



Federally Funded Training for Librarianship

SARAH R. REED

THIS REPORT ON the impact of selected federally funded programs for education for librarianship up to December 1974 will focus primarily on the origins of National Defense Education Act (NDEA) and Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II-B programs and will attempt to indicate the contributions such programs have made to professional education for librarianship in the United States. The definitive report on the impact of such programs will have to await access to data from the appropriate government agencies, from program participants, program directors, members of advisory panels, and from internal and external evaluators. Only then will it be possible to assess accurately the long-range impact of federally funded programs on individual grantee programs and on education for librarianship generally.

This report deals with: (1) the school library institutes funded under NDEA Title XI, (2) the programs funded under HEA Title II-B, (3) the Medical Library Assistance Act training programs, and (4) very briefly, several other federally funded programs which have included opportunities for the support of library education programs.

BACKGROUND

Between the mid-1950s and the mid-1960s the gap between expenditures for library support and those for the support of professional library education had become a gulf. By 1963, for example, the condition of ALA-accredited library education programs was critical. The median library school expenditure for salaries in the 1963-64 academic year was \$60,246; the range was from \$28,867 to \$198,382. Median salaries on a 9- or 10-month basis were: for an assistant professor, \$8,460; for an associate professor, \$9,833; for a professor, \$12,500. On a 12-month basis the median salary for the

Sarah R. Reed is Director, School of Library Science, Kansas State College, Emporia, Kansas.

head of the program was \$16,000.¹ Yet these are the people responsible for the preparation of the bulk of the United States' library personnel who in turn are the curators of one of this country's richest resources.

In addition to the problem of a near-starvation level of support available for library education programs, there was a serious lack of a source of supply of competent faculty members and of research support. In 1963-64, for example, only thirteen doctorates in library science were awarded. Since usually about one-half of the recipients of doctorates in any one year go into teaching, and most of the others choose the far more lucrative role of library administrator, this meant that perhaps six or seven new library school faculty members were available in that year for appointments in an estimated 300 library education programs. Prior to 1963-64, the largest number of doctoral graduates in any year was nineteen.² While library schools recruit faculty from other sources as well as from library school doctoral programs, the latter provides a major source of able candidates.

A similar poverty level obtained in relation to funding of research to support graduate library education and library operations. In an analysis of the total support for research reported by library schools in *Library Research in Progress* between 1959 and 1964, it was found that all reported funding averaged about \$6,000 per school.³

This record of inadequate support is not unlike that found by C.C. Williamson in his study of the situation forty years earlier, when he reported that "the fundamental cause of many of the deficiencies noted in the work of library schools can be traced to inadequate financial support."⁴

Except for a temporary infusion of Carnegie Corporation funds following the Williamson report, the financial complexion of most library schools has resembled that of the character described by Somerset Maugham as belonging to the "impecunious genteel."

With the Kennedy-Johnson thrust for an informed America, libraries were recognized as the keepers of one of the nation's important resources and librarians as intermediaries between the users and their "need to know." This increased visibility made new demands upon libraries, librarians and library-training agencies. If the latter were to respond to rising expectations, some more realistic means of support had to be found. Since the precedent of federal dollars for libraries had already been well established and since the recruitment and training of competent staff is essential for the success of sound library development, federal support for the training agencies, many

Federally Funded Training

of which were by that time suffering from near fatal cases of malnutrition, was sought.

NDEA SCHOOL LIBRARY INSTITUTES

Under Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as amended, twenty six NDEA Institutes for School Library Personnel (out of fifty-eight proposals) were supported in 1965; thirty-two (of sixty-six proposals) in 1966; and eighteen (of forty-three proposals) in 1967.⁵ The person responsible for the Institutes for School Library Personnel, as well as the for the direction of institutes in all fields included under Title XI, was Donald Bigelow, acting director of the U.S.O.E. Division of Educational Personnel Training. A dynamic educator in the humanistic tradition, Bigelow's objective was to achieve the greatest possible impact in terms of upgrading the quality of American education. In each field in which institutes were to be offered he issued a call to national leaders to help work out the guidelines and to select the proposals to be funded.

In librarianship, then, the Title XI institutes designed to update and develop the competencies of school library personnel were as good as the profession made them. Frances Henne of Columbia University, assisted by Margaret Rufsvold of Indiana University and Sara Syrgley of Florida State University, together with a series of excellent advisory panels, carried major responsibility for developing institute guidelines, for selecting proposals to be funded, and for conducting informal evaluations of institute results. Recognizing that many library education programs lacked both the human and material resources to respond with innovative proposals, meetings of the institute directors were used in part as clinics in which proposals were critiqued, consultant help was made available, and the results of institutes were evaluated candidly.

Each institute participant was eligible to receive a stipend of \$75 per week plus a weekly allowance of \$15 for each dependent, and was exempt from all tuition charges since the sponsoring institution received payments to offset the educational costs attributable to the operation of the institute as specified in the contract.

Frances Henne commented on the significance of the institutes:

The institute program provides the means that are usually not forthcoming in most library education agencies: for added professional, clerical, and technical staff; for lecturers and consultants; for smaller student-teacher ratios; for faculty time to

concentrate on one program and work intensively with one group of students; and for conducting a form of continuing education in greater depth and over a longer period of time than that typically given in workshops or conferences. The stipends for students and *the removal of tuition and other academic fees have the same* incentive that scholarships have, but scholarships on this wide scale are not usually available. . . . Although enthusiasm for the institutes, on the part of the students and planners, is high indeed, it would be foolish to say that every institute was an unqualified success or every participant deliriously happy. The over-all picture and net results are excellent, however.⁶

On the basis of site visits to a number of institute programs—and of personal observations of the development of institute directors and of the benefits gained from the opportunity for interaction afforded school librarians, school library supervisors, school library educators, and specialists from related fields—this former U.S.O.E. library education specialist would support Henne's evaluation and hypothesize that the impact of the institutes upon participants at every level would, even now, be regarded by the substantial majority of the participants as significant and positive.

After the 1967-68 series of Institutes for School Library Personnel, this program was transferred to Title II-B of the Higher Education Act program and the scope broadened to include other aspects of librarianship.

LIBRARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER HEA TITLE II-B

When the guidelines were written to implement Title II-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, it was recognized not only that very generous funding for the training of library and media technical assistants was available under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, but also that the program managers in the U.S.O.E. Division of Vocational and Technical Education were ready to encourage and to support proposals related both to the training of library and media technical assistants and to the development of educational materials to support such programs. Since proposals for this category of library staff were eligible for a higher level of funding than was forthcoming for all other levels of library personnel combined, initial priorities for HEA Title II-B funding were for professional staff development. It will be recalled that the law authorized "grants to institutions of higher

Federally Funded Training

education to assist them in training persons in librarianship . . . [in order to] substantially further the objective of increasing the opportunities throughout the Nation for training in librarianship."⁷

Initially an attempt was made to develop guidelines which would enable institutions of higher education to design programs in terms of the major components appropriate for the specific school. This could have varied from a self-contained institute proposal to initial underwriting for a full-fledged multi-purpose program such as the University of Puerto Rico was attempting to establish in the early 1960s under the leadership of Thomas Benner. A major consideration in granting funds to support such proposals would have been the commitment of the respective institution to continue to support a program once it was established. With such a commitment, it was hoped not only that money would be made available to attract more able students, but also that the federal "seed money" would stimulate a long overdue library education renaissance by strengthening and revitalizing library education programs.

This pattern of funding was not approved by U.S.O.E. officials. Instead, the guidelines were formulated in terms of the familiar format of fellowship and institute support.

Table 1 combines information presented by Frank Stevens, then Program Manager, Training and Resources Programs, Division of Library Programs, U.S.O.E., and statistics available from Eileen Cooke and Sara Case of the ALA Washington Office.⁸

Short-term institute participants receive a weekly stipend of \$75 plus \$15 per dependent. Stipends for the long-term institutes and for the fellowship/trainee programs vary from \$2,500 to \$4,700 per person plus dependency allowances of \$500 per academic year and \$100 per summer per dependent.⁹ Institutional support varies from payments to offset the educational costs attributable to the operation of the institute as specified in the contract, to a payment of \$2,500 per fellow for the academic year or \$3,000 per fellow for the academic year plus one summer session of six weeks or more.

In 1969-70 the Office of Education began to stress equalization of educational opportunity, services to the disadvantaged, and the increased use of multimedia concepts. In 1971, part of the funding previously allocated to fellowships was diverted to support institutes "which were thought to be a more responsive training format for the Office of Education's priority training needs."¹⁰ This was reflected in the sharp decline in number of fellowships awarded in FY 1971 and 1972. When the Education Amendments of 1972 directed that at least

TABLE 1
LIBRARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Academic Year	Institutions	Fellowships/Traineeships			Total	Institutes	Partici- pants	Appropriations
		Doctoral	Post Master's	Master's Associate				
1966/67	24	52	25	62	139	66	2,084	1,000,000
1967/68	38	116	58	327	501	91	3,101	3,750,000
1968/69	51	168	47	494	709	46	1,347	8,250,000
1969/70	56	193	30	379	602	38	1,557	8,250,000
1970/71	48	171	15	200 ^a	386	39	981	4,000,000
1971/72	19	116	6	^a	122	24	654	3,900,000
1972/73	14	39	3	^a	42	29	1,346 ^c	2,000,000
1973/74	39	21	4	159 ^b	201	30	1,339	3,572,000
1974/75	50	21	3	171 ^d	200	363	12,409	2,850,000
1975/76								2,000,000
TOTAL	339	897	191	1,792	2,902			39,572,000

^aTwenty traineeships were awarded in each of these years in an experimental program at SUNY Albany.

^bIncludes 14 traineeships.

^cIncludes 45 traineeships.

^dIncludes 3 traineeships.

Federally Funded Training

one-half of the available funds be spent for the fellowship/traineeship program, and authorized the awarding of suitable grants to library agencies as well as to institutions of higher education, FY 1973 funds were restored for MLS awards, but support for doctoral study was not increased.¹¹

For the past decade, library programs have had less than enthusiastic support from the U.S. Office of Education. On April 16, 1970, James Allen, U.S. Commissioner of Education, testified before the House Special Subcommittee on Education that "since part B merely duplicates other authority, there is no need to extend it as a separate categorical aid program."¹² On March 3, 1974, John R. Ottina, Commissioner of Education, reported that the office was requesting zero funding for Title II-B in 1975.¹³

A U.S.O.E.-sponsored evaluation of the Title II-B program concluded that, based upon degree completion, post-program employment, and subjective evaluation by the deans involved, the program is successful.¹⁴ One of the deans said: "The HEA Title II-B program has probably been one of the greatest factors in promoting library education since the Williamson Report. Not only has its related publicity had an impact on recruitment, but it has made continuing education for library service a possibility for many who could not have afforded advanced study. It has served as an excellent pump-primer for additional funds to be created locally in support of library education."¹⁵ Another dean voiced a concern that has been heard from time to time: "There has been a decided impact on doctoral programs and many people who would never have entered such programs have been able to do so. Only time will tell how wisely invested the money was. My personal opinion is that priority should go to doctoral programs but that the schools that receive them should be required to measure up to high standards in faculty ratio, research productivity, etc. I am sure that, had such precautions been taken from the beginning, some schools that are seriously over-extended now would have developed doctoral programs at a more realistic rate."¹⁶

Holmstrom and El-Khawas summarized the above study in an article in *College & Research Libraries* and concluded with the following quotation from Russell E. Bidlack, Dean of the School of Library Science, University of Michigan: "The existence of these fine fellowships . . . has given library schools visibility on their own campuses. . . . The fact that library education was given this kind of recognition by the Congress . . . has done more for librarianship in

the eyes of nonlibrarians than nearly any other event in recent library history."¹⁷

Despite the tacit recognition of the role of libraries in national development, federal library programs have sometimes suffered from being stepchildren of the Office of Education. Rather than expressing regret that the number of doctoral fellowships vital to the well-being of all library education suffered a 65 percent decrease between 1971-72 and 1972-73, that all programs funded have not been of equal quality, that the delays in the announcement of grants have sometimes decreased the effectiveness of competitive recruitment, that grant priorities have sometimes been self-defeating, and that some grants have gone to institutions without the commitment to continue programs beyond the duration of the grant, most library educators will report that the advantages of these grants have far outweighed the disadvantages; they will agree with Bidlack that the visibility achieved for library education through the Title II-B programs could not have been achieved by the schools themselves. Therefore everyone interested in the future of librarianship owes a vote of thanks to Frank Stevens and Paul Janaske for maintaining such programs. Also among those who deserve far more than an anonymous tribute are the institute directors, many of whom have demonstrated dedication and achievement of the highest caliber. In the opinion of the writer there are few library education programs in the United States which have not benefited in some way from Title II-B programs. The increase in number of new library school faculty members, the increase in number of minority group representatives recruited, and the impact upon quality of education for librarianship have all been made possible by the infusion of HEA Title II-B funding.

MLA ACT TRAINING PROGRAMS

The Medical Library Assistance Act (MLAA) of 1965 was signed into law by President Johnson on October 22, 1965.¹⁸ Initially approved for a five-year period, it was extended for three more years and then incorporated in part into Public Law 93-45 as amended June 18, 1973.¹⁹ However, the MLAA training grants were not continued under the latter legislation.

Two people whose names occur frequently in relation to the work of securing the passage of the MLAA are Scott Adams, then Deputy Director of the National Library of Medicine, and Estelle Brodman,

Federally Funded Training

Librarian and Professor of Medical History, Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis.

Included in this legislation was authorization of grants for the training of medical librarians and other specialists in the health sciences, for research in medical librarianship and related medical communication fields, and for fellowships.

In a presentation to the Medical Library Association on June 9, 1966, those responsible for the extramural programs of the National Library of Medicine stated that:

Training programs are needed which go beyond the basic traditional training in library science and provide the student with an educational experience that combines further theoretical depth with either research or practical experience all directly related to the problems of medical science. . . . Special emphasis will be given to the planning of medical information systems, and the training environment will draw heavily upon various disciplines, particularly the biomedical sciences, and also mathematics, systems engineering, linguistics, and library management. Such training activities will be developed in conjunction with strong biomedical programs so that the scholarly research pursued by the graduate students in medical library or information science can be conducted in the actual environment which they seek ultimately to serve. There is an unsurpassed opportunity here to perfect the interface between the working medical scientist or practitioner, as the case may be, and the information specialist. . . . If the librarian is to assume an appropriate role as a key faculty member in the structuring and coordination of scientific communications networks for the health professions, an appropriate educational background at the graduate level is a prerequisite.²⁰

Martin Cummings, Director of the National Library of Medicine, and Mary Corning reported that by the end of 1971 training funds would have provided training for approximately 350 individuals at an average cost of approximately \$8,100 per trainee, of which 57 percent was for the stipend or other trainee expense and 43 percent for nontrainee expense.²¹ They indicated that from July 1, 1965, through June 30, 1970, a total of \$4,460,000—or 11 percent of total MLAA funding—was spent on MLAA training grants in twenty-eight institutions as shown in Table 2.

SARAH R. REED

TABLE 2

NLM TRAINING PROGRAMS, FY 1966-70 (JULY 1, 1965-JUNE 30, 1970)

	Projects funded	Individuals supported
A. Training grants		
Non-degree programs	6	77
Degree programs		
Master's	9	143
Ph.D.	5	33
Total	20	253
B. Fellowships		
Postdoctoral research		
History	6	6
Biomedical communications	2	2
Total	8	8

Source: Cummings, Martin, and Corning, Mary E. "The Medical Library Assistance Act: An Analysis of the NLM Extramural Programs, 1965-1970," *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 59:381, July 1971.

As far as this writer is aware, relatively few programs were funded between 1971-72 and 1973-74. The schools which continued to receive grants during that period included the University of California at Los Angeles, (UCLA), which had both a post-MLS training program in medical librarianship and MLS fellows for the M.S.I.S. degree; the University of Illinois which, except for the final year of the program, had biomedical traineeships; Washington University School of Medicine Library, which had traineeships in computer librarianship; and the University of Tennessee Medical Units, which had a postgraduate training program for science librarians. Developed in 1966 by Andrew Lasslo, chairman of the Department of Medicinal Chemistry of the College of Pharmacy, the latter program stressed the importance of assigning trainees to research teams made up of senior scientific or clinical investigators. As of 1972 the total cumulated funding approved for this operation, which had involved twenty-seven trainees, was \$520,055.²²

In contrast to the Tennessee postgraduate program, the Training Program in Medical Librarianship, developed by the Case Western Reserve University School of Library Science as an integrated sequence of specialized courses within the one-year library science master's

Federally Funded Training

curriculum, provided training in both traditional and automated methods of medical librarianship within the context of the organizational patterns of health care and medical research.²³ Through a variety of techniques this program demonstrated an exemplary use of a wide range of community resources.

In his 1971 study of programs of education for medical librarianship in the United States, Fred Roper indicated that eight degree programs, all established after the passage of the Medical Library Assistance Act, and four internship programs were still being offered. The degree programs were being sponsored by the University of Chicago, UCLA, Case Western Reserve, University of Minnesota, University of Illinois, University of Missouri, University of Southern California and Illinois Institute of Technology; the intership programs were sponsored by the National Library of Medicine, UCLA, University of Tennessee, and Washington University at St. Louis.²⁴

According to Roper, the degree programs generally divided into three areas—general librarianship, biomedical/scientific librarianship, and information storage and retrieval—with a number of programs either requiring or encouraging outside courses in the sciences. The internship programs generally consisted of some course work and departmental rotation of work assignments within the library.²⁵

In their report, Cummings and Corning concluded that funds for the training programs had been well spent and that “graduates from these programs may well be our library leaders of the future.”²⁶ They did express regret, however, that there had not been adequate funds to undertake the retraining of existing librarians in “modern information-handling methods.”²⁷

Despite the high hopes for this program, which was diversified, flexible, and stressed the need for interdisciplinary training and experimentation, the impact was less than might have been desired. As Cummings and Corning indicated, funds were not available to launch the continuing education program that they believed to be important. In addition to the lack of long-range program commitment of some of the institutions funded and the small number of trainee awards available, Roper found, too, that slightly less than 60 percent of these trainees were employed in medical libraries.²⁸ He found, however, that approximately 80 percent of the trainees were highly satisfied or satisfied with their programs and that more than 90 percent would enter such a program if they were to make the choice again.²⁹ Roper also found, probably as a result of the inclusion in training programs of advances in technology and the utilization of that technology in

libraries, that trainees were securing positions as information analysts, research bibliographers, and systems analysts—positions formerly not generally open to medical librarians.³⁰

It is interesting to note that the National Library of Medicine has recently made a two-year resource grant to the University of Connecticut to support a project entitled "Clinical Librarians in Patient Care-Teaching Settings." The theory is that by going on rounds, "clinical librarians" can answer requests from doctors and students and also determine whether other material would be of value. Gertrude Lamb, principal investigator and director of libraries at Hartford Hospital and assistant librarian at the University of Connecticut Health Center, contends that this will "make the information flow user-oriented rather than subject-oriented,"³¹ that doctors will develop a more sophisticated bibliographic competency, and that a core of multidisciplinary readings useful in patient treatment will be identified.

In summarizing the deliberations of a group of people whose names have been long associated with education for health sciences librarianship, host Irving Lieberman quoted as follows from one participant's conference evaluations: "The Conference was important not only for medical librarianship, but for all special librarianship. It established an objective for medical library education which, with very little alteration, may be translated into an objective for all special library education. Such education . . . should eventually develop a cadre of librarians who can make the library an integral part of educational research and development programs in education, industry, and Government."³²

OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR FEDERAL FUNDING FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION

In addition to the federally funded programs discussed thus far, there are others which have been available to the occasional library education applicant. Among these were the Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program and the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program available under HEA Title V-C, which included stipends, dependency allowances, and tuition waivers to pursue education for school librarians and forty for experienced school librarians.³³ Under first series of teacher fellowships included seventy for prospective school librarians; and forty for experienced school librarians.³³ Under Title V-C, schools which were awarded fellowships were also eligible to

Federally Funded Training

apply for institutional assistance grants to strengthen graduate teacher education programs. Effective July 1, 1968, the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) of June 29, 1967, as amended by the HEA amendments of 1968, was an attempt to coordinate federally funded teacher education programs. Don Davies, then Associate Commissioner of Education in charge of the newly established Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, voiced the hope "that the ultimate impact of our program will be that school districts and teacher training institutions will build into themselves the capacity for self-renewal. . . . Unless this is done, schools will always be obsolete."³⁴ EPDA Part E authorizes grants to institutions of higher education for the training of persons preparing to work in colleges and universities as teachers, administrators or educational specialists.³⁵ In the summer of 1972 and during the 1972-73 academic year, out of 912 fellowships, 50 were in the field of library science for study in the following universities: Denver, Illinois, Western Michigan, Queens, Long Island, Oregon, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin.³⁶

Title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 as amended, and Titles IV and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, specifically mention the inclusion of personnel training programs. The Older Americans Act provides for training "to improve the quality of service and to help meet critical shortages of adequately trained personnel for programs in the field of aging."³⁷

In conjunction with administering Title II of ESEA a number of states conducted in-service training programs involving librarians, school administrators, and, in at least one instance, school board members.³⁸

These are only a few of the sources of federal funding that can be tapped by those library education programs fortunate enough to have someone who has the time and talent to undertake the grantsmanship involved.

Most library educators would probably agree that those federally funded programs which have been viable, innovative, and future-oriented have provided educational experiences which have benefited participants, stimulated the faculty members involved, provided employers with personnel who at least possess the potential for competency, and have made a positive impact on the quality of education for librarianship. Specifically, federal funding has increased the pool of competent library school faculty members; it has increased the number of minority group representatives in libraries and in library schools; it has developed needed areas of specialization,

whether in providing services to the health or education professions or to the disadvantaged or the elderly; it has encouraged interdisciplinary and multimedia components in the curriculum; it has stressed the importance of building in an evaluation component on a continuing basis in order to ensure programs relevant to society's needs; and it has provided at least a beginning in creating sorely needed opportunities for continuing education.

At the same time, it must be admitted that while federally funded grants and contracts have been helpful to library schools, they are mixed blessings. They are sometimes dedicated to endeavors dictated by grantors, which may not give direct support to the main missions for which schools exist. Then, too, grantsmanship takes time. Few people who have not taught in a library school recognize that the 14- or 15-hour day is not unusual for many library educators, at least some of whom frequently begin their own work after a long day of teaching, counseling, committee meetings, consultant work, speaking engagements, and a bevy of other school assignments. To siphon off undue faculty time to develop proposals—not all of which are successful in securing funding—can jeopardize the caliber of teaching. If too many assignments were to be assumed as overloads, the long-range effect could be on the debit rather than the credit side of the ledger as far as program quality is concerned.

What is required in order for today's library schools to meet the challenge of NCLIS to provide the personnel who can render the high quality of service called for by the commission?³⁹ The answer surely must be: vast improvements in (1) quality of faculty; (2) fellowships that will attract able students with majors in the sciences as well as in the social sciences and humanities; (3) physical facilities; and (4) support for research and development.

Perhaps it is fair to say that federal funding has given education for librarianship a slice of bread where there was none previously, but through the mechanism of program priorities, the funding agencies have been somewhat less than altruistic in the allocation of funds. Those in library schools know that the battle for funding to support programs of quality education for librarians still lies ahead.

References

1. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. *Survey of Library Education Programs*. Washington, D.C., U.S.O.E. Library Services Branch, 1965. (Mimeographed)

Federally Funded Training

2. Reed, Sarah R. "Library Education Report," *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 5:263, Spring 1965.
3. _____, "Library Education Report," *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 5:204, Winter 1965.
4. "Training for Library Service" (Report prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York). New York, 1923, p. 140.
5. Reed, Sarah R. "The Federal Government and Library Education," *ALA Bulletin*, 61:1050, Oct. 1967.
6. Henne, Frances. "As Good As Librarians Make Them," *Library Journal*, 91:2566, 2569, May 15, 1966.
7. *United States Statutes at Large. 1965*. Vol. 79. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1966, p. 1227.
8. Stevens, Frank A. "Higher Education Act, Title II-B, Library Education." In Madeline Miele, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. 19th ed. New York, Bowker, 1974, p. 150.
9. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Division of Library Programs. *Applications and Proposals, Fiscal Year 1975: Library Training Program: Institutes, Fellowships, Traineeships*. Washington, D.C., U.S.O.E., 1975.
10. Vale, Michëlle R. "Trends in Federal Library Training Programs for Service to the Disadvantaged," *Library Trends*, 20:466-67, Oct. 1971.
11. Stevens, *op. cit.*
12. "Higher Education Hearings," *ALA Washington Newsletter*, 22:1, April 22, 1970.
13. Ottina, John R. "USOE and the Library Role," *American Libraries*, 5:316, 318, June 1974.
14. Sharp, Laure M., *et al.* *Overview of the Library Fellowship Program*. Washington, D.C., Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., 1970, p. 49.
15. *Ibid.*, Appendix B.
16. *Ibid.*, Appendix B3.
17. Holmstrom, Engin P., and El-Khawas, Elaine. "An Overview of the First Four Years of the Title II-B Fellowship Program," *College & Research Libraries*, 32:215, May 1971.
18. *Congressional Record*, 111:27346, Oct. 22, 1965.
19. *United States Code Annotated*, Title 42, Sec. 280b, Oct. 1973, p. 796.
20. Wilson, Marjorie P., *et al.* "Extramural Programs of the National Library of Medicine: Program Objectives and Present Status," *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 54:298-300, Oct. 1966.
21. Cummings, Martin, and Corning, Mary E. "The Medical Library Assistance Act: An Analysis of the NLM Extramural Programs, 1965-1970," *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 59:375-91, July 1971.
22. "Tennessee Training Program Receives New Funds," *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 60:501, July 1972.
23. Reese, Alan M. *Training Program in Medical Librarianship and Health Sciences Information. Annual Report July 1, 1967-June 30, 1968*. Cleveland, Center for Documentation and Communication Research, Case Western School of Library Science, 1968.
24. Roper, Fred W. "A Comparative Analysis of Programs in Medical

Library Education in the United States, 1957-1971." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation prepared for Indiana University, 1971, pp. 31-32.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
26. Cummings and Corning, *op. cit.*, p. 391.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 381.
28. Roper, *op. cit.*, p. 134.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 135-36.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 137-38.
31. Lamb, Gertrude. *FLC Newsletter*, 80:8, Jan. 1975.
32. Lieberman, Irving, ed. *Education for Health Sciences Librarianship; Proceedings of an Invitational Conference, September 10-12, 1967*. Seattle, University of Washington School of Librarianship, 1968, p. 151.
33. Reed, "The Federal Government . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 1051.
34. Davies, Don. "EPDA from the Top, an Interview with Don Davies," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 50:39, Sept. 1968; See also _____, "Reflections on EPDA," *Theory into Practice*, 13:210-17, June 1974.
35. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. *EPDA Higher Education Personnel Training Programs 1973-74; Instructions and Application Forms for Submitting Fellowship, Institute, and Short-term Training Proposals for Support Under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act, P.L. 90-35*. Washington, D.C., U.S.O.E., 1972, p.1.
36. "President's FY 1973 Library Budget," *ALA Washington Newsletter*, 24:3, Jan. 26, 1972.
37. *United States Code Annotated*, Title 42, Sec. 3031, Oct. 1973, p. 908.
38. Reed, "The Federal Government . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 1053.
39. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. "A National Program for Library and Information Services." 2d draft rev. Washington, D.C., 1974, p. 4.