attached to large libraries rather than to educational establishments was certainly considered; and this view has never lacked supporters right down to the present day. In some foreign and Commonwealth countries library schools were occasionally established in and controlled by large libraries; but in the event McColvin and his colleagues preferred to follow the precedent set by the London University School in this country and generally in the United States, and establish the new schools of librarianship in educational institutions.

The idea of the "training-library" is at first sight an attractive one. Practical work in all departments and sections of the library, which it is assumed would be large, efficient and progressive, would be carried out under the supervision of the senior staff of the library, who would also be responsible for providing the lectures and tutorials, which would occupy part of the trainee's time throughout his period of training. There are, however, many drawbacks to such a plan. In the first place, such a library would only train staff for work in its own type of library. (There might even be a danger that it would only train staff for work in its own library! "type" here also means something more specific than say public library as opposed to academic and special: a large municipal library, for instance, could hardly train staff for work in a county library). In such a system the practical side of librarianship as a series of actual tasks in a particular library would be well taught; but librarianship could hardly develop as a coherent body of thought relating to the principles governing work in all library situations, and training for librarianship would hardly be able to rank as a form of higher education.

There were also practical difficulties. It would not have been easy to find a sufficient number of libraries both willing and able to fulfill this role. (The demands that would have been made on the senior staff of such libraries, at a period of acute staff shortage, would have been enormous). It is also doubtful whether

such courses would have been recognized by the Ministry of Education for the purpose of grants to students and so on.

On balance both practical and educational considerations pointed to the college-based course, and education for librarianship in this country has developed consistently along this path up to the present time, and shows every indication of doing so in the future. Some of the early schools were at first very closely associated with large public libraries, especially those in the large cities—such as Manchester; but gradually even these moved away from too great a dependence on one particular library system. The establishment of the sandwich courses at Liverpool in 1962 might be seen as a step in the other direction, but it was not in practice a serious one. The courses were established at the City of Liverpool College of Commerce, and it was not intended that they should serve only one library system. The number of library-based sandwich-course students there is now a minority, and the precedent has not been followed elsewhere.

Library schools must, of course, maintain close relationships with libraries, since the practical work a student does before, during and after his course must be regarded as an integral part of his education as a librarian, for which both library schools and libraries are responsible. It is, however, undesirable for a Library school to be too closely linked to a particular library. It is significant that even in the case of the university schools of librarianship in England and Scotland the schools are not closely

integrated with their own university libraries. They make very full use of them, but they are quite separate and maintain close relationships with other libraries.

The idea that professional librarians should be trained through full-time courses in colleges gained general acceptance in this country only very slowly. A few far-sighted librarians saw this as early as 1919, but even now, in 1966, there is a fairly large and quite vociferous minority who oppose the idea. The development of full-time education has passed through three phases. In the first phase, which lasted from about 1919 to 1946, it was accepted that full-time training was one possible method by which a librarian might be produced, but it was not regarded by the majority as by any means the best method. In the second phase, which lasted from 1946 to 1963, possibly the majority of librarians were content with a situation where the full-time system existed side by side with the part-time system; but an increasing number of progressive and influential librarians began to be convinced that the full-time system was in fact the only wholly satisfactory one, and to press for its extension at the expense of the part-time and correspondence-course system. In the third phase, which began in 1963, the full-time pattern has been accepted by the majority of librarians as the standard one; and part-time study is generally regarded as appropriate only in a small number of exceptional individual cases.

The successful establishment of a more or less wholly full-time pattern after 1963 can be attributed to three main factors. First, the movement in further, higher and vocational education generally towards full-time and sandwich courses.[6] Secondly, the success of the full-time library schools themselves in the period from 1945 to 1963, which gave a practical demonstration of the superiority of full-time education. And thirdly, the enthusiasm and hard work of a comparatively small number of librarians, who were themselves convinced of the superiority of the full-time system, and were able finally, in the face of strong opposition from many sections of the profession, to convince the majority of influential librarians of the strength of their case, and carry the L.A. with them.

Many features of the library education scene that were essentially products of the 1946 to 1963 period are now being called into question, and may not survive for very much longer; but there is no doubt that the librarians of the future will be produced by full-time educational courses in academic institutions.

III: General Educational Standards

It has always been recognised that a librarian ought to be a well educated person, and only those who have achieved a high standard of general (i.e. non-vocational) education ought to be admitted to courses in librarianship. The controversy has arisen when it has been necessary to fix the precise level at which students (or trainee-librarians) should be recruited; and the views expressed have varied from those who thought the old School Certificate too exclusive, and insisted on the L.A. holding its own somewhat easier Preliminary Examination, to those who would have restricted entry to those with first or second class honours degrees. Two considerations have always had to be borne in mind at least by the realistic. First, what standard of education is really appropriate to the job? And secondly, at what level can it be expected (given salaries, conditions and prospects in the profession) that sufficient candidates will present themselves?

Discussion of the first question has in the past been vitiated by the failure of public libraries in particular to divide their staffs clearly into professional and non-professional categories with the appropriate career-streams. If the recruit was to spend a substantial proportion of his time over a period of years engaged in routine clerical jobs, it was dishonest to insist even on 5 "O" level passes in G.C.E. as the minimum standard of admission, as a person without any "O" level passes could have

done this kind of work just as well. The advances that were made in education for librarianship from 1946 onwards could only have been made on the assumption that libraries would so divide their staffs, and that the products of the library schools would be placed in the professional (including the trainee-professional) category. The assumption was made, but it was only slowly that it began to reflect the real state of affairs; and it is only perhaps in the last few years that the majority of public libraries have made a clear division. (In many cases it can hardly be doubted that the development of education for librarianship has constrained them to do so somewhat against their will).

Even if it can now be assumed, however, that education for librarianship is a preparation for professional jobs only, it by no means follows that every professional job in every library requires the same level of either general or library education. Until recently the content and level of librarianship courses in both university and non-university schools has been very similar, although there are now signs of change, which will be considered later; so it is the level of <u>general</u> education requirements that has been seen to very from post to post. To take an extreme example it can be plausibly maintained that whereas 5 "O" level passes constitute a sufficiently high general educational standard for the job of librarian-in-charge of a small county branch, the possession of a degree or diploma in technology would be more appropriate for the

librarian-in-charge of the technical information service of the same county.

It seems to have been a basic principle of the L.A., and of the system of education that developed under its auspices, that a person who successfully completed the professional examinations and became a chartered librarian was (subject, of course, to his having had the necessary experience) equally well qualified for any professional job in any library. The corollary of this is that the minimum educational qualifications laid down by the L.A. for admittance to its examinations (5"O" levels in G.C.E. up to 1967 and 2 "A" levels thereafter) are a sufficient general educational standard for any professional job in any library.[7]

Most librarians, even those most anxious to maintain the unity of the profession and the status of librarianship qualifications, would be unable to accept this. Most university libraries, as has already been pointed out, have come to accept qualifications in librarianship as essential, or at least as highly desirable, for their professional staffs; and this has signified a great step forward in the movement towards the universal recognition of the value of education for librarianship. Nevertheless, qualifications in librarianship, however high, are not regarded as being sufficient; and all universities insist also that their senior staff should be graduates. Qualifications in librarianship (or information science) are even more generally demanded in the special library field; but appropriate subject qualifications on as high a level as

possible are also essential. Public libraries have been content in the main, until recently at any rate, to demand only qualifications in librarianship for even their most senior posts; and this meant accepting the L.A. 5 "O" levels entry requirement as a sufficiently high general educational standard for all posts in public libraries. No-one who values the role that public libraries have to play in modern society could have been happy with this situation. It may be that many of those whose jobs are graded as professional according to the present classification do not require high educational qualifications; but there are almost certainly more who do. Those responsible for organizing the service and for stock provision; and reference librarians, heads of technical information services and other subject departments, where they have been provided, are obvious examples.

All these points indicated the desirability of raising general educational standards in the profession; but the practical question of the supply of a sufficient number of recruits had to be considered. The L.A., as I think wisely in the circumstances of the time, came to the conclusion in 1960 that the minimum entry qualifications could be raised to 2 "A" levels without cutting down the flow of suitable entrants, but not higher. The pessimists, who fought a rearguard action against this reform, were disconcerted to find that it actually improved the recruitment situation when carried out in conjunction with the reform of the educational system; but I do not think it could be argued from this

that it would have had the same result if entry had been restricted to graduates. University growth has been spectacular in recent years by previous British standards; but there are still not enough suitable graduates available to fill all the professional posts in British libraries, and salaries, prospects and conditions, especially in most public and many special libraries, are not in any case sufficiently good to attract them.

From the beginnings of education for librarianship, and certainly in the period 1946 to 1960, recruitment to the profession has been carried out chiefly on two levels of general education: that of 5 'O' levels in G.C.E. or the equivalent, and that of first university degree. In the future there will still be two levels of recruitment, but the lower level will be fixed at a minimum of 2 "A" levels in G.C.E. This will ensure that all professional librarians have reached a reasonably high standard of general education: it will also narrow the gap between graduates and non-graduates in libraries.

The case for higher general educational standards for librarians is so obvious that it hardly needs to be made out; although it is interesting to remember that many prominent librarians were able to maintain in public even into the 1960's that prospective entrants to the library schools were better employed in studying librarianship for the L.A. First Professional Examination than in studying academic subjects for "A" levels or

university degrees. The increasing specialization of knowledge makes the possession of subject expertise on as high a level as possible essential in university, college and special libraries, and in what Savage called special librarianship in general libraries. The increasing level of general education in the community as a whole equally makes it necessary for those who serve the ordinary reader in every public library service point in the country to be a better educated person than he needed to be in the past.

It will nevertheless always be necessary to recruit librarians at somewhat different levels of general education to suit the needs of different types of library work; and this would be dangerous only if the levels were widely dissimilar, or if they were rigidly segregated. Neither of these dangers appears to be very real in the present situation. The young people who go to our non-graduate schools of librarianship have almost exactly the same qualifications as those who go to universities; although it is true that their academic performance is on average not quite so high.[8] Two of the university schools of librarianship, Belfast and Strathclyde, recruit both graduates and non-graduates for their courses, as do all the non-university schools; and these students study side by side in the same institution. In future many of the non-graduate students at the non-university schools will probably be studying for degrees in librarianship. On qualification students of all

levels go to work in virtually all types of library, so that there is no rigid tie-up between a particular level of general educational level and work in a particular library; although there are, of course, general patterns.

IV: The Pattern of the Course: Academic and Practical

For many years education for librarianship tended to be regarded merely as training for a practical job, or rather for a series of crafts, such as cataloguing, that every librarian ought to be able to practice. The academic content of the syllabus was made up with non-librarianship subjects such as English Literature and analytical bibliography. Gradually, however, there emerged the idea of librarianship as an academic discipline, as a body of principles that could be studied and then applied to actual situations and tasks in libraries, as a subject that was itself educative in the broad (and true) sense. The pioneers of this development were chiefly Americans, and so far as special librarianship or documentation was concerned, Frenchmen and other continental Europeans also; and their ideas did not begin to have very much effect on education for librarianship in this country until the late 1950's, but they are now dominant here.

This gradual change of emphasis from librarianship as a practical craft to librarianship as an academic subject can conveniently be dealt with under two of its main aspects: the relationship between academic study and practical training; and the content of the course. To take the first aspect first, the development of full-time in contradistinction to part-time education or training has already been dealt with, and education

for librarianship in this country is now almost wholly full-time. It does not, however, necessarily follow that part-time courses are training or craft courses, and still less that full-time courses are genuinely educational. Part-time students still take good degrees in the most respectable academic subjects; and whereas until recently most educational experts would have liked part-time study for degrees to wither away as the full-time system expanded, many now feel we should be better advised to follow the example of the Soviet Union, for instance, where there are a very large number of part-time degree students. On the other hand technicians and craftsmen can be trained by full-time courses, and often are, especially where speed and efficiency are particularly desirable as in the armed forces or in the case of industrial retraining or post-war reconstruction programmes. In general the contemporary expansion of full-time education and training is beginning to affect technician and craft courses in technical colleges and similar institutions under the Government's industrial training programmes.

The relationship between the academic part of the course in College and the practical part in the job situation is more fundamental. It must be recognized that there is no clear cut division between academic professions on the one hand and practical crafts on the other. Rather, there is a whole spectrum of professions and crafts with the highly theoretical and academic at one extreme and the very practical at the other. For each

profession or craft there should be an ideal type of course that provides a correct balance of theoretical and practical elements and arranges these in the right order. In the case of a well-established learned profession with a well-developed and generally accepted body of theory the academic element might safely be regarded as the predominant one. For this kind of profession the candidates might best be recruited straight from school to an academic course lasting three, four or more years before beginning to practise at all, even as "apprentices". At the end of their course they would gain an academic qualification and become full-time practitioners, putting into effect the principles they had been studying, under the guidance of expert practitioners. In the case of an industrial craft, at the other extreme, where the element of practical skill could safely be regarded as the predominant one, it might be best for the trainee, immediately on leaving school, to become a full-time working apprentice and to be released for one afternoon a week to study the limited theoretical aspects of his craft.

In between the two there are many variations. In some learned professions, such as medicine, the student goes on from the predominantly academic first part of his course to the predominantly practical or clinical second part, and he does not take his final examinations or become qualified until after the end of the second part. In law a common method is for the candidate first to read law at a university as an academic subject, and then in the case of solicitors to become articled to a qualified practitioner while

studying for the examinations of the Law Society. In other professions there are courses which are largely academic (and I take academic to include laboratory and other practical work in College), but which include periods of practical work outside College. Courses for teachers are of this type, as are many of those for engineers and technologists. If the periods of practical work outside College form a substantial part of the course it can then be ragarded as a college-based sandwich course, and these courses are very common in the field of engineering and technology.

All these courses tend to have this feature in common, that the candidate goes straight from school to college, and that his college or professional association tends to retain some responsibility for the completion of his training. In other cases, however, even where the theoretical element is still important, or even in the same professions, a different method is followed, in which the candidate leaves school to work as a junior in his chosen field, and remains in a sense an "apprentice" rather than a "student". He may be helped towards qualification by a variety of courses, correspondence, part-time, full-time, or sandwich, but the predominant element will tend to be his work in his own organization. Accountants, for instance, still tend to be trained in this way.

So far as education for librarianship is concerned it seems to me that this admittedly extremely difficult problem of the relationship of academic to practical elements has never been solved in the past, and is not really being solved now. One

decision has been made, that there should be an element of full-time college-based study in the training of every professional librarian, but practically every other question remains open.

The basic pattern that existed up to 1964 (setting aside part-time students) was that the student left school or university and obtained a full-time post in a library.[9] After working there as a junior for at least one year he went on to a full-time library school for one year, then returned to his own library, and after a further year or so as a sort of senior-junior become a professional librarian. (The element of practical work outside college in the one-year course itself was limited to two or three weeks). This type of course belonged more or less to the second type of those I have outlined, and the training was throughout library-based.

At least it had the merit of being consistent, which cannot be said for the pattern that has developed since 1964. It was the original intention of both the L.A. Education Committee and of the A.B.L.S. that under the new pattern the standard method of recruitment to the library schools should be straight from school. If librarianship is a genuine profession with a well-developed body of principles, it is reasonable that the candidate should go on straight from school to the study of librarianship rather than to work of a largely routine nature in a library. It also seemed likely that if this were done librarianship would present itself as

a more attractive proposition to the bright sixth former choosing his future career.

There were, of course, many objections to this step. Practising librarians feared that the selection of future librarians would be taken out of their hands and placed in those of library school tutors. Many also feared that young people would choose librarianship unwisely without knowing what was involved, and later on either leave or become unsatisfactory librarians. And those tutors who lacked the courage of their convictions feared that it would be difficult to teach their subject to students who had not already worked in libraries for at least a year. In practice everybody's fears proved to be somewhat groundless as only a minority of students came straight from school even when the new system had had time to get well under way. One of the chief reasons that this happened, pradoxically enough, was that there were not enough places at the library schools for all who wished and were suitable to enter them; so that would-be candidates were compelled to take a job in a library for a year in the hope of a place in the following academic year.[10]

Under the new pattern there are in effect three elements of practical work in libraries to be undertaken by the prospective librarian before he becomes a trueprofessional: first, before the course begins, secondly, during it; and thirdly, after its conclusion. The factors already outlined have warped the proper development of the first element. It should have been a short

induction or orientation course organized and supervised by the library school itself, but it has tended to revert to the one year's work as a junior assistant in a library in the majority of cases. The work done during the course has developed satisfactorily. It is an integral part of the course completely under the control of the library school and relevant to the student's chosen subjects. The third element is not, however, wholly satisfactory. The student is entirely dependent upon the library he can find a post in; he has no further study to do or examinations to pass, and no organized supervision.

It is certainly true, and library school tutors are as well aware of this as practising librarians, that however excellent the academic part of the training programme for the professional librarian is, it will not be really effective without a properly organized practical part. There are many possible solutions. Two will rule themselves out immediately if librarians take their professional claims seriously: first, dependence on a fairly long period of practical training before the course begins, and secondly, the library-based sandwich course. Of the others, one method would be to extend the periods of practical training during the course, somewhat on the pattern of courses at colleges of education, which include a sufficient amount of teaching practice to ensure that the student is qualified to practice as a teacher on completion of his course. At present the amount of time given

over to practical work in libraries during the two-year courses at library school varies widely from school to school; but it is never more than one term or the equivalent. It could only be increased if the length of the course as a whole were increased, and although other factors also make this desirable, practical difficulties will probably make it impossible in the near future.

Another solution would be the college-based sandwich course, and one library school, Liverpool, provides such courses. The total length of these courses is three years, but the student normally completes the in-College period, and normally his examinations, at the end of two-and-a-half-years. The College year is divided into four ten week terms, and students commencing in January are in-College during the first two terms of the year, and those commencing in July during the third and fourth term. Contact is maintained by correspondence, a newsletter and visits by tutors during the in-Library periods; and the students are also set projects and written work. The system has much to recommend it, as the student should be well-grounded in both the theory and practice of his craft by the end of the course. It has its compensating dangers, however, as in many cases the student does all his practical work in the same library, and has not the same opportunity to compare the methods of different types of library as a student at the other schools. (One of the objects of the short periods of practical work during the course in the other schools is

to enable the students to choose wisely which types of librarianship suits their aptitudes and interests best). And it is not so easy to build up the right sort of atmosphere that will foster deep study or research within the framework of sandwich-courses; but this is not to say that it cannot be done, or to imply that it has been done at the other library schools.

A third solution would be to retain the broad lines of the present pattern, which really depends for its practical element on the year or so following the end of the course at library school, but to improve it. The best way to do so would be to exercise some kind of control over this practical work somewhat on the lines of the medical student's clinical training. At present the only requirement the prospective librarian has to fulfil after completing his course and passing his examinations is to complete one or two year's of full-time library service approved by the L.A. [11]

There are formidable practical difficulties, but it is easy to suggest in principle some of the ways in which this one or two years' practical training, which is in reality just as important as the two years' academic training that have preceded it, might be made more effective. The L.A. could exercise some control by raising its conditions for approving library service. (In the case of public libraries, for instance, it could approve for training purposes only those libraries which achieve certain of the standards laid down

in the Department of Education and Science's Working Party Report). Alternatively or additionally the library school might exercise some continuing control; and the trainee's admission to the register might be made conditional on the production of a satisfactory report from the library school on this practical work. (The library school tutors would have to visit the trainee in his library, correspond with him, set him projects and written work perhaps, and interview him at the end of the year). Everything would depend on the co-operation of chief librarians and their staffs in training and supervising the candidates for A.L.A., and their reports would also need to be taken into consideration. Alternatively the responsibility for certifying the satisfactory completion of the practical training might be more appropriately placed in the hands of the chief librarians.

We shall perhaps not get the kind of librarians we ought to have until some such method is put into operation; but there is no chance of its being even considered as a practical proposition at present, owing chiefly to the shortage of qualified staff. In the circumstances of today the products of the library schools tend to find themselves almost immediately in responsible positions where they are as likely to be called upon to train others as to receive any training themselves. The responsibility for their training nevertheless remains completely in the hands of the chief librarians of the libraries where they are

employed; and the success of the present pattern depends as much on them as it does on library school tutors. Some librarians, to their credit, have been able to introduce systematic post-library-school practical training schemes even under present circumstances; and an account of one such scheme, that at Manchester Public Libraries, was given to the L.A. Public Libraries Conference in 1966.

V: The Content of the Course

Librarianship, as an academic discipline, is of comparatively recent origins, and it is only quite recently that a fairly general measure of agreement has been reached as to the subject content of a course in librarianship. Even now areas of disagreement exist, and I will deal with the most controversial of these at the end of this section.

It seems to me that the subjects that might properly be included in the curriculum of a school of librarianship can be divided into four main groups: first, history, philosophy and sociology of librarianship and library management; secondly, cataloguing, classification, and information retrieval; thirdly, cognate subjects such as historical, analytical and descriptive bibliography and palaeography and archive administration; and fourthly, subject bibliography. I will say a little about each of these groups in turn.

The first one has always been regarded as the foundation of all further studies; it has been included in L.A. syllabuses from the beginning, and no one has ever doubted that it ought to be a compulsory part of the curriculum. One of the most interesting recent developments has been the separation of what I have called the history, philosophy and sociology of librarianship from the management of libraries, and the provision of two separate papers for each of these aspects. This was first done in the 1956 First

Professional Examination, whose first two papers were respectively Librarianship: Purpose and Librarianship: Methods. It was repeated in the 1963 Professional Examinations, Part One, whose first two papers are The Library and the Community and Government and Control of Libraries; and in the new Post-Graduate Professional Examination, whose first two papers are The Library in Society and The Management of Libraries. (The varying terminology is in itself interesting, since it reflects the attempt to define the essential features of each aspect of the study of libraries and librarianship).

This division results, I think, from an increasing recognition of the importance of a study of the purposes and functions of libraries. The term philosophy of librarianship is no longer in favour, but what it implies, a study of principles, ends, priorities is being increasingly emphasized. The study of the place of the library in the community it serves, or the sociology of librarianship, is obviously one of those aspects of librarianship that will develop most rapidly in the future. So far as library management is concerned the most important development, which was an important contribution of the period 1946 to 1963, is the increasing emphasis on principles rather than routines.

Such controversy as still exists in this field arises chiefly from the competing demands of different types of library, and this has been dealt with earlier. The basic assumption of the L.A. Syllabus and the curricula of all the library schools is that there is a core of principles that are common to all types of

library, and compulsory papers are provided in these. Optional papers are provided for those who wish to specialize in particular types, and these include as well as the three main types, academic, special and public, libraries serving special groups of readers such as children and hospital patients. Optional papers can also be provided for those who wish to take further a special aspect, such as the history or the sociology of libraries and librarianship, or the principles of library management.[12]

The second group comprises two traditional library techniques, which have always held an important place in the Syllabus - cataloguing and classification, together with the more modern methods of information retrieval. In the past no one doubted that every librarian ought to have studied the theory of cataloguing and classification to a reasonably high level and to have mastered the practical techniques. Indeed, from 1933 to 1946, the Intermediate Examination, which was the qualifying examination for professional librarians, consisted only of cataloguing and classification; and from 1946 to 1964 three of the seven compulsory papers of the Registration Examination were concerned with them. From 1964 onwards it became possible, perhaps for the first time, for a librarian to become qualified after having studied only the essential principles of cataloguing and classification, and without any training in the techniques; since only the Part I Paper 3: Organization of Knowledge was compulsory.

It was argued that only a minority of librarians ever became cataloguers and classifiers, and that the majority of librarians needed only enough knowledge of the principles and methods involved to be able to use catalogues and other information retrieval systems intelligently. This was probably true in the case of public libraries; but not, as non-public librarians were quick to point out, in the case of academic and special libraries. Cataloguing is proportionately a more important task in national and academic libraries, a larger proportion of the professional staff is engaged on it, and the catalogues themselves are highly complex. Information retrieval is clearly the most important function of special libraries, and their systems are even more complex. These facts are now generally recognized, and students intending to specialize in non-public libraries are encouraged to offer the three optional papers on cataloguing and classification in Part II, together with the paper on Handling and Dissemination of Information in the case of those intending to become special librarians. Some library schools also provide tuition in practical cataloguing and classification for all their first-year students although it is not required by the L.A. Syllabus.

The new Post-Graduate Syllabus shows a keener awareness of the importance of cataloguing and classification. Of the five compulsory papers, two are concerned with cataloguing and classification, one with the principles and the other with the

practice; and there is an optional paper on indexing, abstracting and information retrieval. It also shows a much more realistic approach to the teaching of practical classification and cataloguing by providing for it to be assessed on course work and not by examination. In the future it seems likely that the traditional techniques of cataloguing and classification will decline vis-à-vis the more modern techniques including mechanized information retrieval, but the subject as a whole will remain an essential part of the education of librarians. In due course the Syllabus will undoubtedly need to include an element of computer science. There will always be a certain amount of controversy as to whether certain aspects of the subject, such as the handling and dissemination of information, abstracting and so on, are part of librarianship at all; but this again is a problem I discussed in an earlier section.

The third group, which I have called cognate subjects, includes studies which are very closely connected with librarianship but which are not really part of it. From the librarian's point of view they can be regarded as ancillary subjects; and they tend to be concerned with the materials that form the contents of libraries. They should obviously be regarded as optional subjects so far as the librarianship syllabus is concerned. No one has ever doubted that palaeography and archive administration are in this category; but until recently many have considered that bibliography is an essential element in library studies, and many syllabuses have

included it as a compulsory subject. This misconception has arisen in large part from a failure to separate rigidly enough historical, descriptive and analytical bibliography on the one hand from subject bibliography on the other. There can be no doubt that subject bibliography is one of the most essential studies in the librarianship syllabus; but it is a mistake to deduce from this that all branches of bibliography are equally essential.

The L.A. Syllabus in force from 1946 to 1964 was particularly at fault here. On the Registration Level Group B comprised two compulsory papers, the first of which was concerned with analytical, descriptive and historical bibliography, together with modern book production and documentary reproduction, and the second, Assistance to Readers, with subject bibliography, reference materials and reader guidance. At least, the two main branches of bibliography were dealt with in two separate papers; but on the Final level even this elementary distinction was confused. The compulsory two-paper Part I Bibliography and Book Selection included, as well as subject bibliography, analytical and descriptive bibliography, while there was an optional paper on historical bibliography in Part 4, and subject papers, including subject bibliography, in Part 3. (Cataloguing and classification were not compulsory subjects at Final level).

The theory behind this obviously was that every librarian ought to have an advanced knowledge of descriptive and analytical bibliography, and a good knowledge of historical bibliography. It was recognized from the 1950's onwards that this theory was no longer

tenable. The important place descriptive bibliography held in librarianship syllabuses dated from the late 19th century when librarianship itself was not very well developed as a discipline; and bibliography provided at least one element in the syllabus that was of recognised academic standard. This was no longer true by the 1950's, but a more powerful argument against it was its comparative irrelevance to the work of most librarians. Only to those who were responsible for the custody of older or rare books was it of any real value, and this excluded most public librarians, virtually all special librarians, and probably the majority even of university and other librarians in the higher educational field.

The one thing that can be said in favour of descriptive and historical bibliography as a compulsory subject for librarians is that they ought to know something about the physical make-up of the raw materials in which they deal. What is indicated, however, is a study of the principles of modern book production and of non-traditional methods of documentary reproduction; but this is the aspect of their subject that interests students of bibliography themselves the least. The 1964 Syllabus again shows a much more realistic approach to this problem. One compulsory paper of Part I includes contemporary book and periodical production, re-binding, the uses of documentary reproduction and micro-form publishing. It is emphasized that the subject is to be studied from the librarian's viewpoint and not the publisher's or technician's, which rules out the detailed study of printing processes in a pseudo-technical way

that was one of the most bizarre features of education for librarianship as taught by some tutors before 1963. There are optional papers in Part II for those who wish to take the study of descriptive, analytical and historical bibliography further.

The new Post-Graduate Syllabus is even more progressive. Only subject bibliography is compulsory; but the student who is interested, or who feels it will be of use to him, can if he wishes, choose to offer one or more of the three optional papers in this field: historical bibliography, analytical and descriptive bibliography and modern book production.

This brings us to the fourth group, subject bibliography; or to extend it somewhat according to the terminology of the 1964 Syllabus, the bibliography and librarianship of particular subjects. Its place in the librarianship syllabus has always been in theory recognized; but it was until fairly recently included in the same papers as the other branches of bibliography and to a large extent overshadowed by them. Most of the syllabuses in force from 1884 onwards included papers on Elements of Bibliography and Cataloguing (1884), or Elements of Practical Bibliography (1904-1932); but it is clear that the amount of subject bibliography included was very small. Only slowly did it come to be recognized that the librarian ought to be concerned with the subject content of books and other materials rather than with their physical format.

Several factors can be adduced to account for the increasing importance of subject bibliography in librarianship from the 1930's

onwards; but it was not really until the 1960's that the syllabus reflected this increasing importance at all effectively First, there was the rapid growth and increasing importance of special libraries and special departments in general libraries; secondly, the increasing emphasis on the active role of librarians as providers of information, rather than on the passive role as custodians of materials, in all types of library; and thirdly, the increasing specialization of knowledge in all fields.

The provision for subject bibliography in the 1946 Syllabus was not at all satisfactory. In the case of the Registration examination it had a place only in one part of one of the seven papers; and this, let it be remembered, was the main qualifying examination for professional librarians, and the one with which the library schools were chiefly concerned. Quite apart from the fact that much too little emphasis was placed on subject bibliography, the approach to it was quite unrealistic; since the student was expected to study bibliographies, reference materials and book selection tools in every field, a quite impossible requirement. (Library school tutors did in fact encourage their students to specialize, ~~impractical~~ and this approach was eventually recognized by the L.A. examiners). This general approach was also evident in the appropriate sections of Part I (Bibliography and Book Selection) of the Final Examination; and only in Part 3 of that examination (Bibliography and Librarianship of special subjects), out of the whole Syllabus, was it possible to specialize.

Perhaps the most striking achievement of the 1964 Syllabus was to give its due weight to subject bibliography, and to provide for a realistic approach to it. Paper 4 of Part I provides for an introduction to the general problems of subject bibliography (and for the study of general reference materials and aids to stock building) in the first year; and the List C papers of Part II enable the student to choose in his second year one or more special subjects from a list of over thirty, and study the bibliographical apparatus available in these subjects.

Not surprisingly, however, precisely because this is the most novel feature of the 1964 Syllabus, it is the one that has given rise to the most difficulties and anxieties on the part of students, tutors and examiners alike. Many of these were questions of the interpretation and scope of the Syllabus and have been largely ironed out by now; but one fundamental difficulty has remained, the relationship between the academic study and the bibliographical study of a subject. It is a difficulty that raises issues much wider than the study of a particular subject in the librarianship syllabus: it is necessarily involved with the important question of pre-entry educational standards, and with the equally important question of whether the librarianship course should include, as well as librarianship subjects, standard academic subjects. These two questions are undeniably the most crucial and controversial ones facing those concerned with the future

development of education for librarianship.

What has become clear during the first four years of working with the 1964 Syllabus, even if it was not clear before, which it probably ought to have been, is that it does not make sense to study the bibliography and librarianship of a subject, as it were, in a vacuum. The student must either have studied the subject to a reasonably high level before entering library school, or he must study the subject concurrently with its bibliography at library school. The whole edifice of 1964 was erected on the assumption that the first alternative was the correct one; and for the first time ever the librarianship syllabus rigidly excluded any non-librarianship element.

As has been shown in a previous section, the decision was made that entry to library schools should be restricted to those with either a degree or two "A" levels; and it was hoped that this would provide an adequate foundation of subject knowledge on which to build the bibliography and librarianship of the subject. In fact "A" level is too low a level to provide this foundation; but it is not solely a matter of level, and even undergraduates do not always encounter those aspects of their subject that really give rise to bibliographical problems, nor do they always become well-acquainted with the methods, scope and terminology of their subject. It seems impracticable to put it this way, but it is probably true that only those who are doing research in a subject are really well prepared to study the bibliographical problems it presents.

In practice, it would be sufficient if students had a good knowledge of the needs and methods of research workers in their subject; but this is something that is not normally included in the "A" level, or even in the first degree curriculum; (although it might well be, and not only for the benefit of those who intended to become librarians).

Another problem is that the vast majority of candidates have "A" levels (or degrees) in a very restricted number of subjects; and if students at library schools offered List C papers only in subjects they had studied at School (or University) the needs of libraries for staff with a knowledge of the bibliography and librarianship of say education, mechanical engineering or chemical technology would just not be met - at least on the present basis of recruitment.

This brings us to the consideration of what could be a fifth group of subjects in the library school curriculum, i.e. standard academic subjects. If we examine the history of education for librarianship from the 1880's to date we shall be struck by a rather paradoxical development in the attitude to the inclusion of non-librarianship subjects in the librarianship syllabus. In the early years L.A. syllabuses included besides librarianship, bibliography and other cognate subjects a substantial element of what could only be regarded as general education. The emphasis was on literature, and the syllabuses drawn up in the 1880's and 1890's provided as many

compulsory papers in English and European literature as in librarianship. Throughout the next fifty or sixty years the emphasis on literature as against librarianship proper was gradually reversed; but it was not until 1964 that all subject papers were removed from the Syllabus. What is, at least at first sight, paradoxical is that there is now a move to reinstate the subject element in the library school curriculum.

The advocates of this move, however, are perhaps not so reactionary as at first it would appear, as their reasons for including a subject element are rather different from those that prevailed in 1882 or even in 1946. The pioneers of 1882, and their successors for many years, had two clear motives for including the general subject element in their syllabuses: first, librarianship itself was not, especially as an academic discipline, very well developed and needed additional weight from outside to make a qualification in it of any worth; and secondly, the re-entry qualifications were so low that the librarianship student's general education needed to be improved.

Let us now consider the motives of the present-day advocates of broadening the course. The first motive obviously arises from what I have just said about the artificiality of the present approach to subject bibliography. One solution to this problem would be to provide tuition at the library schools both in the subjects offered themselves and in their bibliography. The approach to the subjects would be different from the normal academic

approach in that the emphasis would be placed on the scope and methods of the subject, its terminology and its literature. There are, of course, precedents in the 1946 Syllabus, where the literature of subjects had to be studied for Group D of the Registration Examination and for Part 3 of the Final Examination. The papers most relevant as precedents were the first papers of the Final Part 3 alternatives, which were generally devoted to the subjects themselves and their literature, while the second papers were devoted to their bibliography and librarianship.

This is quite a promising approach, and may well be put into practice, but there are many problems to be overcome, both practical and theoretical. To take the practical ones first, it would probably be necessary to extend the course beyond the present two years, and it would be necessary to obtain tutors with the necessary subject qualifications. So far as the first is concerned, other factors indicate the extension of the course, and in spite of the difficulties I think that the course might be extended to three years in the not too far distant future. So far as the second is concerned, if the schools are situated in or transferred to the appropriate kind of parent-colleges, the staffs of these colleges should include a sufficient number of subject specialists with an interest in the literatures of their subjects to provide tuition in a reasonable range of subjects.

The chief ~~principle~~ objection in principle to this solution is that the study of the literature of subjects, or of approaches to subjects specially devised for librarians, is thought by some to be academically unsound. If they are right the only possible solution is to restrict entry to the profession to graduates; or possibly to institute degrees in librarianship. I shall discuss the actual establishment of degrees in librarianship in my final section, but in this context something needs to be said about their content. They could be of several different types, depending on how the syllabus was made up. In the first place they could be based on an extension of the present two-year syllabus along the lines I have already suggested, - that is, they could include librarianship and cognate subjects together with standard academic subjects approached from the point of view of their literature, bibliography and librarianship. These courses would then be open to the same objections as the extension to the two-year course itself. Secondly, they could include as well as librarianship subjects, and other subjects at present generally regarded as cognate such as bibliography, palaeography and information science, additional subjects that might be regarded as cognate such as sociology, computer science, public administration or business management. Thirdly, they could include librarianship and cognate subjects together with standard academic subjects (or, indeed, one standard academic subject) studied *in the normal way as by non-librarianship students.*[14] This type of course is the one that would meet the objection to specially devised approaches to subjects for librarians. (In practice these three alternatives would not be regarded as mutually exclusive by those planning syllabuses for degrees in librarianship, and a suggested syllabus might contain elements of all three.)

It seems to me that on grounds of principle only two courses stand out as being really satisfactory: first, the post-graduate course in librarianship following the normal degree course; and secondly the course in librarianship including librarianship subjects and academic subjects studied from the point of view of their literature and bibliography. It is desirable that those who serve the needs of research workers particularly in academic and special libraries should have taken the first type of course; for other posts the second course should be entirely adequate.

One suspects that degree courses in librarianship of some types are being formulated largely for pragmatic reasons; and it is here that arguments certainly held in the 1880's but subsequently thought to be discredited are being heard again. Lying at the root of most of these developments is the desire for more status, rather than for more effective training, for librarians. It is realized that in present circumstances a sufficient number of graduates cannot be recruited to make librarianship a solely graduate profession in the traditional way; so methods are being sought to enable post-"A"-level courses in librarianship to lead to degrees. This entails that when the content of such courses is being considered it is necessary not so much to consider the requirements for a good education in librarianship, but rather the requirements considered appropriate by individual universities, or by the C.N.A.A., for the recognition of the courses as being of degree level. In this way a general (as opposed to librarianship) education element

is introduced into the librarianship course, and extraneous subjects are introduced chiefly to add academic weight to librarianship subjects proper; and incidentally to make up deficiencies in the student's general education.

A more honest and in the long run more promising approach is to develop library studies themselves so that they comprise a genuinely educational discipline up to the highest academic level; and there are signs that this may be achieved. If librarianship is studied concurrently with one other academic subject in a kind of combined-honours course this might well form a satisfactory basis for a first degree in librarianship that could fittingly become the third method of educating librarians. The actual establishment of degree courses in librarianship will be considered in the next section.

VI: The National Structure

In spite of all the changes and major developments that took place between 1884 and 1963 in the field of education for librarianship in Great Britain one major factor remained the same: the position of the L.A. as virtually the sole examining and certifying authority. It is true that the first apparent breach in this monopoly came as early as 1919 with the foundation of the London University School of Librarianship; but it was for reasons already discussed a very minor one, and there was no further development along these lines until 1964 when the Sheffield University School of Librarianship was established. The changes of 1946, while being of major importance in other respects, did not affect the *status quo* in this respect, although they did, of course, contain within them the seeds of future challenges to it.

Although the examining and registering of students was thus centralized and unified on a national basis, the actual education and training of librarians, including the preparation of students for the centralized L.A. examinations, were completely decentralized, to a large extent unplanned, and subject to no national standards or control. Correspondence courses after 1930 were provided by the Association of Assistant Librarians, part-time courses, and full-time courses when they began, were provided by Local Education Authorities in their Colleges of Further Education; and individual library authorities also played their part. It was the policy of the L.A.

to maintain standards by retaining in its own hands the right to examine and certify, and not by accrediting teaching institutions. The corollary of this was that there was one standard generally accepted qualification for librarianship, but there were many different ways of preparing for it of very variable degrees of efficiency.

The changes of 1963, like those of 17 years earlier, again however far-reaching in other respects, were not intended to affect the status quo in this; since students would still be prepared for L.A. examinations which would lead to L.A. registration. Indeed, the years immediately following the introduction of the new pattern can be regarded as the high-water-mark of standardization; since not only did examination and certification remain centralized, but the means of preparation became more uniform than ever before. In 1960, for instance, there were only about 300 students at the full-time schools of librarianship as compared with perhaps 2,500 or more preparing for L.A. examinations by other varying means. In 1965, on the other hand, there were about 1,600 students at the full-time schools as compared with a mere 200 part-time students proper (i.e not including those who were transitional between the old and new syllabuses).[15] Of these, 1,600 full-time students there were about 50 at the university schools doing one-year courses in preparation for university diplomas (London and Sheffield), and about 70 doing sandwich courses (at Liverpool) in preparation for the

L.A. professional examinations. This means that out of an estimated total number of 1,800 students of librarianship in Great Britain, 1,470 were doing the standard full-time course leading to the professional examinations of the L.A.[16]

It is true, of course, that these students were at eleven different institutions each with its own independent governing authority, ten of them being in colleges of further or higher education under the responsibility of local education authorities and one, Glasgow, since the previous year, a part of the University of Strathclyde. Eleven institutions, however, all except one of more or less the same status, constituted a much more homogeneous teaching body than had ever been the case before by a very large margin. ~~In fact the change was qualitative rather than quantative~~. In addition, as has been shown in previous chapters, the influence of national bodies on individual schools had been increasing slowly but surely since the early 1950's. The L.A. itself gradually became more concerned with standards within the library schools; and the Association of British Library Schools steadily strengthened its position as the national representative body for library school heads and their staffs. Regional Advisory Councils for Technological Education exercised some co-ordination and standardizing influence from 1950 onwards; and in more recent years the Department of Education's Advisory Councils for Librarianship have begun to interest themselves in education for librarianship.[17]

It is, of course, true that once high tide has been reached the sea inevitably begins to ebb; and recent developments indicate that the same is true of education for librarianship. It seems quite likely that we shall move within a comparatively short time from the most uniform and standardized pattern that has ever been achieved to a situation where there is greater variety in the length of the course, the content of the syllabus, the examinations and even the final qualification than ever before. The trends in this direction can be studied under three main heads: first, the devolution of actual examining under its own syllabus from the L.A. to the individual library schools; secondly, the partial replacement of the L.A. by another body (i.e. the C.N.A.A.) as the national arbiter of courses in librarianship; and thirdly, the increase both in numbers and importance of library schools in institutions (i.e. universities) able and willing to award their own independent (and varying) qualifications. Each will be dealt with in turn.

Dissatisfaction with the system under which the library school tutors had no say in the interpretation of the Syllabus, in the setting and assessing of the examinations or in the examining of their own students' work had existed almost as long as the schools had existed; and in some respects, as we have seen, their position gradually improved in the years up to 1964. The setting up of moderating committees, the later study groups, the major part played by library school staffs in the drafting of the 1964

Syllabus, the final waiving of the rule that lecturers could not be L.A' examiners were all steps in the same direction; and the granting of the rights of internal examining to the schools should be seen as the logical culmination of this process rather than as a completely new departure.

It was as early as March 1962 that the L.A. Education Committee set up a sub-committee to study the matter of internal examining; and its report, which might reasonably be summed up as advocating gradual evolution to safeguarded internal examining, was approved by the Council in January 1964 and put into effect more or less as planned; so that by the winter of 1966 some of the larger schools were setting their own papers and examining their own students for Part I of the L.A.'s professional examinations.[18]

Two factors lead to this development, the most interesting and least obvious being the attitude of the L.A. itself. I have stressed throughout my work the striking contrast between on the one hand the almost complete control the L.A. possessed over syllabus, examinations and qualifications, and on the other its almost complete lack of control over the library schools themselves, and in general over the preparation of students for its examinations. By the 1960's the L.A. itself was beginning to see the disadvantages of this situation; and the members of the 1962 Sub-Committee saw in the setting up of a system of safeguarded internal examining the means of remedying it. The library school tutors could be given the

powers, subject to general overall control being maintained by the L.A., to set their own papers and examine their own students; but it could be made the condition of granting such powers to an individual school that it meet standards laid down and enforced by the L.A.

The minimum standards laid down in Appendix I of the Sub-Committee's Report followed closely previous reports on standards. The School in question had to be situated in a college a substantial proportion of whose work was of an advanced (i.e. post "A" level) kind; and it hai to possess reasonably independent status within the parent institution. There had to be a minimum of 6 full-time teaching staff and 80 students; and standards were laid down regarding such matters as common services, staff/student ratio, clerical and administrative staff, selection procedures, residential and recreational facilities, accommodation, teaching aids and equipment, library facilities and arrangements for practical work. The difference between these standards and previous ones was not so much in their content as in the fact that the L.A. now possessed an effective means of enforcing them. The L.A. had to be given the right to send visitors to the college at any reasonable time; and only if they were satisfied that the school was conforming to the prescribed conditions and standards would it be given, or be allowed to retain, the right to internal examining.

The second factor was the desire of the library schools themselves to examine their own students. Educational considerations

plainly indicated the desirability of this step. Account could be taken of the work done by students during their courses, personal qualities including personal aptitude for professional work could be assessed, individual schools could develop their own special interests more easily within the general framework; and, perhaps most important of all, bearing in mind that teaching and examining are parts of the same educational process, examination could match the depth of the actual tuition provided.[19] As well as these points of educational principle, there was also the quite practical fact that the schools had grown so remarkably in size and status over the years, and in particular during the 1960's, that no one could really doubt that the individual schools, or at least the largest ones, had the necessary number of expert examiners on their own staffs, and the administrative ability, to examine their own students.

In spite of the fact that they had had to face a fairly strong and certainly vociferous criticism of this move from a section of the membership, the L.A. Council had in fact achieved something of a master-stroke; since by it they retained most of the advantages of the traditional British system of centralized control of examinations and qualifications, and yet added to it most of the advantages of the American system of accrediting individual library schools. The only thing the L.A. was ceding to the library schools was the power to set and mark examinations for their own students; and even this was subject to stringent conditions (apart from those relating to the granting of the right to conduct

internal examinations), and had to progress slowly. Draft examination papers and marking notes had to be approved (and could be amended) beforehand by the L.A. Assessors; and all the students' scripts had to be made available to the Assessors, who could inspect the tutors' marking and vary it where they thought fit. In the first place only the Part I examinations were included in the system; and the L.A. made it clear that they would extend it to Part II only after they had satisfied themselves, if necessary after several years working, that the system was acceptable.

It is reasonable to expect that the stringency of many of these conditions will be relaxed in time; and their relaxation would in no way affect the main principle of the system. This principle requires only two conditions. First, that the actual Syllabus should remain under the control of the L.A.; and secondly, that the L.A. should retain the power to grant the right to examine its own students to a particular school (or withold it). The system has much to recommend it. It ensures that there is a national standard of examinations and a fairly uniform qualification in librarianship; while at the same time it allows the individual library schools a fair amount of freedom, and is based on the undisputed fact that educationally internal is much to be preferred to external examining.

It might have been reasonable to predict in 1962 that such a system would become the standard pattern of education for

librarianship in Great Britain for the 1970's and after; and to look forward to such a development as being in many ways a desirable one. By now, however, it looks as if much more radical changes will take place. A large and flourishing library school is likely to resent, whether rightly or wrongly, in the long term the attempts of an external body to keep it in what it regards as a kind of educational straitjacket. And perhaps the L.A. would be attempting the impossible if it tried to keep both complete control of the Syllabus for all library schools, and also the right to accredit individual library schools.

A new factor was in any case introduced into the situation by the setting up in 1964 of the Council for National Academic Awards.[20] Before this those library schools situated in non-university institutions had virtually no alternative but to accept the L.A. Syllabus, and to prepare their students for L.A. examinations. The theoretical alternative of working out their own syllabuses and awarding college diplomas was completely out of the question. The parent colleges themselves were not organized to perform this function; and college diplomas would not have had the necessary status. A degree, however, awarded under the auspices of the C.N.A.A., would possess the necessary status, and the parent colleges were to provide courses for C.N.A.A. degrees in a wide range of subject and professional fields.

A number of schools of librarianship, with the approval and support of their parent institutions, began to plan courses in

librarianship for C.N.A.A. degrees very soon after the C.N.A.A. was established; and a number of proposed courses have been submitted. The Librarianship Board of the C.N.A.A. was set up only in Autumn 1966, and so far there is insufficient evidence available to make it possible to say precisely why no projected courses for degrees in librarianship have been accepted, or to estimate what chances there are of such courses being approved in the near future. One or two important points, however, have emerged. The C.N.A.A. has chosen to take into account many factors other than the content of the Syllabus, including, for instance, staffing, accommodation, and facilities generally; so that clearly a library school will have to reach standards even higher than those laid down for internal examining privileges under the L.A. before it stands a chance of being approved for C.N.A.A. courses. To be approved a full-time course must also extend over at least three academic years, but this was understood by all the library schools applying. The content of the Syllabus remains the chief point at issue. It was made clear by the C.N.A.A. in its first statement of intentions that it did not propose to limit itself to traditional academic disciplines; on the contrary, it expressed itself eager to look at new fields of business and social studies, so there seemed no reason to rule out librarianship.

What seems to have happened is that the C.N.A.A. were not thought likely to regard librarianship as being in itself a sufficiently well-developed field of studies to be able to constitute

the whole syllabus for a degree course. The proposed courses, therefore, either included librarianship as an element (albeit a preponderant one) in a general science, social sciences, business studies, or even humanities degree course; or weighted central librarianship subjects with related subjects, such as the sociology of communications, computer science or administration. The C.N.A.A. has obviously not regarded any of the combinations so far proposed along these lines as constituting a viable course; and it is obviously in the long-term interests of librarianship that any such course should be very carefully scrutinized before it is approved. The harm that would be done to the profession by the approval of a premature or half-baked scheme would more than offset any good done by enhancing the apparent status of education for librarianship. The L.A. is not a direct party to negotiations for the setting up of C.N.A.A. degrees in librarianship, which must be between the Principal of the individual college concerned and the C.N.A.A. itself; but it has a real interest in them, which is primarily to ensure that any course envisaged provides a genuine and sufficiently far-reaching education in librarianship, and is represented on the C.N.A.A. Librarianship Board. The C.N.A.A., for its part, must ensure that any such course is based on a coherent body of knowledge, is genuinely educational, and is of a sufficiently high level.

This brings us to a consideration of the third trend away from the uniform pattern of 1963, the increase in the number and size of independent schools of librarianship. By an independent school of librarianship is meant one that works out its own syllabus and curriculum, conducts its own examinations, and awards its own independent qualification. A school that possessed full internal examining privileges under the L.A.'s scheme would be a little way advanced towards independence; one that organized its own course for a C.N.A.A. degree would be almost completely independent; but the only completely indepenent schools are those in universities able to award their own diplomas or degrees. From 1919 to 1964 there was only one such school, that at University College, London, and it was throughout the whole of that period a comparatively small one; now there are four as in the few years from 1963 three new University schools of librarianship have been set up, at Sheffield, Strathclyde and Belfast. University schools of librarianship fall into two rather different categories, those that provide only for post-graduate study in librarianship, London and Sheffield, and those that provide for both first degree or diploma and post-graduate study in librarianship, Strathclyde and Belfast. Since undergraduate study in librarianship constitutes the more radical departure from the standard pattern and follows on from what has been said about degrees in librarianship, these will be considered first.

The idea of a university diploma in librarianship for non-graduates is not, of course, a new one, even in Great Britain. The London University School awarded such a diploma from its establishment in 1919 until it closed down in 1939, and again from 1945 to 1947; but there were no university courses for non-graduates in librarianship from 1947 until 1965/1966, when Queen's University, Belfast and the University of Strathclyde established theirs one. I do not think it would be inaccurate or unfair to those concerned to regard the establishment of a university school of librarianship in Glasgow as the result of a fortunate train of events resulting from educational developments in the city rather than from the educational needs of librarianship.[21] The Glasgow School of Librarianship was part of the Scottish College of Commerce; and as part of a re-organisation of higher education establishments in Glasgow it was decided to transfer the high level courses of the College of Commerce to the new University of Strathclyde. The inclusion of the librarianship course in this category was only achieved after very full and careful consideration; and the staff of the Glasgow School, and those who supported them, deserve much credit for convincing the authorities that librarianship was a university-level subject. The transfer took place in 1964.

The new University of Strathclyde was naturally much more likely to consider academically unorthodox courses than a long-established university, and as a primarily technological university much more likely to favour vocational study. It is not surprising

therefore that it is at Strathclyde that the first university courses in librarianship for non-graduates since 1947 have been established, and the first ever degree courses in librarianship in Great Britain.

In addition to continuing at least for the time being the two year course for the Professional Examinations of the L.A., Strathclyde established two new courses: a one-year course for a post-graduate diploma in librarianship, begun in 1965, and a three-year course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts, begun in 1966. The latter is, of course, the more interesting development: it is essentially a general degree course offered by the School of Arts and Social studies (of which the Department of Librarianship is a part) with librarianship as the first principal subject.[22]

The School of Library Studies at Belfast is equally the result of special circumstances, albeit of a completely different kind. It had always been considered that a library school ought to be established in Northern Ireland primarily to serve the needs of the profession in Ireland; and the comparative smallness of the province clearly made it highly undesirable to set up more than one, especially as there was already one in the Republic of Ireland at the National University in Dublin. It took a long time to achieve this aim, but the School at Queen's University was finally opened in 1965, and made it its aim to provide courses to suit all needs. A one-year post-graduate course of the usual kind is provided, but

there is also a two-year course for non-graduates, which also leads to the University's Diploma in Library Studies. Most of the content of the latter course is librarianship, bibliography and auxiliary subjects; but during their first year the students must study, in addition to classification and cataloguing and bibliography and reference work, a first-year subject from the B.A., B.Sc., or B.Sc.(Econ.) Syllabus. These courses commenced in 1965.

The desirability of a second university school of librarianship in England had also been long recognized, but it was not achieved until 1964, when the Postgraduate School of Librarianship at Sheffield University began its first course.[23] It will be remembered that one of the chief stumbling blocks to the establishment of additional schools of librarianship in universities in the late 1940's had been the attitude of the L.A. on two important points: first, they were unwilling to recognize university diplomas based on purely internal examinations as the equivalent of their own professional qualifications; and secondly, they did not approve of solely post-graduate schools of librarianship. By 1960 they had abandoned these two principles; and it is significant that having done so their approaches to Sheffield University to consider the establishment of a library school, first made in that year, were well received and had a speedy and highly successful outcome.

The national pattern of library schools in 1967 is, then, much richer and more variegated than might have been expected during

the years when the 1963 Syllabus was being planned. Within three years there were established no fewer than three new schools, including two in universities. The third new school, Aberystwyth, which opened its doors to students in 1964, is a unique phenomenon in Great Britain in that it is an independent college of librarianship in the sense that it has no parent college, but it prepares its students for the examinations of the L.A. The London University School re-organized its courses in 1965, and now offers in addition to the one-year post-graduate Diploma course, degrees of M.A. by examination (a one-year course), M.Phil. by thesis (not less than two years), and Ph.D., in library studies.[24]

The Glasgow School, as we have seen, has achieved university status; and practically all the other pre-1963 schools have achieved or will achieve higher status in the near future as a result of the Department of Education and Science's Plan for Polytechnics of 1966. Under this plan university level work done in colleges of higher and further education will be concentrated into thirty regional colleges, which will be almost wholly concerned with degree level work, to be designated polytechnics.[25] In so far as the polytechnics will be the institutions chiefly providing courses for C.N.A.A. degrees, it seems likely that some at least will be able to formulate courses in librarianship that will meet with the approval of the C.N.A.A.

If one were to try to sum up the state of education for librarianship in Great Britain at the present time, one would, I

think, concentrate on two conflicting views, one optimistic and one pessimistic, but both aspects of the same development, the trend from a national uniform standard to a wide range of different schools, syllabuses and qualifications.

The pessimist would point to the dangers of having many different qualifications. From 1919 to 1965 qualified applicants for professional posts in British libraries could offer only two types of credentials - Associateship or Fellowship of the L.A. or the Diploma of the London School of Librarianship, and those who held the latter were in any case a tiny minority. In the very near future an applicant might still offer the Associateship of the L.A., but he might offer one of four different postgraduate university diplomas, or a B.A. degree including librarianship, or a non-graduate university diploma; courses for all these are at present being provided, and who can doubt that new ones will develop, and many more qualifications in librarianship will become available? There are two consequences of this development; first, the mere confusion, and secondly, the almost inevitable order of precedence that will be worked out and disputed about. Library staffs will possibly be divided not into two groups, professional and non-professional, depending on whether they have passed the L.A.'s professional examinations or not, but into three or more depending on precisely which type of qualifications they possess.

The optimist might begin his case here by maintaining that the provision of more than one professional grade is in any case indicated by the needs of libraries themselves; and that a system of education that produces more than one type of qualification will serve better the needs of contemporary and future libraries. At one time it was thought by some that three-year librarianship degree courses should ultimately replace two-year courses for the L.A. Part II (or the equivalent) altogether; but now even those schools who are most anxious to start C.N.A.A. courses do not intend to abandon their two-year courses when they get C.N.A.A. courses successfully established. Indeed they expect that the majority of their intake will still be for the two-year courses. It is generally thought that the two-year course following "A" level entry qualifications provides an adequate grounding for the majority of ordinary professional jobs in libraries; and it would in any case be unrealistic to extend the basic course to three years in present circumstances. In practice the majority of entrants are women, and the majority of these leave the profession within say two to six years of leaving library school (although many, it is hoped, will return later). It is essential therefore to get them trained in as short a time as is educationally possible.

It would be clearly wrong, however, to argue that because the two-year course serves an essential function and ought to be continued, no other course ought to be allowed to develop.

Educational considerations and the needs of libraries ought to be given priority over the desire for uniformity, understandable as this is. Many are sceptical about the value of three-year degree courses in librarianship, and it is well known that in the United States such courses, which were once very common, have now been abandoned; but the educational pattern as a whole is completely different here, and it would be wiser to suspend judgment as to the value of such courses in Great Britain until at least one has been established, and has been given an opportunity to prove its worth. In the meantime the one-year post-graduate courses continue to flourish and expand; and will certainly continue to be regarded as the most suitable education for senior posts in academic and other research libraries.

In any case it would be a mistake to exaggerate the divisive tendencies of present and expected future developments in education for librarianship. The basic division of library staffs into professional and non-professional will continue to harden; but for reasons already outlined it is unlikely that the educational system will produce exclusive castes of professionals with different educational levels and functions. Above all, the gap between the least and most thoroughly educated professional librarians will be narrower than ever before: all will have started with more or less the same minimum educational level of 2 "A" levels, and all will have benefitted from at least two years of full-time education in a "major institution of higher education."

One of the chief dangers in the increasing diversity of the educational pattern is admittedly the lack of a national uniform standard; but the L.A. still exists to preserve standards in education for librarianship, and the fact that it sees its role in regard to this task in a different light from what it did in the 1940's and 1950's shows that it has been able to keep abreast of developments both in professional education and in librarianship itself.

In 1946 the L.A. had to foster the building up of a system of full-time education for librarianship more or less from scratch; and for the succeeding ten years or so consolidation was more important than experimentation. It was vitally important that the new library schools should become well-established institutions, and that the L.A.'s own qualifications should become universally accepted, alike by librarians themselves of all types and by employing authorities and organizations. Underlying all this effort was the need to build up librarianship as a universally recognized profession.

In this context it is possible to understand the L.A.'s otherwise apparently over-rigid attitude towards its own educational system; and its suppression of attempts to establish independent qualifications. By the late 1950's an influential body of opinion within the L.A. began to recognize that circumstances had changed; and that the advantages of having more schools of librarianship in universities far outweighed the disadvantage of having several different qualifications in librarianship. As late as May 1958 the

the Education Sub-Committee refused to support negotiations with the University of Wales for a School of Librarianship in Wales partly because of its persisting suspicion of University diplomas in librarianship; but, as we have seen, the new attitude prevailed in regard to the moves for the establishment of the Sheffield University School from 1960 onwards; and since then the L.A. has supported the establishment of university library schools at Strathclyde and Belfast, and recognized their diplomas.

The fact that the role of the L.A. has changed does not mean that it is any less important. Its task now is to encourage rather than to inhibit experiments in education for librarianship, while at the same time maintaining standards, albeit by different methods than those appropriate in the 1940's and 1950's. The present might accurately be seen as a period of transition during which the L.A. continues to maintain its examining and qualifying machinery, but expects it to be gradually taken over by other bodies, while the new pattern and the L.A.'s own new role is emerging. The new pattern will almost certainly consist of a comparatively large number of independent institutions each awarding its own qualifications; and the role of the L.A. will be to maintain high standards throughout all these institutions. Its ability to maintain standards will not depend any longer upon its control of examining, but on its prestige and status in the community, and this is undoubtedly higher than it was in the 1940's or even in the 1950's.

The L.A. is in a stronger position than ever before to

refused to accept as entitling the holder to become an Associate of the L.A. would have very much chance of being accepted by librarians or employers. So long as the L.A. exists, therefore, the fear that standards in education for librarianship may be depressed is a groundless one.

There is thus little to fear and everything to hope for in the increasing variety in education for librarianship. The diverse needs of the thousands of individuals who make up the actual entry to the profession, and of the thousands of different jobs that make up librarianship as it is actually practised, are more likely to be met by many different courses than by one monolithic one; and where there are many free and independent institutions there is much more scope for experiment, and new and more progressive ideas are much more likely to be carried into effect. A strong and forward-looking L.A., backed up by other professional bodies including Aslib, by the Department of Education and Science with its advisory councils and advisers, and by other interested organizations such as OSTI, will ensure that standards are not only maintained but also raised and above all kept in line with rapidly changing needs.[27]

Perhaps the most hopeful sign for the future is the development at long last of research in librarianship on an adequate scale in this country. The L.A. led the way when it replaced the written examination by the thesis as the qualification for its Fellowship in 1963; the university schools led by London

are beginning to award higher degrees in librarianship; some schools have appointed research assistants; and one or two, led in this instance by Sheffield, have embarked on ambitious research projects. Apart from the value of this work to the progress of librarianship it should also help to establish library studies as a subject with an intellectual and educational value comparable to the traditional academic disciplines. This in turn should make possible the development of really worthwhile and viable first-degree courses in librarianship.

PART IV: NOTES

1 L.A.R. Vol. 67, pp. 203-204. Full-time Students' Census.

2 The comparatively poor salaries in public libraries also deter the graduate diplomates of the university schools of librarianship. See the article by W. L. Saunders - Challenge and opportunity: Sheffield's new postgraduate library school. Aslib Proc. Vol. 16, pp. 105-115 (March 1964).

3 See J. Farradane: Training for information science in Progress in library science, 1965; ed. by R. L. Collison (pp. 96 - 110).

4 ibid.

5 op. cit. sup. Full-time Students' Census p. 113.

6 It is fair to say that the L.A. has to some extent given the lead to other professions in developing facilities for full-time professional education. In many professions, including, for instance, chartered surveyors, accountants and secretaries the proportion of students having the benefit of some full-time training is still very small (i.e. under 15%). See /Robbins/ Committee on Higher Education. Report. 1963. Appendix 2(B) Part V.

7 The significance of 1967 is that the last Entrance Examination was held in the Winter of that year; so thereafter new entrants had to obtain 2 "A" levels. From 1960 onwards prospective entrants were encouraged to take "A" levels instead of F.P.E. or Entrance, but they were not compelled to do so.

8 In both cases the basic qualification is 2 "A" Levels; although in present circumstances it is normally necessary to possess good grades in 3 "A" levels to obtain a place on most courses in most universities. Most of the entrants to non-graduate schools of librarianship fall, in fact, into the level of educational attainment immediately below that required in practice if not in theory for University entrance, although many have 3 "A" Levels.

9 Graduates were usually admitted to the non-university schools immediately on graduation if they preferred this method, but the London University School normally insisted on a year's practical work in a library before admission.

10 More and more public library authorities also are setting up training-schemes under which the school-leaver enters the library as a trainee for a year, then goes to library school for two years (often on paid leave), and returns to work as a professional in that library.

11 For admission to the Register as an A.L.A. the students need three years of approved service, towards which one year at library school can count, and of which at least one must take place after passing Part I. There are no age limits. If the student has gone direct to library school from school, he will need to do two years after leaving library school before he can qualify: if he has had a year's practical experience before entering library school he will only need to do one further year after leaving. The L.A.'s approval of library service means little more than that there is at least one chartered librarian on the library's staff, or who can act as visitor to it.

12 Of these the L.A., in its Part II Examination, at present provides only for the History of Libraries in a separate paper; although the others are included to some extent in the List A papers (as also is the History of Libraries!)

13 Queen's University, Belfast, however, includes one non-librarianship subject in the first year of its two-year non-graduate diploma course. (It is an ordinary intermediate degree course, incidentally, not one specially angled to the needs of librarianship students).

14 The recently instituted course at the University of Strathclyde, the first degree course for students of librarianship to be provided in the United Kingdom, is of this type.

15 The estimates of the L.A. Education Department.

16 Of these 1,470 about 140 were doing the one year post-graduate course and about 1,330 the two-year non-graduate course (of whom about 600 were second year students). Full-time students' Census op. cit. sup.

17 A detailed questionnaire was sent to all the library schools in England and Wales by the Library Advisers of the Department of Education and Science in 1966, in order to obtain the information on which future recommendations could be based. A working party was set up in 1966, vide infra.

18 L.A.R., Vol. 66, pp. 116-119 (March 1964). Internal and external examining: report of the L.A. Sub-Committee.

19 It also makes it practicable to assess the student's ability by methods other than written examinations where appropriate. The 1966 L.A. Post-Graduate Syllabus, however, is the real pioneer in this respect. Paper G4 Practical classification and cataloguing is wholly assessed on the basis of course work undertaken in school; and paper G 8 Analytical and descriptive bibliography is partly so assessed. When internal examining is extended to Part II of the non-graduate Syllabus, no doubt this method will be extended. L.A.R. Vol. 67, pp. 16 - 18 (January 1965).

20 See the article Degrees in librarianship by B. I. Palmer in L.A.R. Vol. 67, pp 306 - 310 (Sept. 1965).

21 See the address by W.E. Tyler: The education and the staffing of libraries in Scottish Library Association, Annual Conference, 1966. Proceedings, pp. 21 - 31.

22 The first year in all arts degrees at Strathclyde is of a general nature and students need not elect to take librarianship until their second year.

23 See the article by W. L. Saunders op. cit. sup.

24 Queen's University, Belfast and the University of Strathclyde also intend to provide higher degrees in librarianship.

25 Of the ten non-university schools of librarianship seven will be situated in the new polytechnics, that is, all except Aberystwyth, Ealing and Loughborough. (Aberystwyth and Loughborough are hoping to be associated respectively with the University of Wales and the Technological University of Loughborough). It is the Government's intention that these polytechnics should be "major institutions of higher education". They will be administered by governing bodies with a large measure of autonomy, and the minimum of detailed control by local authorities. Their governing bodies are to include at least five academic members as well as the director; and their academic boards are to be

given a large measure of autonomy. Academic and administrative matters primarily affecting study, including control of syllabuses, examinations and admission of students, are to be delegated to the staff concerned.

26 L.A.R. Vol. 68 Liaison p. 91 (December 1966).

27 One of the most important future needs, and one with which OSTI is particularly concerned, is for properly trained information officers and special librarians. A recent survey undertaken by A.P.J. Edwards for OSTI showed the comparative paucity of officers in information departments with adequate qualifications both in science or technology and information work; and indicated that the situation was likely to grow worse. Evidently, the present educational system is not meeting this particular need. The expansion of full-time courses at schools like those at Sheffield and the City University will help; but there is also a need to enable those at present working in information departments and special libraries to gain qualifications, and the method most favoured by employers is by day-release courses. Of the 1,906 staff covered by the Survey, 369 possessed L.A. qualifications and 175 those of the Institute of Information Scientists; the great majority (1,362) had neither. Of 1,101 staff canvassed only 108 had taken or were taking full-time courses in information work. (Aslib proceedings, Vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 44 - 51, February 1966 and Journal of documentation, Vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 210 - 220, Sept. 1966). (Only 50 chartered librarians out of 6,000 hold science or engineering degrees).