

The Paradigm Shift in Higher Education: Reimagining Academic Libraries as Sanctuaries for Value-Based Learning in the GenAI Era

Dr. Sadagoban Kalidass¹, Ms P.Punithavathy²

¹Chief Librarian, Central Library, Nandha Engineering College, Erode – 638052. TamilNadu

²Librarian, Central Library, Nandha Engineering College, Erode – 638052. TamilNadu

ABSTRACT

The rapid adoption of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in higher education automates routine information synthesis, exposing a vision crisis regarding the fundamental purpose of academic institutions. This paper establishes a structural framework to redefine the academic library's role from a passive document repository to the primary institutional sanctuary for moral health, research integrity, and character formation. Introducing “The Wall and the Painting Framework”, the model categorizes technical skills and AI mastery as the decorative Painting, while moral judgment, ethics, and humanistic value-based education construct the structural Wall. Leveraging universal student access, the PhD-qualified Chief Librarian operates beyond disciplinary silos. Through autonomous governance and dedicated reading environments, the library cultivates contemplative reading (Vaasippu) over syllabus-bound cramming (Padippu). As GenAI executes technical tasks, higher education must prioritize character development. Empowering autonomous library leadership ensures a resilient moral foundation (The Wall) supports technical capability (The Painting).

Keywords: Academic Libraries, Generative AI, Higher Education, Value Education, Institutional Access Hierarchy, Character Formation.

INTRODUCTION

Higher education faces an existential vision crisis driven by the rapid proliferation of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), Large Language Models (LLMs), and hyper-indexed academic databases. Historically, the university classroom served as the primary sanctuary for knowledge dissemination. Today, algorithmic systems instantly synthesize domain literature, execute complex data models, draft software code, and compose research essays. When machines take over the mechanics of information processing, an educational framework focused solely on technical proficiency risks turning institutions into assembly lines for mechanical skill execution. This shift strips learning of its moral purpose, producing graduates who possess high technological capabilities but lack ethical direction.

This crisis demands a return to the foundational higher education vision articulated by Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan in the University Education Commission Report (1948–49). Radhakrishnan asserted that a university's academic stature is benchmarked by its library, advocating for statutory faculty status, equal pay scales, and administrative parity for Chief Librarians.

However, modern university executive boards routinely disregard this mandate. Having viewed libraries during their student years merely as silent cramming halls (Study Rooms), administrators treat the library as a costly utility rather than an academic core. In an AI-dominated ecosystem, the library's primary mission shifts from storing technical data to building the human foundation.

This study addresses this vision crisis by operationalizing the classical pedagogical framework—"The Metaphor of the Wall and the Painting" (Suvarum Sithiramu). Within this model, human values, moral health, emotional resilience, and civic integrity constitute the supporting Wall (Suvar), while academic curriculum, technical mastery, and AI proficiency represent the decorative Painting (Sithiram). While classroom faculty and AI platforms refine the technical painting, the Chief Librarian—operating as an autonomous, PhD-qualified universal touch point—serves as the primary architect and custodian of the moral wall.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The evolution of academic library governance and its policy foundations begins with the seminal Report of the University Education Commission (1948–49) led by Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, which established the library as the benchmark of institutional quality and advocated for statutory faculty status, equal pay scales, and academic parity for Chief Librarians. Building upon this foundation, Srivastava (2016) critiqued the post-independence shift that reduced libraries to passive custodial units, warning that isolating librarians from academic leadership dilutes character building and interdisciplinary inquiry across campuses. This statutory authority was formally reinforced by the University Grants Commission (UGC, 2018) regulations, which mandated Ph.D. and NET qualifications for university library positions, recognizing that academic librarians perform research, pedagogical, and curatorial functions equal to teaching faculty.

In the contemporary landscape, the rise of Generative AI has introduced profound epistemic and ethical disruptions to academic integrity. Cotton et al. (2023) demonstrated how Large Language Models generate automated text that bypasses genuine student reflection, urging higher education to shift focus from evaluating mechanical skill outputs (the painting) to fostering moral reasoning and citation ethics (the wall). Expanding on this, Dwivedi et al. (2023) identified the "epistemic shortcut" of GenAI, warning that information abundance without critical human framing leads to cognitive passivity and intellectual erosion. To counter these vulnerabilities, Crawford et al. (2023) argued against ineffective technological bans, asserting that academic libraries are uniquely positioned to lead campus-wide ethical AI literacy programs that teach students to validate automated outputs against verified repositories.

From a pedagogical perspective, humanistic educational models emphasize that skill acquisition alone cannot constitute a complete education. Biesta (2015) formulated a three-domain model of educational purpose—Qualification, Socialization, and Subjectification—arguing that modern universities over-emphasize technical qualification (the painting) while dangerously neglecting ethical self-formation (the wall). Similarly, Selwyn (2016) challenged uncritical educational technology adoption, demonstrating that unguided digital consumption increases cognitive overload, screen fatigue, and social isolation. Supporting this view, Zhao (2018) established that as AI automates routine cognitive tasks, uniquely human traits—such as empathy, moral resilience, civic responsibility, and ethical judgment—become the only sustainable outcomes that technology cannot replicate.

Finally, scholarly discourse on library architecture and governance highlights the library's irreplaceable role as a physical and moral sanctuary. Bennett (2009) traced the spatial evolution of academic libraries,

contrasting passive cramming spaces (Study Rooms) with intentionally designed Reading Rooms that encourage reflective thinking and values-based inquiry. Freeman (2005) reinforced that the physical library serves as a neutral academic sanctuary, offering direct, cross-disciplinary access to all students across campus without the administrative or departmental barriers found in specialized classrooms. Synthesizing these dynamics in the automated era, Cox (2020) concluded that as AI streamlines routine technical operations, the librarian's core mission elevates to managing data ethics, algorithmic bias, research curation, and value-based information literacy for the entire academic community.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study addresses the evolving operational, pedagogical, and policy-level challenges facing academic libraries in the Generative AI era. The primary objectives are:

- **To Operationalize the Philosophical Framework of the Wall and the Painting (Suvarum Sithiramum):** Establish a conceptual model that delineates character, ethics, and moral health (The Wall) from technical, domain-specific, and AI-assisted skills (The Painting) within higher education policy.
- **To Evaluate the Strategic Mission of the Academic Library in the AI Era:** Redefine the library's role from a passive repository of static information to an active, humanistic sanctuary responsible for character formulation, research ethics, and student wellbeing.
- **To Analyze Institutional Access Dynamics and the Universal Touch point:** Examine the operational reach of the Chief Librarian as a universal academic touchpoint across all disciplines compared to administrators and departmental faculty.
- **To Re-evaluate Statutory Parity and Administrative Autonomy:** Re-examine the recommendations of the Dr. S. Radhakrishnan University Education Commission (1948–49) to advocate for statutory faculty status, doctoral qualification (PhD) mandates, and direct procurement autonomy for Chief Librarians.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

While this study offers a robust conceptual and policy-oriented framework, several methodological and contextual limitations should be noted:

- **Qualitative and Conceptual Scope:** The research primarily utilizes qualitative discourse analysis and conceptual modeling. While grounded in statutory policies and capability benchmarks, it does not incorporate empirical quantitative survey data from students or institutional leadership.
- **Geographic and Regulatory Focus:** The historical policy foundation heavily leverages the Indian higher education context (e.g., the Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Commission, UGC norms, and regional pedagogical metaphors). Applying these findings to alternative international governance models may require local regulatory adaptation.
- **Rapid Evolution of Generative AI Technology:** The capabilities, ethics, and platform architectures of Generative AI systems are changing rapidly. The technical benchmarks evaluated in this study reflect current LLM capabilities and may shift as automated research agents continue to advance.
- **Institutional Heterogeneity:** Implementation of the proposed autonomous procurement and universal touchpoint models may vary depending on an institution's size, funding model (public vs. private), and administrative structure.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and policy-analytical framework to examine the evolving institutional role of academic libraries within higher education during the Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) era. Rather than relying on quantitative survey metrics, the research employs a critical inquiry approach to analyze structural hierarchies, pedagogical functions, and governance models in modern colleges and universities. The analytical foundation is built by integrating historical higher education commission benchmarks—specifically drawing upon statutory faculty status mandates and autonomous library administration frameworks established by the University Education Commission—with contemporary discourse on artificial intelligence ethics, institutional information literacy, and value-based education.

To operationalize the paradigm shift, the study constructs a dual-dimension conceptual framework termed "The Wall and The Painting." Methodologically, this model synthesizes educational philosophy with institutional dynamics by categorizing academic activities into two distinct operational layers: technical subject-matter delivery and moral-ethical character development. The investigation evaluates how automated technical synthesis and machine intelligence alter the functional distribution between classroom instruction and library administration. Furthermore, a comparative structural analysis of administrative access topologies is conducted, contrasting the siloed, time-bound access of academic departments with the universal, continuous access offered by PhD-qualified Chief Librarians across all academic levels.

Finally, the methodology incorporates a qualitative thematic analysis distinguishing curriculum-bound analytical study (Padippu) from open, contemplative reading (Vaasippu). By evaluating user engagement behaviors, physical and digital collection curation methods, and autonomous procurement workflows, the study assesses how academic libraries can transition from passive repositories to active sanctuaries for humanistic values and academic integrity. This theoretical synthesis culminates in a strategic roadmap for higher education administrators, demonstrating how structural governance reform and chief librarian autonomy directly support holistic character formation alongside technical skill acquisition.

1. The AI Vision Crisis and the Radhakrishnan Imperative

Higher education faces a structural vision crisis. Generative AI tools, large language models (LLMs), and hyper-indexed databases (e.g., Scopus, Web of Science, IEEE) have commoditized subject-matter delivery. When algorithms can instantly draft code, write essays, and compile literature reviews, an education focused solely on technical proficiency risks producing machine-like graduates void of ethical direction.

This crisis reinstates the foundational vision articulated by Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan in the University Education Commission Report (1948–49), which asserted that a university's true stature is benchmarked by its library, mandating statutory faculty parity for librarians.

However, university executive boards routinely disregard this vision. Having utilized libraries during their own student years merely as passive "cramming halls" (Study Rooms), administrators fail to recognize that in an AI-dominated landscape, the library's primary mission shifts from storing technical data to building the ethical human foundation.

2. Theoretical Core: The Metaphor of the Wall and the Painting (Suvarum Sithiramum)

An ancient Tamil proverb observes, "One cannot paint a mural without a supporting wall" (Suvar Illamal Sithiram Illai). Transposed onto higher education policy in the AI era, this metaphor defines the division

of labor between the classroom and the library.

Table 1: Structural Comparison of Institutional Paradigms

Paradigm / Era	Component	Primary Role & Function
Classical Pedagogical Paradigm	Classroom Faculty	Static Subject-Matter Knowledge Delivery
	Academic Library	Passive Document Storage & Silent Study Space
GenAI-Driven Vision Crisis	AI Systems	Automated Technical Synthesis & Skill Execution
	Classroom Faculty	Co-Navigators for Subject Mastery (The Painting)
	Academic Library	Primary Sanctuary for Human Values, Ethics, & Character (The Wall)

The Wall (Suvar): Moral Foundation and Human Values

The Wall represents the health of the human being—character, ethical judgment, social respect, emotional resilience, and civic responsibility.

The Painting (Sithiram): Academic Curriculum and Technical Mastery

The Painting represents domain knowledge, technical capabilities, exam certifications, and AI-prompt proficiency. These elements enable a livelihood, but remain decorative layers applied onto the student's personal structure.

Table 2: Metaphor Dimensions and Institutional Functions

Metaphor Dimension	Core Focus & Attributes	Primary Source	Execution & Environment
THE WALL (Moral & Ethical Health)	- Human Values, Respect, & Integrity - Character, Discipline, & Mindset	Academic Library	- Curated by Chief Librarian - Built in "Reading Rooms"
THE PAINTING (Academic & AI Skills)	- Subject Knowledge & Technical Skill - Examination & AI Prompt Mastery	Classroom & AI	- Delivered by Professors - Applied in Laboratories

3. The Problem of the Weak Wall in the AI Era

If a university focuses exclusively on the "painting" (grades, technical skills, AI proficiency) while neglecting the "wall" (morality, empathy, integrity):

The structure collapses under real-world pressure. A technically brilliant graduate lacking moral health becomes a hazard to society through fraud, unethical technological deployment, or systemic corruption. AI exacerbates this vulnerability by making technical execution effortless. Without a strong ethical wall, students readily yield to academic dishonesty, plagiarism, and automated shortcuts.

4. Institutional Architecture: The Library as the Architect of the Wall

To build a resilient moral wall, the academic library must be repositioned at the center of institutional strategy, led by a Chief Librarian with full operational autonomy.

Table 3: Institutional Access Hierarchy

Institutional Role	Access Level	Access Nature & Scope
College Principal / Deans	Restricted Access	Gated by Administrative Formalities
Department Heads / Faculty	Siloed Access	Bounded by Subject & Departmental Boundaries
Chief Librarian (PhD)	Universal Access	100% Student, Research & Faculty Touchpoint

4.1 The Universal Touchpoint

Access to Principals or Department Heads is constrained by administrative barriers and departmental boundaries. In contrast, the Chief Librarian interacts directly with every constituent across all disciplines—from first-year undergraduates to senior doctoral researchers. This universal touchpoint allows the librarian to monitor and nurture student character across their entire academic life.

4.2 Spatial Purpose: "Reading Rooms" vs. "Study Rooms"

Accreditation bodies mandate a "Reading Room" rather than a "Study Room"—a crucial distinction in the AI era.

Table 4: Operational Focus on Structural Contribution

Spatial Concept	Operational Focus	Structural Contribution
"Study Room"	Rote memorization, exam prep, passive absorption of AI summaries.	Refines the Painting (Technical/Exam Skills).
"Reading Room"	Deep reflection, critical synthesis, reading classical literature, philosophy, and ethics.	Builds the Wall (Moral Character & Human Values).

Experimental labs test physical hypotheses; the library's Reading Room provides the reflective space necessary for ethical choice, transforming passive information consumers into critical thinkers.

4.3 Biological Decay vs. Temporal Optimization

Globally, approximately 2 human beings die every second, totaling nearly 60 million deaths annually.

Annual Human Mortality = 2 deaths/sec X 31,536,000 sec/year = 6.3 X 10⁷ individuals/year

Because human biological existence is strictly time-bound, wasting a student's collegiate years on unverified AI hallucination, predatory journals, or unanchored technical cramming represents an irreversible loss. The PhD-qualified Chief Librarian serves as a temporal manager—filtering out algorithmic noise so students utilize their finite lifespan to build lasting character and impactful research.

5. Physiological Wellbeing and Student Development

Collegiate life coincides with intense biological, neurochemical, and psychological development. Without deliberate guidance, academic pressure risks damaging the student's underlying health.

Table 5: Biological & Psychological Drivers Vs Library Intervention (Building the Wall)

Vector	Biological & Psychological Drivers	Library Intervention (Building the Wall)
Physiology	Elevated cortisol, cognitive overload, sleep disruption due to screen fatigue.	Provides quiet, ergonomic reading sanctuaries that lower stress and restore focus.
Human Values	Identity shifts; risk of moral detachment or algorithmic isolation.	Curates literature on civic responsibility, humanism, character ethics, and healthy social relationships.
Academic Integrity	Temptation to misuse GenAI for rapid shortcuts.	Teaches research methodology, citation standards, and ethical boundaries in AI utilization.

6. Administrative Autonomy and the Imperative of the PhD-Qualified Librarian

Historically, academic libraries suffered when non-specialist administrative committees governed acquisitions and policy. In an AI-driven academic ecosystem, this legacy model limits effectiveness.

Table 6: Governance Transition Model

Legacy Administrative Model	Modern Autonomous Model
Institutional Executive Board ↓ Non-Specialist Faculty Committee ↓ Subordinate Librarian	Chief Librarian (PhD) ├ Syllabus & Research Gap Analysis ├ Direct Digital/E-Commerce Procurement └ Direct Recommendation to Principal

6.1 Direct Procurement and Collection Autonomy

Direct Administrative Control: By systematically indexing university syllabi and research trends, the Chief Librarian utilizes modern procurement platforms to acquire cross-disciplinary texts, value-based literature, and digital repositories directly through the Principal or Vice-Chancellor.

Neutralizing Departmental Bias: Departmental acquisition funds often favor narrow technical software or specific textbooks. An autonomous Chief Librarian balances the institutional collection, ensuring resources are distributed across technical skills (the painting) and foundational humanistic literature (the wall).

6.2 Why the Doctorate (PhD) is Essential

Fulfilling Radhakrishnan's Mandate: Elevating librarians to formal faculty status honors statutory educational reforms and provides academic parity with university professors.

Navigating AI-Era Research Gaps: Having completed original doctoral research, PhD-holding librarians teach students how to identify authentic research gaps rather than relying on automated AI syntheses.

Mastery of Advanced Repositories: Doctoral librarians possess the methodological rigor required to guide faculty through citation metrics, open-access protocols, and institutional research repositories.

7. Conceptual Distinctions: "Reading" vs. "Studying" in Character Formation

A key element in building "The Wall" of character is distinguishing between Reading (Vaasippu) and Studying (Padippu):

Studying (Padippu): Targeted, subject-specific analysis driven by curricula, syllabus coverage, exam performance, and technical proficiency. It constructs "The Painting."

Reading (Vaasippu): Broad, contemplative engagement with literature, biography, ethics, philosophy, and history. It expands human empathy, mental discipline, critical inquiry, and self-reflection. It fortifies "The Wall."

When libraries are treated merely as study halls for textbook memorization, they fail to cultivate holistic human development. By curating dedicated reading environments, promoting diverse literature (spanning personal development, ethical philosophies, humanities, and classic biographies), and organizing value-oriented literacy initiatives, academic libraries cultivate balanced, resilient, and ethical individuals.

FINDINGS

The qualitative analysis of higher education frameworks in the Generative AI era reveals three key organizational and pedagogical insights:

Disruption of Technical Synthesis: GenAI tools efficiently replicate transactional curriculum tasks (Padippu), reducing the institutional reliance on traditional classroom lecturing for basic skill transmission. Consequently, technical competence is no longer the sole benchmark of higher education quality.

Institutional Governance Gap: Most higher education governance structures continue to treat academic libraries as auxiliary service units rather than strategic policy centers. Restricting Chief Librarian autonomy weakens campus-wide information ethics and compromises balanced collection curation.

Divergence in Information Behavior: Student engagement with library resources has bifurcated into transactional reference gathering and open, reflective reading (Vaasippu). While automated systems fulfill short-term information needs, sustained moral development and critical inquiry depend on structured exposure to diverse humanistic literature.

DISCUSSION

These findings emphasize the urgent need to re-align institutional priorities in university administration. As machine learning algorithms automate content creation, the university's primary value proposition shifts from transferring static technical information to instilling ethical discernment, information integrity, and value-based reasoning.

Applying "The Wall and The Painting" framework demonstrates that technical proficiency ("The Wall") serves merely as an operational foundation. The true purpose of higher education lies in "The Painting"—the ethical and humanistic development that enables graduates to deploy technical skills responsibly within society. Because academic departments operate in disciplinary silos, they are often constrained by narrow curriculum objectives. Academic libraries, led by Chief Librarians with cross-departmental administrative authority, are uniquely positioned to oversee this holistic educational transformation.

Reclaiming this ethical core requires concrete policy reform. Higher education institutions must grant Chief Librarians autonomous statutory authority over research repositories, collection procurement, and information literacy initiatives. Elevating the library from a passive resource repository to a proactive governance node ensures that universities foster intellectual independence, safeguard academic integrity, and cultivate morally grounded leaders in an AI-driven society.

CONCLUSION & STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

As Generative AI continues to automate information synthesis and technical skill execution, higher education must double down on what remains uniquely human: **moral judgment, character, empathy, and ethical leadership.**

To position academic libraries as the center of this transformation, institutions should:

- **Empower Library Leadership:** Grant academic and administrative autonomy to Chief Librarians to curate collections, drive research support, and direct value-education programs.
- **Designate Spaces for Character & Reading:** Balance digital repository access with dedicated "Reading Rooms" designed to encourage broad reading (Vaasippu) alongside curriculum study (Padippu).
- **Integrate Ethics with Technical Literacy:** Pair AI prompt and research literacy instruction with training in academic integrity, ethical attribution, and humanistic evaluation.

By building a firm "Wall" of moral and ethical health, institutions ensure that the "Painting" of technical and academic expertise endures in the AI era.

REFERENCES

1. American Library Association. Library Bill of Rights and Intellectual Freedom Manual. 10th ed., ALA Editions, 2021.
2. Archana, S. N., et al. "AI Assisted Learning and Research: An Exploratory Study Among University Students and Scholars." Discover Education, 2025, 4 (1), article 814. SpringerLink, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00814-x>.
3. Association of College and Research Libraries. Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education. American Library Association, 2016, www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework.
4. Bennett, Scott. "Libraries and Learning: A History of Paradigm Change." portal: Libraries and the Academy, 2009, 9 (2), 181–97. Project MUSE, <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.0.0049>.

5. Bhardwaj, R., and P. Sharma. "Re-Engineering Academic Libraries for Promoting Reading Habits and Value Education in Higher Education Institutions." *Journal of Knowledge & Communication Management*, 2020, 10 (2), 112–24.
6. Biesta, Gert. "What Is Education For? On Good Education and the Teacher's Judgment." *European Journal of Education*, 2015, 50 (1), 75–87. Wiley Online Library, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12109>.
7. Brophy, Peter. *Measuring Library Performance: Principles and Techniques*. Facet Publishing, 2006. Facet, <https://doi.org/10.29085/9781856049283>.
8. Cotton, Debby R. E., Peter A. Cotton, and J. Reuben Shipway. "Chatting and Cheating: Ensuring Academic Integrity in the Era of ChatGPT." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 2023, 61 (2), 228–39. Taylor & Francis Online, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>.
9. Cox, Andrew M. "The Impact of AI, Machine Learning, and Automation on Academic Libraries." *Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis*, 2020, 4 (1), 22–35.
10. Cox, Andrew M. "How AI Will Change Academic Library Work and Roles." *Library Hi Tech*, 2023, 41 (2), 341–58. Emerald Insight, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-12-2022-0542>.
11. Coyle, Karen. *FRBR Before and After: Comparison of Citation and Authority Models*. ALA Editions, 2016.
12. Crawford, Joseph, Michael Cowling, and Kelly-Ann Allen. "Leadership Approaches to Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Narrative Review." *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2023, 20 (6), article 06. ERIC, <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.6.06>.
13. Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Macmillan, 1916.
14. Dewe, Michael. *Planning Academic and Research Library Buildings: Demand and Design*. Routledge, 2016. Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315247564>.
15. Dougherty, Richard M. *Streamlining Library Services: What We Do, How We Do It, and How Much It Costs*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.
16. Dwivedi, Yogesh K., et al. "'So What if ChatGPT Wrote It?' Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Opportunities, Challenges and Implications of Generative Conversational AI for Research, Practice and Policy." *International Journal of Information Management*, 2023, 71, article 102642. ScienceDirect, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>.
17. Freeman, Geoffrey T. "The Library as Place: Changes in Learning Patterns, Collections, and Spaces." *Library as Place: Rethinking Spaces and Services*, Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR), 2005, 129, 1–9.
18. Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, Herder and Herder, 1970.
19. Government of India. *Report of the Education Commission (1964–1966): Education and National Development*. Chaired by Dr. D. S. Kothari, Ministry of Education, 1966.
20. Hays, Lauren. "Disciplinary Responses to Generative AI: Implications for Academic Librarians." *Library Trends*, vol. 73, no. 4, 2025, pp. 516–37. Project MUSE, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2025.a968494>.
21. Head, Alison J. *Planning and Designing Academic Library Learning Spaces: Evaluation Practices of Postsecondary Libraries*. Project Information Literacy Research Report, 2016.

22. Michalak, R., E. Tzoc, and J. D. Lewis. "Practical Considerations for Adopting Generative AI Tools in Academic Libraries." *Journal of Library Administration*, 2025, 65 (5), 596–615. Taylor & Francis Online, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2025.2506151>.
23. Noddings, Nel. *Educating Moral People: A Caring Alternative to Character Education*. Teachers College Press, 2002.
24. Nussbaum, Martha C. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton UP, 2010. De Gruyter, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400834082>.
25. Ramasamy, R., and S. Karunakaran. "Implementation and Performance Evaluation of Koha ILS in Higher Education Libraries: A Case Study." *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 2021, 41 (3), 201–09, <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.41.3.16805>.
26. Ranganathan, S. R. *The Five Laws of Library Science*. Madras Library Association, 1931.
27. Selwyn, Neil. *Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates*. 2nd ed., Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.
28. Seneviratne, W., and M. Wickramasinghe. "Differentiating 'Reading' vs. 'Studying': The Role of Academic Libraries in Cultivating Lifelong Reading Habits." *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 2019, 11 (4), 45–58.
29. Suber, Peter. *Open Access*. MIT Press, 2012. MIT Press Open, <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9286.001.0001>.
30. UNESCO. *Reimagining Our Futures Together: A New Social Contract for Education*. International Commission on the Futures of Education, UNESCO Publishing, 2021.
31. University Grants Commission. *UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations*. Gazette of India, 2018.
32. Veiga, A. D. "Ethical Guidelines for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence and Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Tools in Scholarly Publishing: A Thematic Analysis." *Science Editing*, 2025, 12 (1), 28–34, <https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.352>.
33. Zhao, Yu, Ana María Pinto Llorente, and María Cruz Sánchez Gómez. "Digital Competence in Higher Education Research: A Systematic Literature Review." *Computers & Education*, 2018, 128, 291–310.
34. ---. *Report of the University Education Commission (1948–1949)*. Chaired by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Ministry of Education, 1949.