ENGIN I. HOLMSTROM and ELAINE EL-KHAWAS

An Overview of the First Four Years
of the Title II-B Fellowship Program

Over 1,500 fellowships have been granted under the Title II-B program since its inception in fiscal year 1966. The Title II-B program seems to have contributed to an improvement in the quality of students recruited into library programs. The majority of the fellows successfully completed their programs and have become well-trained librarians. The Title II-B program also seems to have had the effect of strengthening institutional programs of instruction and improving the quality of library education.

SINCE FISCAL YEAR 1966 when the Title II-B program of the Higher Education Act of 1965 was first implemented, the U.S. Office of Education has provided over 1,500 fellowship grants to students in library and information sciences (LIS) and has assisted fifty-six schools in defraying the cost of courses of training in librarianship.

In a recent study, data were collected from fifty-six LIS institutions participating in the Title II-B program in order to evaluate the first four years of the program. All of the participating institutions cooperated with the study by providing information on students who had received Title II-B fellowships during the first four years of the program (1966/67–1969/70), yielding information on a total of 1,627 students. In addition, institutional questionnaires which contained information regarding enrollment trends and selection of Title II-B

Dr. Holmstrom is a research associate at the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. At the time this paper was written Elaine El-Khawas was research analyst, Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D.C. She is now employed by the University Research Corporation, Washington, D.C.

fellows and other awardees were obtained from all but one of the participating institutions.

Although differences among schools in record-keeping practices, admission policies, and academic schedules reduced the comparability of the data to some extent, the results clearly indicated that the deans of the participating LIS institutions viewed the program favorably and that the program was seen as contributing highly to the quality and the quantity of students graduating from the LIS institutions.

TRENDS IN ENROLLMENT

Table 1 presents the estimated totals for LIS enrollments of the institutions participating in the first four years of the Title II-B program, including data on Title II-B fellowship recipients. These figures should be treated with some caution insofar as the totals, in some cases, include part-time students. In addition, the schools supplying the information varied greatly in their interpretation of what constituted a formal application. However, combining the four years of the program, it would appear that two-thirds of all students who sub-

mitted "formal applications" were admitted to LIS institutions. Approximately one-fifth of these students, or one-third of admitted students, requested financial aid. Three-fourths of the students applying for financial aid were considered for Title II-B fellowships. Generally, one-third of the students considered for the Title II-B program received the fellowship, comprising about five percent of the total number of students applying for admission, or eight percent of the students who were finally admitted.

The financial resources that were available to students enrolling in the LIS institutions in our study were not limited to Title II-B fellowships. To some degree, the size of the school determined the number of grants that were available. The types of support also varied greatly among the schools, again to some degree dependent on the size or the locality of the school: for instance, a large urban school would have a number of grants restricted for the use of certain ethnic groups in addition to a number of

other grants or fellowships which were distributed according to the scholastic achievement or the financial need of the applicants. Small, nonurban schools, on the other hand, would have only one or two awards in addition to Title II-B fellowships. When all schools were considered together, it appears that, with the exception of the first year of program, Title II-B fellowships constituted about half of the grants or awards offered in the participating LIS institutions. Since the program aided less than ten percent of the total number of enrollments, there is definitely room for expansion of the program.

SELECTION OF THE AWARDEES

An overwhelming majority of the deans agreed that their best candidates were awarded the Title II-B fellowships, although there was less agreement regarding the criteria used in the selection process. The most important criterion appeared to be undergraduate grades. However, the importance at-

TABLE 1

ESTIMATES OF LIS AND TITLE II-B ENROLLMENT

	1966–67	1967–68	1968–69	1969–70
Total Library Science Enrollment				
Number of formal applications received	5,432	7,257	9,469	9,656
	(24)[a]	(33)	(44)	(46)
Number of students accepted	3,524	4,738	6,366	6,084
	(25)	(32)	(45)	(49)
Number of newly entering students enrolled	2,706	3,353	3,926	4,270
	(27)	(34)	(43)	(49)
Newly entering students requesting financial aid	980	1,414	2,010	2,342
	(20)	(26)	(36)	(42)
Total enrollment, i.e., newly entering and continuing students	6,915	8,435	9,684	9,364
	(40)	(46)	(55)	(55)
HEA Title II-B Fellowship Enrollment				
Number of newly entering students considered for HEA Title II-B fellowships each year	430	1,094	1,475	2,092
	(16)	(25)	(43)	(50)
Number of HEA Title II-B fellowships offered to newly entering students each year	120	426	595	514
	(23)	(34)	(49)	(54)
Number of students who rejected HEA Title II-B Fellowships	3	21	46	57
	(21)	(31)	(44)	(53)
Number of HEA Title II-B fellows who later resigned from the program	2	18	31	7
	(23)	(34)	(49)	(49)

[a] Number of LIS institutions supplying information.

tached to undergraduate grades depended largely on the reputation of the undergraduate institution. The second most often mentioned criterion in the selection of the awardees was references. Again, the weight attached to each reference depended on whether or not the dean or the persons on the selection committee knew the individual used as a reference.

Table 2 presents the factors considered important in the selection of students for Title II-B and other grants. Generally, academic considerations appeared to be slightly more important in the selection of students for Title II-B awards than for other awards. Less than half of the deans also reported considering the financial need of the applicant as an important variable in awarding the Title II-B fellowship. However, the importance attached to financial need of the student considered for the Title II-B award appears to depend largely on the dean's perception of the objectives of the program. Most deans, who felt that the major purpose of the program was to recruit and prepare outstanding young men and women for faculty positions in LIS institutions, deemphasized financial need, while others, who felt that the program existed primarily to make it possible for applicants needing financial assistance to obtain a library education, emphasized it.

Generally, most deans felt that the program has allowed them to compete with other departments and with other states for better and higher-quality students and that, as a result, the completion rates of the programs offered in their institutions have improved considerably.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FELLOWSHIP RECIPIENTS

The Title II-B fellowships, mainly one-year awards, had been granted primarily for study in master's programs (76.4 percent), and less often in postmaster's (7.0 percent) and in doctoral programs (16.6 percent). As shown in Table 3, the students recruited into the master's programs were younger and had had less experience with library work than those entering the other programs. The students in the master's programs were typically women in their

TABLE 2

FACTORS CONSIDERED IMPORTANT IN SELECTING STUDENTS
FOR TITLE II-B AND OTHER AWARDS
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Factors	Title II-B	Other
Undergraduate grades	98.2	89.1
References	78.2	72.7
Graduate record exams	74.5	69.1
Financial need	45.4	49.1
Curriculum type	38.2	32.7
Professional promise	30.9	21.8
Previous academic preparation	29.1	23.6
Interview	25.4	18.2
Career objectives	18.2	16.4
Student's character	14.5	–
Work experience	10.9	9.1
Library experience	9.1	7.3
Miller Analogies Test	7.3	7.3
Minority group representation	7.3	3.6
Age	5.4	1.8
Geographical area representation	5.4	3.6
Leadership potential	5.4	–
(Base N)	(55)	(55)

twenties, of whom fewer than half were married. Only a third had worked as librarians before entering the program, and most (87.5 percent) held no prior graduate degree.

In contrast, the recipients of post-master's awards, again mostly women (72.8 percent), were older, with more than half over forty; about half were married. Almost all held an M.A. degree—and in some cases more than one —and two-thirds had held library positions before receiving the award. The students in the doctoral programs, on the other hand, were predominantly men (61.9 percent) and usually married (63.8 percent), of whom about half were in their thirties and only a third

over forty. They usually held an M.A. degree and three-quarters had been working in library positions prior to receiving the award.

Students in the three programs had somewhat similar undergraduate backgrounds (see Table 3). Undergraduate majors were most often in the humanities, and to a lesser degree, in social sciences. Very few had taken their baccalaureate in natural sciences or in business, and only a small proportion had majored in education. There were also very few who had majored in LIS, at best, only 10.0 percent of those in the postmaster's programs. Blacks were also underrepresented, constituting only 6.0 percent of the total group and only

TABLE 3

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF TITLE II-B FELLOWS
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Characteristic	Students			Total
	Master's	Postmaster's	Doctoral	
Sex				
Men	22.3	27.2	61.9	29.2
Women	77.7	72.8	38.1	70.8
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,243)	(114)	(270)	(1,627)
Race				
White	85.3	85.1	87.4	85.6
Black	6.6	6.1	3.3	6.0
Other	1.0	1.8	0.4	1.0
No answer	7.1	7.0	8.9	7.4
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,243)	(114)	(270)	(1,627)
Age				
21–25	41.4	2.6	–	31.8
26–30	27.9	13.3	16.8	25.0
31–35	10.6	16.8	25.0	13.4
36–40	8.8	15.9	24.3	11.9
41–45	6.1	20.4	18.6	9.2
46–50	3.6	12.4	11.9	5.6
51–55	1.2	11.5	3.4	2.3
56 years or older	0.4	7.1	–	0.8
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,227)	(113)	(268)	(1,608)
Median age	27.0	40.8	37.2	29.1
Marital Status				
Married	43.1	54.0	63.8	47.2
Not married	56.9	46.0	36.2	52.8
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,192)	(113)	(246)	(1,551)

TABLE 3—(CONTINUED)

Characteristic	Students Master's	Postmaster's	Doctoral	Total
Preprogram Employment				
In school or not working	17.3	10.4	2.6	14.3
Library positions	34.2	67.9	76.2	43.8
Other positions	48.5	21.7	21.2	41.9
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,077)	(106)	(240)	(1,423)
Previous Graduate Degrees				
None	87.5	7.9	3.3	68.0
M.A.	11.3	81.6	70.0	26.0
More than one M.A.	0.2	10.5	25.9	5.2
M.A. and library certificate	–	–	0.4	0.1
Other advanced degrees	1.0	–	0.4	0.7
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,242)	(114)	(270)	(1,626)
Undergraduate Major				
Library science	3.0	11.6	1.6	3.3
Humanities	45.8	38.4	46.7	45.4
Social science	31.5	30.3	32.9	31.7
Natural science	2.2	–	2.9	2.1
Education	10.1	15.2	7.8	10.1
Business	0.3	–	0.7	0.4
Other	7.1	4.5	7.4	7.0
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,238)	(112)	(270)	(1,620)
Undergraduate Average				
A or A+	17.7	6.9	9.8	15.9
A–	21.6	15.8	22.4	21.3
B+	24.8	22.8	31.7	25.8
B	25.8	33.7	20.5	25.4
B– or C	10.1	20.8	15.6	11.6
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1,132)	(101)	(224)	(1,457)

about 3.0 percent of the doctoral group.[2]

Finally, our data on the undergraduate grade-point averages of students supported by the Title II-B program indicated that the quality of students now being recruited into library programs had somewhat improved due to the Title II-B program. Almost two-thirds of the master's students, for instance, reported averages of B+ or better. A similar proportion of the doctoral students reported averages of B+ or better, although only about half of the older postmaster's students could boast such averages.

STUDY COMPLETION

Our findings indicate that a very large proportion of the students in both the master's and postmaster's programs had successfully completed their studies by the time of the survey (see Table 4).[3] Notably, very few fellows—between 2.0 and 4.0 percent—had withdrawn from the program either for academic or other reasons. This is perhaps indicative of the strong vocational interests characteristic of students in LIS programs.

In most cases, the master's students

who had already graduated (82.4 percent) had been able to attain their degrees within a year; for example, only 7.5 percent of those who graduated received their degrees more than a year after entering the program. Presumably, even more of the master's students might be expected to graduate since many of those who have completed the program without yet graduating are likely to have completed the coursework requirements of their programs and may now be engaged in writing their master's papers on a part-time basis.

Judgments on study completion for the 270 doctoral students who received Title II-B fellowships cannot be as precise, since the minimum time necessary to complete a doctoral program is subject to variation according to institutional requirements, previous graduate work of the students, and other factors. Three-quarters of the Title II-B doctoral

students, for example, are still in school, although it can be noted that among those receiving fellowships in academic year 1966–67 (three years before the survey), 19.2 percent had already completed their work and received the doctoral degree.[4]

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Preprogram employment. Before accepting the Title II-B grant, the great majority of students in each program had been working: 83 percent of the students in the master's program, 90 percent of the students in the postmaster's program, and 98 percent of the students in the doctoral program. However, the extent of preprogram experience in library work varies. Approximately 40 percent of the students in the master's program had reported working as librarians prior to the receipt of

TABLE 4

PRESENT ACADEMIC STATUS OF TITLE II-B FELLOWS IN MASTER'S, POSTMASTER'S
AND DOCTORAL PROGRAMS BY YEAR OF AWARD
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Academic Status	Students			
	1966	1967	1968	Total
Master's Program				
In school	3.2	0.6	9.2	5.6
Completed award tenure	1.7	9.5	8.0	8.1
Graduated	91.9	87.1	78.1	82.3
Withdrew from the program	3.2	2.8	4.7	4.0
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(62)	(317)	(488)	(867)
Postmaster's Program				
In school	–	2.2	3.3	2.2
Completed program	[13][a]	95.6	93.5	95.6
Withdrew from the program	–	2.2	3.2	2.2
Total %	–	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(13)	(46)	(31)	(90)
Doctoral Program				
In school	21.2	72.1	85.5	73.0
Completed award tenure	51.9	12.7	11.6	16.7
Graduated	19.2	7.6	–	5.9
Withdrew from the program	7.7	7.6	2.9	4.4
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(52)	(79)	(69)	(200)

[a] Too few cases to compute percentages.

the fellowship, whereas over three-fourths of both postmaster's and doctoral students had worked in libraries before (see Table 5). Of the students who had worked in libraries before, over half had been employed in university libraries and approximately one-fifth had worked in public libraries.

About a quarter of the master's students had been in academic employment, primarily teaching in high school, and just over 30 percent had worked in other fields, mostly in industry. About a tenth of the postmaster's students had been teaching, mostly at the college level, while another 10.0 percent held other types of positions, primarily in government or industry. Most of the students in the doctoral program who were not involved in library work had held academic positions in colleges or universities; very few had positions which were not academic- or library-related work.

Postprogram employment. At the time of the study, nearly half of all Title II-B fellows were still in school and thus had not yet returned to the labor market. Examining only the data on those who had returned to work after their studies, considerable change can be seen between preprogram and postprogram employment statistics (see Table 6). Most notably, the proportion of persons in library employment has jumped, rising to 86.6 percent of those now working.

The greatest change has occurred with the master's students, among whom the proportion in library work has more than doubled. Library work now accounts for almost all of their employment. Accompanying this shift were major declines in the proportions employed in industry or in high school teaching.

Among the postmaster's students, about the same proportion of students had gone into library work as before, although there was some overall shift in the types of libraries involved; i.e., fewer persons were working in high school or public libraries, and more persons were employed in university libraries. Also, more of the postmaster's students were employed by colleges or

TABLE 5

PREPROGRAM EMPLOYMENT OF TITLE II-B FELLOWS BY TYPE OF AWARD[a]
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Type of Employment	Students							
	Master's		Postmaster's		Doctoral		Total	
Academic Positions								
(Teaching or Administrative)	27.1		12.6		16.2		23.8	
Universities		5.0		9.5		14.5		7.2
High schools		22.0		3.1		1.7		16.6
Librarian Positions	41.3		75.8		78.2		51.1	
University libraries		20.5		36.9		50.9		27.6
High school libraries		7.9		20.0		8.1		8.9
Public libraries		10.5		12.6		14.5		11.5
Other libraries		2.4		6.3		4.7		3.1
Other Positions	31.6		11.6		5.6		25.1	
Universities		7.1		2.1		1.3		5.6
Government		6.5		3.2		1.3		5.2
Industry		14.8		5.3		1.3		11.5
Miscellaneous		3.2		1.0		1.7		2.8
Total %	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	
(N)	(891)		(95)		(234)		(1,220)	

[a] Excludes persons in school or not working.

universities after the program than before the program.

The doctoral students who had returned to work also reflected an employment change, mainly from library positions to academic positions with colleges or universities.

Table 7 presents the data on employment changes in a more detailed manner, organized so that turnover patterns, rather than simply the aggregate results of those changes, can be seen.

Employment changes for master's students. The data on individual employment shifts reinforce our earlier comments on the extensive changes made by students in the master's program. As many as 334 master's students without previous library experience entered library work after completing their studies. Most of these new librarians had been in "other" fields before, primarily in industry or government; a good number had been teaching, mainly in high schools; while the rest had not worked before or had been in school. Table 8

shows the type of library chosen by these "new" librarians.[5] Almost half of those for whom we have this information chose university libraries, while about a third took positions with public libraries. In contrast, there was only a slight degree of attrition among those who had been in library positions before their graduate studies. Almost all for whom we have data on postprogram employment were again working in libraries; the only exceptions were 2.0 percent who took academic positions instead, and 5.1 percent who took jobs in other fields (see Table 7).

Of the master's students formerly in library work who stayed in that field, just over half also returned to the same type of library as their previous employment (see Table 8). Stability of employment occurred most often among those with experience in university libraries or public libraries; a bit less often among those in high school or other libraries. Of those who did change to a different type of library, just over a third

TABLE 6

POSTPROGRAM EMPLOYMENT OF TITLE II-B FELLOWS BY TYPE OF AWARD[a]
(IN PERCENTAGES)

	Students							
Type of Employment	Master's		Postmaster's		Doctoral		Total	
Academic Positions								
(Teaching or								
Administrative)	2.7		23.9		49.0		7.9	
Universities		1.6		23.9		49.0		7.0
High schools		1.1		—		—		0.9
Librarian Positions	91.7		70.5		47.0		86.6	
University libraries		41.2		45.1		35.2		41.2
High school libraries		17.0		11.3		7.8		15.8
Public libraries		25.7		11.3		2.0		22.7
Other libraries		7.8		2.8		2.0		6.9
Other Positions	5.6		5.6		4.0		5.5	
Universities		1.4		4.2		2.0		1.7
Government		1.8		1.4		—		1.6
Industry		1.9		—		2.0		1.7
Miscellaneous		0.5		—		—		0.5
Total %	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	
(N)	(626)		(71)		(51)		(748)	

[a] Excludes persons in school or not working.

TABLE 7

PRE- TO POSTPROGRAM EMPLOYMENT CHANGES AMONG TITLE II-B
FELLOWS, GROUPED ACCORDING TO FORMER POSITIONS[a]

| Type of Position | Students | | | | | | Total | |
| | Master's | | Postmaster's | | Doctoral | | | |
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Those formerly in library positions are now in:								
Library positions	184	92.9	36	70.6	23	59.0	243	84.4
Academic positions	4	2.0	13	25.5	14	35.9	31	10.8
Other positions	10	5.1	2	3.9	2	5.1	14	4.8
Total	198	100.0	51	100.0	39	100.0	288	100.0
Those formerly in academic positions are now in:								
Library positions	108	86.4	5	—°	—	—°	113	79.0
Academic positions	9	7.2	2	—	11	—	22	15.4
Other positions	8	6.4	—	—	—	—	8	5.6
Total	125	100.0	7	—	11	—	143	100.0
Those formerly in other positions are now in:								
Library positions	131	92.3	4	—°	—	—	135	91.2
Academic positions	2	1.4	2	—	—	—	4	2.7
Other positions	9	6.3	—	—	—	—	9	6.1
Total	142	100.0	6	—	0	—	148	100.0
Those formerly in school or not working are now in:								
Library positions	95	94.1	2	—°	—	—	97	93.3
Academic positions	1	1.0	—	—	—	—	1	1.0
Other positions	5	4.9	1	—	—	—	6	5.7
Total	101	100.0	3	—	0	—	104	100.0

[a] Excludes those still in school or not yet working after the program.
° Too few cases to compute percentages.

found their new positions in university libraries, and just under a third went into public libraries. High school or other libraries were sources of new employment less often than university and public libraries.

Overall, university libraries appear to be a popular choice among these graduates of Title II-B master's programs. Among those with prior library experience, for instance, stability was greatest for university libraries and the most frequent type of change was into university libraries. A college or university employer was also the most frequent choice of the new librarians for whom we have such detailed information. Using these same criteria, it seems that public libraries rank second in popular-ity as an employer, while students chose to take positions with high school or other libraries much less often.

From the point of view of later employers (Table 8), positions in university libraries were held mainly by people with previous university library experience (29.7 percent) and next by former high school teachers (19.3 percent). The record for public libraries is quite similar, since a quarter of new employees had worked in public libraries before, and 17.5 percent had previously been in high school teaching. Among those master's students now working in high school libraries, only 21.8 percent had worked there before; the large majority of the recruits were people with previous experience in high school teaching,

TABLE 8

TYPE OF POSTPROGRAM EMPLOYER OF TITLE II-B MASTER'S STUDENTS, BY TYPE OF PREPROGRAM EMPLOYER[a]

Type of Former Employer	Total N	Postprogram Employment in Libraries								Other Postprogram Employment					
		University Libraries		High School Libraries		Public Libraries		Other Libraries		Universities		High Schools		Miscellaneous	
		(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Formerly with libraries															
University libraries	95	57	29.7	6	7.7	18	15.0	5	22.7	4	17.5	2	—°	3	14.3
High school libraries	39	12	6.3	17	21.7	3	2.5	2	9.2	2	8.7	2	—	1	4.8
Public libraries	55	14	7.3	7	9.0	30	25.0	2	9.2	1	4.3	—	—	1	4.8
Other libraries	5	1	0.5	—	—	2	1.7	1	4.5	1	4.3	—	—	—	—
Formerly in nonlibrary employment															
Universities	58	26	13.5	2	2.6	17	14.2	1	4.5	9	39.1	—	—	3	14.3
High schools	107	37	19.3	36	46.2	21	17.5	3	13.6	2	8.7	5	—	3	14.3
Industry	71	28	14.6	9	11.5	20	16.6	5	22.7	2	8.7	1	—	6	28.6
Other	36	17	8.8	1	1.3	9	7.5	3	13.7	2	8.7	—	—	4	18.9
Total	466	192	100.0	78	100.0	120	100.0	22	100.0	23	100.0	10	—	21	100.0

[a] Refers only to those who had postprogram employment and for whom details on employer were given.
° Too few cases to compute percentages.

who already had acquired some experience with people of that age group in a learning context.

Noteworthy too, is a certain amount of interchange within universities between library positions and other positions, either in administration or teaching. About half of the master's-level students with previous university employment outside of libraries are now working in university libraries. At the same time, 17.4 percent of the master's-level students entering general university employment after completing their studies had been in university libraries previously.

Employment changes among postmaster's and doctoral students. The employment record for postmaster's and doctoral students also shows a great deal of stability, both in terms of type of position and place of employment (see Table 7). Most of the postmaster's students who were librarians before the program were again in library work (70.6 percent). Although based on small numbers, the results further indicate that the majority of the former librarians had returned not only to the same type of position, but also to the same type of library. However, a quarter of the former librarians in the postmaster's program did take academic positions after completing their studies.

Stability of position is also common among the small number of doctoral students who had returned to work by the time of the study. All of those previously in academic positions returned to such positions and most of those who had been in library work before were again working as librarians (see Table 7). More than a third of former librarians did take academic positions, although these positions were probably related to their library experience. Some evidence of the professional commitment of doctoral students previously in library work is found in the fact that almost all of those presently in library work were

employed in the same type of library as they had been prior to the program.

CONCLUSION

The results of the present study would strongly suggest that the Title II-B program is successful in its objective of training individuals in the principles and practices of library and information sciences. This conclusion is based on both an objective evaluation of the program in terms of degree completion rates and postprogram employment of Title II-B fellows and on a subjective evaluation of the program by the fifty-five deans of participating LIS institutions.

A majority of Title II-B fellows successfully completed their programs and were immediately employed either as LIS faculty in colleges or universities or in positions with libraries and information centers. The greatest beneficiaries of the new and better-trained cohorts of librarians were the universities. Public and high school libraries benefitted too, but to a more modest extent.

All three programs (master's, postmaster's, and doctoral) contributed equally well to the fulfillment of the objectives of the program, although there was evidence to suggest that while postmaster's and doctoral programs helped advance the training of personnel already in LIS fields, it was the master's program through which new personnel were recruited, particularly into positions of library work in areas outside the university.

In addition to the training of well-qualified librarians or LIS faculty, one other point emerged from the study. A great many of the deans participating in the study strongly felt that the Title II-B institutional support had strengthened their programs of instruction and had definitely improved the quality of library education. There can be little doubt that the programs served the universities and the profession extremely well. As aptly expressed by one dean:

The existence of these fine fellowships, finer in some respects than those existing in almost every other field, has given library schools visibility on their own campuses which they had not enjoyed previously, and has given the students holding these fellowships a new status among other graduate students. The fact that library education was given this kind of recognition by the Congress in the Higher Education Act has done more for librarianship in the eyes of nonlibrarians than nearly any other event in recent library history.[6]

REFERENCES

1. This study was conducted for the U.S. Office of Education and is based on the final report submitted under Contract OEC-3-9-180268-0047(095). The study director was Laure M. Sharp. The authors wish to thank Mrs. Sharp and Russell E. Bidlack, dean of the School of Library Science at the University of Michigan, for their critical reading of the manuscript.
2. See Wasserman (Paul Wasserman, "Elements in a Manpower Blueprint—Library Personnel for the 1970s," *ALA Bulletin* 63:581–602 (May 1969).) for a discussion of the need of achieving a balance in the backgrounds of those who function as librarians.
3. Because less than a year elapsed by the time of the study for those enrolled in the 1969–70 academic year, these students are not included in the discussions here.
4. One measure of the academic achievement of doctoral students supported by Title II-B award would be a record of their progress in completing each of the specific requirements for the doctoral degree. These data are available for the doctoral students who were still in school at the time of the survey. From an overall perspective, it seems that this cohort of doctoral students has made substantial progress in their studies. With respect to general qualifying exams, for instance, fully two-thirds of fel-

lows in their third and fourth year of study and half of those in their second year of study have passed this important milestone in doctoral work. In addition, over 80 percent of those in their third and fourth year of study and over two-thirds of those in their second year of study have already completed all language requirements. All of the eight doctoral candidates from the first year of the program, and 40 percent of those from the second year of the program (in their fourth and third year of study, respectively) had their dissertation topics approved. Even among the fellows who were only in their second year of study, one-fifth had their dissertation topics approved. It would appear that the completion rates of these fellows are quite comparable (if not quicker) to the completion rates of other

fellowship recipients whose progress has been followed in other studies. See, for example, Laure M. Sharp, Barton Sensenig, III, and Lenore Reid, *Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program—Phase I* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science 1968) p.23ff; and Engin I. Holmstrom and Laure M. Sharp, *Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program—Phase II* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1970), p.38, 63.

5. Such data were given for 235 of the 334 master's students entering library work for the first time. Data obtained did not yield sufficient cases for similar analysis for post-master's and doctoral students.

6. Written communication, Russell E. Bidlack, dean, School of Library Science, University of Michigan.