

READ THIS FIRST

What this file is. A sample synopsis for the IGNOU MLIS project course MLIP-002, written by ignouproject.com as study reference. It shows how the contents that IGNOU asks for can be laid out for one fresh topic. It is not a synopsis you can submit, and it is not approved by IGNOU.

What it is built on. The synopsis contents named in the MLIP-002 Project/Dissertation Work Handbook (Faculty of Library and Information Science, SOSS, 2007-08, sections 3.1 and 3.3): background, rationale, objectives, methodology, sampling, instruments, expected outcome, limitations, future directions and, where a population is studied, the size of that population. The proposal is typed on A4 paper in double space. The report structure at the end follows the 13-part order in Annexure III of the MLIS Programme Guide (July 2022).

The [brackets]. Every place, number, college name, date and finding is left in [brackets]. Those are your own facts. They can only come from your own topic, your own field work and your own guide.

Academic integrity. IGNOU expects your own original work and a Certificate of Originality signed by you and your guide. Copying this sample, in full or in part, and sending it as your synopsis is not acceptable. Use it to understand the shape of a synopsis, then write yours.

What travels with a real synopsis. The Handbook asks for the Proforma for Approval of Project Proposal (Appendix II), one copy of the synopsis, the bio-data of the supervisor signed by the supervisor and showing the present pay-scale, and the Consent Letter of the supervisor (Appendix III). The July 2022 Programme Guide sends the synopsis to the Programme Coordinator, MLIS, Faculty of Library and Information Science, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU, Maidan Garhi, New Delhi 110068, or as a soft copy to the e-mail address it prints. Send one route only. Confirm current instructions with the Programme Coordinator.

Prepared on 4 October 2026 by ignouproject.com, an independent service that is not affiliated with or endorsed by IGNOU.

ignouproject.com

SYNOPSIS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT / DISSERTATION

MLIP-002: Project Work/Dissertation

Weeding and Stock Verification Practices in Government-Aided College Libraries of [District], [State]: An Inter-institutional Study

Submitted for approval in partial fulfilment of the Master of Library and Information Science
(MLIS) programme, Indira Gandhi National Open University

Item	Your details
Name of the learner	[Your name]
Enrolment number	[As on your IGNOU ID card]
Regional Centre and Study Centre	[RC name and code] / [Study Centre name and code]
Name of the supervisor	[Name, designation, institution]
Programme and course	MLIS / MLIP-002
Month and year	[Month Year]

ignouproject.com

1. Background of the Study

College libraries keep growing in volume while shelf space, staff time and budgets stay limited. Weeding, the planned withdrawal of material that is out of date, damaged, duplicated or no longer used, keeps a collection relevant to the courses a college teaches. Stock verification, the periodic physical check of holdings against the accession register, tells the library what it actually has and what is missing. The two activities depend on each other: a library cannot weed sensibly without knowing its stock, and it cannot verify stock efficiently while carrying large quantities of unused material.

In [State], stock verification and the write-off of library material in government-aided colleges may be governed by rules framed by [name the authority, for example the State Higher Education Department or the affiliating university, as stated in a document you have read]. How such rules are applied in college libraries of [District] has not been documented. The MLIS course MLIE-103 Academic Library System treats collection development policy and weeding out policy in Block 2, Unit 6, and MLI-102 Management of Library and Information Centres covers work flow and performance measurement in Block 2. The proposed study applies those two areas to a defined group of libraries.

ignouproject.com

2. Statement of the Problem

The study seeks to describe how government-aided college libraries in [District] plan and carry out weeding and stock verification, whether they hold written policies for either activity, and what conditions the librarians report as affecting these practices. The problem is stated as: *"Weeding and stock verification practices in government-aided college libraries of [District], [State]: an inter-institutional study."*

ignouproject.com

3. Rationale and Need for the Study

Published studies from university and college libraries in other countries report that weeding is done irregularly and that the absence of a written weeding policy is a common reason

(Nawarathne and Rathnayake, 2009; Marandu, 2012). A comparable picture for government-aided college libraries in [District] is not available in the literature located so far [state the databases or sources you searched, for example Shodhganga, INFLIBNET and the journals you checked]. Documenting current practice across several libraries, rather than in one library alone, allows the study to compare practices between institutions of different size and age.

ignouproject.com

4. Objectives of the Study

The objectives are stated in neutral terms and do not assume any finding.

- To study whether the government-aided college libraries of [District] have written policies for weeding and for stock verification.
- To examine the frequency and methods of stock verification followed in these libraries.
- To identify the criteria the libraries use when selecting material for withdrawal.
- To find out the procedure followed for the approval and write-off of withdrawn material.
- To analyse the conditions that librarians report as affecting weeding and stock verification.
- To compare the above practices across libraries grouped by [collection size / year of establishment].

ignouproject.com

5. Scope and Delimitation

The study covers government-aided colleges in [District], [State], that maintain a library in charge of a professional librarian. It covers print books only. Periodicals, e-resources and departmental libraries are excluded. Data refer to the period [Year] to [Year].

ignouproject.com

6. Population and Sample

The population consists of [N] government-aided colleges in [District], as listed by [name the official list you used, with its date]. Because the population is small, the study proposes to include all [N] libraries (complete enumeration) instead of drawing a sample. If any library declines, the number responding will be reported as [n] out of [N].

Note for your own synopsis: the Handbook asks that the size of the population be mentioned whenever a study is conducted on a population. Give the real number and the source of the list.

ignouproject.com

7. Research Design and Methodology

The study follows a descriptive survey design and falls under the Handbook's type (ii), an inter-institutional study comparing practices across institutions. Data will be collected from the librarian of each college and from the library's own records.

ignouproject.com

8. Tools for Data Collection

- **Structured questionnaire for librarians**, with sections on policy documents, stock verification frequency and method, weeding criteria, approval and write-off procedure, and reported constraints. The questionnaire will be pre-tested in [number] libraries outside the study area.
- **Document checklist** to record whether a written weeding policy, a stock verification order, a write-off register and a withdrawn-books register exist, and the date of each.
- **Observation schedule** for the stack area and accession register, completed during the visit with the librarian's permission.

ignouproject.com

9. Procedure of Data Collection

Permission will be sought from the Principal of each college through a letter signed by the learner and the supervisor. Questionnaires will be administered in person during visits between [Month Year] and [Month Year]. Document checks and observation will take place

on the same visit. No personal data of library users will be collected.

ignouproject.com

10. Data Analysis

Responses will be coded and entered in [a spreadsheet or statistical package you know how to use]. Frequencies and percentages will describe each practice. Cross-tabulations will compare practices between groups of libraries formed by [collection size / year of establishment]. Each table will be linked to the objective it answers. Findings will be reported only from the data collected.

ignouproject.com

11. Expected Outcome

The study is expected to produce a documented account of how weeding and stock verification are organised in the government-aided college libraries of [District], a comparison of practices between groups of libraries, and a set of points for the libraries' consideration that follow from the findings. The outcome is described here in general terms; no result is assumed in advance.

ignouproject.com

12. Limitations

The study depends on information given by librarians and on records made available to the investigator. It is limited to one district and to print books, so its findings may not apply to other types of colleges or collections. Practices may change after the period covered.

ignouproject.com

13. Directions for Further Research

Later studies could cover e-resources and periodicals, include unaided and university libraries, or measure the effect of weeding on circulation using the library's own issue records.

ignouproject.com

14. Tentative Chapter Plan of the Report

The report will follow the order printed in Annexure III of the MLIS Programme Guide (July 2022): Certificate; Acknowledgements; Table of Contents; Preface; Introduction; Review of Literature; Objectives; Methodology; Findings; Conclusion; Bibliography; Index; Appendices (questionnaire, checklist, observation schedule, permission letter).

ignouproject.com

15. Bibliography

Listed alphabetically, in the style shown in section 4.1.1 of the MLIP-002 Handbook. Every item below is a real publication; add only sources you have actually read.

Broadbent, D., Goates, M. C., Frost, M., Nelson, G. M. and Pixton, D. S. (2022). In their own words: perspectives on collection weeding from library employees and teaching faculty.

Journal of Academic Librarianship, 48. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102563

Engelson, L. A. (2018). Managing a large-scale weeding project: when we all pull together.

In: *Atla 2018 Proceedings*, p. 276 onwards. Chicago: Atla.

Handis, M. W. (2007). Practical advice for weeding in small academic libraries. *Collection Building*, 26(3), 84-87.

Indira Gandhi National Open University. MLIE-103 Academic Library System, Block 2 Collection Development, Unit 6: Collection Development Policy/Weeding out Policy. New Delhi: IGNOU. [Add the year printed on your copy.]

Marandu, A. A. (2012). *Weeding practice: a case of Moshi University College of Co-operative and Business Studies (MUCCoBs) library*. Master's dissertation. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.

Nawarathne, I. M. and Rathnayake, A. R. M. M. (2009). Weeding practices existing in Sri Lankan university libraries: an analysis of the current situation. *Journal of the University Librarians Association of Sri Lanka*, 13(1), 13-25.

Ranganathan, S. R. (1931). *The five laws of library science*. Madras: Madras Library Association.

ignouproject.com

Declaration space (for your own synopsis)

Signature of the learner: [] Date: []

Signature of the supervisor: [] Date: []

Your synopsis is sent with the Proforma for Approval (Appendix II), the supervisor's signed bio-data showing present pay-scale and the Consent Letter (Appendix III), as listed in the MLIP-002 Handbook.

ignouproject.com