

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 103

LI 002 244

TITLE Instruction in the Use of the College and University Library: Selected Conference Papers [from] July 13-14, 1970 Conference/Workshop.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. School of Librarianship.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.65
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries, Conference Reports, *Library Instruction, *Library Programs, Library Services, *Library Skills, *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

Library programs at U.C. Berkeley, San Jose State College and U.C.I.A. are presented together with an introduction by Associate Professor Harlan, U.C. School of Librarianship. At U.C. Berkeley the experimental program has involved twenty-two librarian-instructors and has reached 825 students. At San Jose, a "team teaching" approach involving the library and librarians was utilized. At U.C.I.A., systematized instruction in library use was provided to fifty Black and fifty Chicano students who lacked normal college entrance requirements but who showed strong academic potential. A second experimental program provided assistance for a course initiated, organized and conducted by students under faculty supervision. The third involved a tour of the library by students who were given instruction in library use. A brief listing of audio-visual material presented at the Conference is given, along with a partial attendance list. (AB)

ED0 45103

DEC 14 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

SELECTED CONFERENCE PAPERS

July 13-14, 1970 Conference/Workshop on

**"INSTRUCTION IN THE USE
OF THE
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARY"**

**Auspices: School of Librarianship, University of California
Department of Letters and Science, University
Extension, Berkeley Division.**

LJ 002244

FORWARD

On July 13-14, 1970 the University of California's School of Librarianship and the Department of Letters and Science, University Extension, sponsored a conference/workshop on "Instruction in the Use of the College and University Library."

Attached are three presentations made the first day re programs at U.C. Berkeley, San Jose State College, and U.C.L.A., together with an introduction by Associate Professor Harlan, of U.C.'s School of Librarianship. A fourth presentation on computer-assisted-instruction by Dr. Hansen, of Florida State University, is not available at this time.

There is also a brief listing of audio-visual material presented at the conference/workshop, together with whom to contact if you wish to borrow any of this material. (Note: It may or may not be possible to borrow a given film, depending upon its use or condition.) A partial attendance list is appended.

In order to cover publication costs a fee of \$1.00 will be charged to persons who did not pay to attend the conference.

CHARLES H. SHAIN
Conference Coordinator

School of Librarianship
University of California, Berkeley
September 1, 1970

Associate Professor ROBERT HARLAN, School of Librarianship
University of California Berkeley

WELCOMING REMARKS

July 13, 1970

On behalf of the School of Librarianship and Continuing Education in Arts and Humanities, and University Extension, I wish to welcome you to this workshop. You may wonder how the School of Librarianship came to be involved in this workshop. The answer is found in the School's association with the course Bibliography I.

Bibliography I began as Bibliography IX, an experimental course offered under the sponsorship of the University's Board of Educational Development. Later, it needed a home in one of the existing departments or schools of the University and the one chosen was the School of Librarianship. From the beginning the School's policy towards the course has been similar to that which the British government adopted towards its American colonies before the troubles which lead to the revolution, a policy characterized as one of "salutary neglect." The course continues to be primarily under the control of the librarians who teach it. For this reason, I, as a member of the School of Librarianship, can say without fear of boasting that it has been one of the most successful--and is, I believe, the longest-lived--of the experimental courses introduced into the University's curriculum. The School of Librarianship has been proud of its association with Bibliography I.

From the beginning the instructors of Bibliography I have been interested in what other librarians in other schools were doing, and through the correspondence of other librarians with the course coordinator Charles Shain, we know that the interest has been mutual. At this point, we decided this workshop would be timely and useful.

We have assembled, from a variety of institutions and locations, with one purpose: to explore the best means of instructing students--and primarily undergraduate students--in the use of their library. It is assumed that we are all agreed on the desirability of such instruction.

The methods finally chosen by each school will vary with the institution, the purposes of the instruction, and the degree of support the program receives.

CHARLES SHAIN, Coordinator, Bibliography I, Environmental
Design Library, University of California, Berkeley

BIBLIOGRAPHY I: THE U.C. BERKELEY EXPERIENCE

*(A paper submitted to a School of Librarianship and
University Extension conference/workshop in Berkeley, July 13, 1970)*

To those in attendance who have heard or read my paper on this subject at the CLA conference in San Francisco, December 1969, please bear with me for a certain necessary amount of factual repetition. Consider this a refresher course, with a certain amount of later developments.

Let me begin with a few statistics before getting into the subject matter. Since Fall 1966 Bibliography I has been offered for seven academic quarters, through Spring 1970. It has involved twenty-two different librarian-instructors, has averaged 5 sections per quarter, and has reached approximately 825 students. For an experimental program, this provides a fair measure of durability.

Although it is hard to separate the overlapping aspects of the course, they can be grouped under: (1) Content and evolution; (2) Growth and administrative problems; and (3) The future.

1. CONTENT AND EVOLUTION.

In brief, Bibliography I--How to Use the University of California Library--is a learn-by-doing approach for undergraduate, or amateur library researchers, taught by professional librarians who are largely amateur instructors. Its goal is to start students using the library by informing them of the various kinds of tools they might use, including librarians, and then having them apply that knowledge using a "search strategy" to compile a 25 item annotated subject bibliography. They must also write a 3-5 page description of how they used the library, plus a ½ to 1 page sketch outline of a paper that this bibliography might support.

This concentration on the term project is one distinguishing feature of our program in contrast to the variety of similar programs long offered elsewhere. We ask that students use a diversified range and variety of materials to demonstrate their grasp, or lack of grasp, of how to use library resources systematically. The quality of this bibliography is severely limited by time

pressure, the students' own familiarity with the subject matter being researched, and whether or not the books wanted are actually available when requested. *The student must encounter the library and its problems to work out his or her paper.*

Because of the practical problems encountered by their students, instructors take a realistic, non-defensive approach to library-use problems. We must prepare students for the realities of using a complex library system, finding alternatives when first efforts fail.

Students are encouraged to find the single or few best locations, among some 40 branch or department libraries, and to consult specialist librarians to round out their research. Such guidance is not designed as a substitute for individual study, but is a realistic supplement, particularly when the subject appears prematurely exhausted or after encountering numerous blind alleys. Ideally, a public service librarian would find out where the student has been looking, and what strategy he has been pursuing, before making further recommendations.

Weekly assignments using a variety of representative reference materials should have turned up some material and established a pattern for finding additional material later. In practice, however, students tend to delay their research and do not take the opportunity to discuss their problems with their instructors because of lack of time or a misplaced confidence. We have tried to provide more class time for such consultation, including brief 1-2 page "progress reports" to identify serious problems, but this has not really been evolved to date. It is the worst range, or fragmentary searches, that worry us. However, there are a great many competent and even distinguished papers that are turned in. The latter often come from quiet students who simply have been learning to use the library via assignments, preparation for quizzes, and by individual work in the library. Several students have even learned to use convenient off-campus libraries and have sent away for materials from associations connected with their topic. (e.g. Arabian horses)

In the course of the past 7 quarters we have modified our program in several ways, and it is likely that there will be future changes. Our Mark I model featured a single weekly 1½ hour meeting, a 50 item bibliography, a few quizzes and midterms, and a final examination. It awarded 2 units, or hours of credit. Our Mark II model, currently undergoing re-examination, meets twice weekly for one hour, has a 25 item bibliography, offers an eight day stack-pass, awards 3

units credit, has abolished the final examination, and has deemphasized rote memory. Student and faculty evaluations have been a vital part in prompting changes.

2. GROWTH AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS.

Although we were initially able to attract enough students for 7 sections in Fall 1968, through posters, information sheets at reference desks, mention during library tours, and listing in the University Bulletin--either to fill a need or to award a few units--this Spring marked our highest level of growth. Some 236 pre-enrolled, from whom we arbitrarily selected enough for 6 sections, with 146 students receiving grades (mostly "pass" this quarter).

Our introduction to the campus came through the Board of Educational Development, now deceased, and we are temporarily under an *ad hoc* arrangement with the School of Librarianship. Word-of-mouth, continuation of past publicity, plus a special story in *The Daily Californian*, (*Journal of Educational Change*) and extensive SLATE SUPPLEMENT coverage probably account for our special growth this past quarter.

Coverage from SLATE SUPPLEMENT, a student "counter-catalog", has been painfully fair, and encouraging:

"...In general, students find this course invaluable; many upper division students say that they wish they had taken it earlier and suggest that it should be required (or at least strongly recommended) for freshmen since the library skills developed in the course are indispensable for upper division work. The material itself is rather dry and boring, but nearly everyone seems to conclude that the skills acquired were well worth a little boredom. [my emphasis, C.S.]

OR

"A very representative comment covering this course states: 'very helpful. The material covered is not particularly interesting or stimulating but the knowledge gained in the course is extremely useful in approaching the overpowering U.C. library.' A

typical suggestion is to 'take the course in conjunction with a course that requires a paper' and start early on your paper.

SLATE SUPPLEMENT, Spring 1970, p. 9.

As we respond to our own instructors' criticisms, and come into contact with outside programs, we hope to modify our programs further. Mrs. Berman, who will lead the workshop on Bibliography I this afternoon, has just completed a draft of a revised Course Handbook, which incorporates some of the handouts used by our instructors to clarify and extend class presentations. This will save both instructors' time and money, the latter a perennial headache.

The mention of money seems an appropriate occasion to examine our administrative or structural problems. Basically, we function in a semi-autonomous fashion with links to the School of Librarianship and the General Library--without whose aid we would have ceased long ago.

Each of our average 5 instructors, plus myself as coordinator, spend 25% of our time each week in the course (10 hours) and the balance at our regular library jobs. Beside 2 class hours, there are one office hour and one staff meeting hour per week. The balance goes into preparation, grading, etc. New instructors have an initial twenty hours pre-course preparation period; continuing instructors ten hours at the beginning of each quarter. This money is supposed to come from the Chancellor's Office, but the School of Librarianship and the General Library in the past have contributed supplies and even released time payment. At the moment we must compete for 1.06 FTE academic positions in the School of Librarianship if our program is to continue. (There is no use dwelling upon this subject. We will politic to the best of our ability and the rest is in the laps of the bureaucracy.)***POSTSCRIPT: Bibliography I was renewed in August for another year, offering 5 sections.

With our instructors working 3/4 time at their regular jobs plus 1/4 time teaching, there is a synergistic effect such that they end up putting in 1 1/4 time. This leads to considerable turnover through exhaustion, with tenure averaging 2 quarters, and thus requiring a coordinator for continuity.

New volunteer-instructors, and any interested U.C. librarian may volunteer, are urged to sit in on one class to get the "feel" of teaching this subject, read our material, and then spend a few hours with an experienced instructor for a

"hairdown" question session on all aspects of the course. It would be exceedingly difficult to integrate new instructors without such help from our experienced instructors. As coordinator, I act as a trouble shooter when required and try to meet red-tape requirements.

Professor Muscatine's advice to me before our course got started was to keep my eyes open for hidden talent and this has been amply demonstrated. New instructors, often without any teaching experience or public speaking experience, have simply pitched in, taken responsibility, and grown into the job. They have recruited additional instructors by their example, either before or after returning to their jobs. I am convinced that such unofficial "staff development" has been useful to the General Library, and at least as important, the course has percolated through the library sensitizing it to the needs of its patrons.

This past quarter we had our first instructor from the Catalog Department, and this is an important step in linking behind-the-scenes activities with the needs of the patron. A related example of this potential was the Catalog Department's posting of Indochina-war related subject headings at the Subject Catalog in May, in response to massive concern. Similar "bibliographies" could be prepared on other subjects such as "ecology", "citizen participation in public programs," etc. Also standard bibliographies by subject specialists, as at San Jose State College. We also look forward to instructors from the Documents Department.

3. THE FUTURE.

Assuming we survive the current budgetary crunch, there is much to look forward to: We have obtained a classroom in the Moffitt Undergraduate Library, for 5 sections, where we will have to reorient some of our work. We will be getting office space for our files and for consultation with students, probably in the Library Annex. We are beginning to get in touch with other programs and efforts in point-of-use audio-visual self-instruction. A variety of user-aids are needed, and at least some of these should come into existence. A bold graphics program should help lead people to the different parts of the library.

We anticipate learning from other programs, and particularly from areas better equipped to produce audio-visual materials. At this point I might announce

the availability of some copies of our Bibliography I Course Notebook, a compendium of lecture notes, assignments, quizzes, and term papers. In xeroxed form these cost \$11, and will be in Room 188 Dwinelle at 1:30 p.m. [or after the conference from Mr. Shain c/o Environmental Design Library, University of California, Berkeley, 94720].

MARY JO PETERSCHMIDT, General Reference Librarian
July 13, 1970

*Experiences Team Teaching Library Instruction
at San Jose State College*

Library instruction courses for the undergraduate have been on the books at SJSC for some years. It was not, however, until three years ago that the library and librarians assumed the responsibility for teaching the courses. Sponsored by the Library School, Library 1, *USE OF BOOKS AND LIBRARIES*, and Library 100, *BIBLIOGRAPHY AND USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS*, are essentially the same course, the difference being that Library 100 offers upper division credit. These one unit courses meet once a week for the duration of a semester.

We plunged in the fall of 1967 and talked about what the course should be in general terms and each teacher initiated his own approach and taught the course. In the beginning, no special arrangements were delineated for those teaching in terms of released time or extra vacation. We were ardent volunteers to the cause: promotion of library contents and services. It's what instruction in use of the college library is all about. Since the second semester of operation and continuing, compensation has been made for variously up to three or four hours per class period--time to prepare for class. It soon became evident that it was easy to spend more than the allotted time in preparation for classes. It sounds simple to say: talk one hour a week about how to use the library. We're all experts, after all, but it does consume time planning a gripping lecture, devising useful, practical assignments, correcting them, putting together a test, meeting with students who need help, and assigning grades. Most teachers found they were spending the 3 or 4 hours allowed and more on their own to present the class well. Perhaps this was an over-conscientiousness on the part of the teachers, perhaps they were trying to do more than the course required, but we aren't unique. Comparing notes with Berkeley instructors, we find the same situation--and they have more hours with which to plan.

Among those in education circles the term "team teaching" is bantered about and it ran through our minds that some practical adaptation--sharing the instructional responsibilities for more than one section--might be utilized to

cut down the time required to prepare for class and to improve the quality of the teaching.

With these objectives in mind and three volunteers, a version of team teaching was initiated in the fall, 1969.

The librarians who composed the first team all had previous teaching experience of from 2 to 4 semesters. They shared the teaching of three sections of Library 1, each teaching five parts of the curriculum three times. All were reference librarians, two from the same department. Initial meetings established what the ground rules were going to be and what areas were to be covered in each of the classes. Each instructor chose topics and went to work planning her lectures and assignments. The teachers taught in random order according to the schedule established in the beginning. We met as necessary to discuss problems as they came up. It seemed organized: assignments were color-coded, we each had our own niche, and there was no conflict. At the end of the semester, student evaluations were encouraging. When asked "What were your reactions to the team teaching method?" 25 said favorable, 4 said mixed, and 1 said unfavorable. Comments such as "I enjoyed each instructor," and "Course was WELL integrated," and "It was like one big happy family," and "It was a beautiful class," were encouraging, but we had some doubts:

The teachers felt a lack of continuity from class to class. The objectives of having more adequate planning and saving time in preparation were met, but some aspects were overlooked. The teacher who taught one week couldn't explain a week later the problems her students had with the assignment; assignments were uneven in complexity, and requirements. Some students reacted too: "There was one or two assignments from the same teacher which were not in proportion to the course or the other teacher's assignments," "Each had something to offer; however, each teacher (as always) expected different things from you," and a bitter "I still have questions to be answered in reference to homework assignments...mainly because the teacher was not available...I don't have time to crawl through this library looking for someone." In short, we felt less satisfied than if we had separately assumed responsibility for teaching one class. The students weren't forgotten--but it could have worked better.

At the end of the semester we reported these observations to the staff of teacher-librarians and suggested that the problems we encountered could probably be overcome.

It might be well, as we did, to pause here to reflect on what team teaching is. What is team teaching? It's an occupational disease, but I did a literature search and found that it depends on your situation: there are as many applications at all levels as there are guesses as to when we'll get faculty status and they all begin with *if*.

Essentially it is a cooperative teaching venture in which two or more teachers share responsibility for the instruction of a class. Some characteristics to be kept in mind are reasonable ideas which on reflection will occur to each of you:

Agree on the rules of the game and then explain them to the students.

Delineate responsibilities.

Be flexible to meet changing group requirements.

Encourage discussion of group goals, better teaching approaches and presentations.

Hinge together by group coordination and constant planning.

What I wish to emphasize however are these thoughts which apply to our course. The teachers must above all else be able to work together, to give to take, to accept criticism--nay to look for it, to reach consensus, because all are responsible for the class. Team members live in a fish bowl: three classes know if you're any good or not and the other teachers sort of know too. You get feedback and this is a humbling, valuable experience.

So, as we began the spring semester, 1970, we kept the team teaching merits and challenges in mind. The teachers had varying background and experiences in the library (this may have served a good purpose): a cataloger, a social science librarian and a general reference librarian. We plotted our course.

Our first decision was to have each teacher meet five consecutive classes to provide maximum feedback to the students (and as it turned out, to us) and to allow follow-through--a sense of security, if you will. We planned a general outline and preliminary organization. Further coordination was afforded at scheduled Wednesday meetings. At these sessions the next week's lecture and assignment were presented. Thus each teacher was aware of what was being presented and why the assignment was taking the shape it did. Revisions in assignments were often made then. The assignments were coordinated and became progressively more sophisticated. Duplication of effort was avoided by knowing what had been presented earlier in the course. Revision took place until the last class--Nixon's Cambodian venture brought some discussion, but

our classes, it turned out, were minimally affected. Students were clearly informed that any problem with an assignment could be answered by any teacher if the one who gave the assignment was not available. Further, these weekly sessions allowed discussions on the progress of certain students. In short, we were convinced that it had worked this time.

Now the true test: what did the students think? The evaluations received: favorable, 22; mixed, 4; unfavorable, 1. These were almost exactly similar to those in the first semester. Comments: "It gave variety. I preferred two of the teachers. One teacher especially made the lectures interesting. One bored me. They were all extremely helpful and willing to aid." "Each instructor has a different approach and subject areas affording VARIETY." "Team teaching enables students to see a new face once in a while, which to me made all three teachers great." "Thank you." "There seemed to be a lack of 'flow' between each instructor. A breaking point situation."

There are several explanations, apologies, to the similarities in the responses when comparing the fall with the spring results: the students didn't know the latter was the "improved" team teaching; the students didn't know what the course was like taught by one person; and, for the most part, they had never taken a course like this one, i.e. library oriented, before the course was being compared to other college courses.

Probably a better question to ask at this point is: what did the teachers feel worked, was valuable, was a good way to approach teaching a course in instruction in library use? Or, more precisely, is team teaching valuable in this situation? I ask: why do we teach? Simply so that the students can learn to use the places we work in. If whatever way we're teaching isn't of value to the students, we should curtail that method. The evaluations don't reveal this feeling among the students, in fact, with two exceptions, all the students emphatically said they would encourage others to take the course. If a particular method is extremely valuable, we should continue it without qualification. But if it cannot be determined to be either advantage or a disadvantage, then other things can be considered. In the opinions of the teachers, the experience of the first semester left the feeling that a single teacher does as well directing the whole semester as he does on part of a group. The experience of the second semester, however, in the opinion of the teachers was very positive: there was time to prepare lectures well and you did because you had to do it

three times; audio-visual aids were devised and used; a beginning teacher learned from the experiences of other teachers; coordination contributed positively to the give and take of the team spirit hopefully resulting in a valuable experience for the student.

In preparation for my comments today, I realized that I would be dwelling on the reasons for team teaching and the greater snags we encountered in the operation. I have ignored other considerations which could properly have been included: grading processes, scheduling of teaching staff, is the course different in teaching approaches from other college classes, is recruiting easier, how to cope with three classes in which every student has a different major, what library backgrounds should be represented on your team, do you get bored with delivering the same lecture three times? These can be considered in the workshop this afternoon if you like.

In conclusion, the team teaching experience can be a profitable one if people can work together, accept responsibility, remain flexible and use a librarian's training to organize the class and to adjust the edges. For a library staff with other obligations--that is, the press of ordinary operations, team teaching can be usefully employed to make maximum use of staffing this time-consuming service. You can't please all the people, all the time, nor should team teaching be tried for its own sake. I hope you can learn from our experiences.

INSTRUCTION IN LIBRARY SKILLS AT UCLA

**A Paper Presented at a Conference on Instruction
in the Use of the College and University Libraries
Held at the University of California, Berkeley**

July 13-14, 1970

by

**MIMI DUDLEY,
Coordinator of Special Instruction
in Library Use for Undergraduates, UCLA**

During this past year the UCLA College Library has been involved in three particularly exciting programs of library instruction. As academic librarians we had all been aware for years, indeed, ever since we had been librarians, of the great need for some sort of systematic instruction in library use for college students. We had talked about it a lot, and had done what all of us have done: we had looked at films and video tapes prepared by other libraries; and had planned audio-visual presentations of our own; we had speculated about a regular course in library use, or even a required course or of tacking several library lectures onto an already required course, such as Freshman English. We had theorized as to whether such a course is effective if it is given before the student recognizes the need for it. And of course we had done more than speculate and theorize. We had given the usual invitational lectures on library resources and research techniques for specific subjects; we had conducted tours of the library for interested

students at the beginning of each quarter and we had prepared guides to the use of specific reference tools. But this past year we have had several opportunities to develop some new approaches. First and foremost is the Chicano High Potential program in which we participated for two wild and exciting quarters.

One afternoon in the summer of 1969, the College Librarian at UCLA received a call from Joe Taylor, an Instruction Specialist, and Elena Frausto, an Instructor in the Department of Special Educational Programs, asking for an appointment to discuss the possibility of arranging a course in library skills for the one hundred Chicano students who had been admitted to the university for the 1969/70 academic year.

The High Potential Program in its first year, 1968/69, had admitted fifty Black and fifty Chicano students who lacked normal entrance requirements but who showed strong academic potential. These students were enrolled in a concentrated program which, within a year at most, was intended to prepare them for full participation in the regular university curriculum. The Chicano element of the High Potential program had two components, English and Social Science. The English component was to help the student develop the language skills necessary for a successful university career; the Social Sciences component was to help the student develop a self-identity based on a reinterpretation of his cultural background.

The great majority of the one hundred Black and Chicano students who enrolled that first year (eighty-three in fact) successfully made the transition to regular course work. The program was doubled the second year and it was at this point, prior to the second year, that we received the phone call.

The College Librarian and several members of the reference staff met the next day with Mr. Taylor, who acted as faculty advisor, and Miss Frausto, who actually developed the library program they proposed. We didn't draw a deep breath again until the program was well on its way the following fall. Their energy, ingenuity and enthusiasm infected all of us on the staff and made us anxious to do all we could to help. And we did help, we helped a great deal, but it was their program. They conceived it, and it was Miss Frausto most of all who was the prime moving force behind it, from the beginning and throughout the entire quarter.

The library skills course was originally conceived because the Chicano High Potential faculty felt that in order for these students to stand any chance of success, they simply had to know how to use a library. It wasn't that it would be helpful or enriching for these students to know this; it was simply that it was impossible for them to succeed without it. There was a special problem though. The sensitivity to criticism and to failure of these students was even greater than that of the average Freshman, and so they were even less likely to seek help on their own from the library staff, or to participate actively or effectively in anything so formidable as a classroom course in bibliography. It was decided, therefore, to devise a program which would be as self-directed as possible, one which would require a minimum of verbal instruction and would permit the student to proceed at his own pace in as close to a real library situation as possible.

The one quarter no-credit course which was developed required that the students spend two hours every afternoon, Monday through Friday, in the College Library, which is housed in the Powell Library.

Building. During the first seven weeks of the quarter the students were required to complete fifteen "tasks," as they were called, which were designed, according to a description of the course prepared by the instructors, "to teach the Chicano High Potential students how to utilize the [College] Library to their maximum advantage" and were "organized...to substitute for and expand the traditional library tour, as well as to eliminate the frequent frustrations experienced by most students when using the library." Miss Frausto and two teaching assistants were present in the reading room or in an adjoining conference room all afternoon each day to help with the library assignments, and with any other course assignments.

Instead of introducing the students to the library initially with the usual conducted tour, Miss Frausto went to their classrooms and gave each of them a map of the campus, with the Powell Library Building indicated, and instructed them to meet her at the Reference Desk in the main reading room in that building at one o'clock on the following afternoon. When they arrived there she greeted them from behind the Reference Desk and presented each of them with an envelope which she took from a box on the desk marked NEW TASKS. These envelopes contained the first of the fifteen tasks. (It was found later that it worked better if no one handed them these envelopes. They preferred to pick them up themselves. The self-directed aspect obviously was important.) The student completed the assignment, signed his name, and returned it to a box labelled TO BE EVALUATED. Each response was corrected by an instructor and filed either in the CORRECTED TASK box, if further work was required, or in the COMPLETED TASK box, if the answers were satisfactory. At his next session the student would first look in the CORRECTED TASK box, and if necessary do any further work

3

required, returning the envelope once again to the TO BE EVALUATED box. If the envelope for the last task was in the COMPLETED TASK box he would remove it and keep it with his other material for future reference. He would then proceed to the NEW TASKS box for his next assignment. (This wasn't the way it began, with four different boxes. I think we had two to start, but four worked out best. And this is the way the program developed throughout. There was a lot of experimenting and making up as we went along.)

Each envelope for each task contained an assignment sheet to be filled in, an instruction sheet, and other materials as needed, such as diagrams, maps, etc.

The first task attempted to familiarize the students with the physical layout of the College Library. A map of the Library was given to each student, with various facilities, such as the Circulation Desk, Reserve Book Room, restrooms, reading rooms, and public telephones, indicated by numbers 1 through 35. The facilities themselves were numbered with white tape, and the students were required to locate each of the numbers and describe where they found it.

In task two they were given a diagram of the library stacks, xeroxed copies of main entry cards for three books located in the stacks and three charge cards. They were asked to locate these books and check them out.

Tasks three, four and five introduced the students to the mysteries and vagaries of the card catalog, task three dealing with author and title entry, task four with subject entry, and task five with LC classification.

Tasks six through nine dealt with the major standard reference tools; dictionaries, encyclopedias, atlases, almanacs, while task

ten gave them a look into the nether world of plot summaries and eleven introduced them to periodical indexes. Task twelve drew their attention to the College Library's pamphlet collection.

Tasks thirteen and fourteen took them out of the stacks and the References room for a closer look at some of the library's other facilities. Task thirteen took them to the Reserve Book Room, while task fourteen directed them to our Audio Room, which specializes in spoken word recordings, along with a fair sampling of Broadway musicals, and folk, country, rock and soul music.

The last task, number fifteen, was devoted to a study of the *UCLA General Catalog* and *UCLA Schedule of Classes*. By this time some of them were ready to enroll in a regular university class and all of them were looking forward to their second quarter.

These fifteen assignments were completed in the first seven weeks of the quarter. During the last three weeks the teaching assistants conferred at length with each student about his completed tasks, in order to reinforce what he had learned and to evaluate his progress. In the second quarter the students were required to compile a bibliography for their history class, thus making immediate use of their newly acquired skills.

The final choice of tasks was the instructors'. We would have made some slight changes, including biographical tools rather than *Masterplots* for example. But theirs was a more pragmatic (and perhaps realistic) view.

We tried to make the questions relevant to the experiences of the Chicanos. We asked them to locate and check out books written in Spanish. The author, title and subject entries were for books on or by Mexican Americans. The encyclopedia assignment introduced

them to Espasa and UTEHA as well as Britanica and Americana. For atlases, "Near what famous coastal city in Mexico is the small town of Xaltianguis located?" And so on.

Evaluating such a program is difficult. The students themselves were asked to tell what they got from the course, and the responses were generally enthusiastic. We should perhaps be heartened too by the interest shown in the program by the other students in the High Potential Program. Having heard the Chicanos' reaction to their library project, members of the Asian-American and American Indian components came to us with requests for library instruction. Their needs were different and the programs we devised to meet these needs were different, but none of them was nearly as extensive as the Chicano program. Perhaps the best indication of the success of the program is the frequency with which these students continue to come to the library and how often we see them using their library skills in studying for their regular courses.

Another special program in which we were involved at about the same time as the Chicano program was HENAC, an experimental course funded by the Ford Foundation under the aegis of the Academic Senate's Council on Educational Development. HENAC, the acronym for Humanistic and Educational Needs of the Academic Community, was a twelve unit accredited course initiated, organized and conducted by students under the general supervision of four faculty members. Some 200 students enrolled to study such subjects of immediate interest as Ecology, Urban Development, Community Involvement, and Revolutionary Non-Violence.

We first read about HENAC in the Daily Bruin and it sounded like something that needed us. We phoned the number given in the article

and a young man came to talk to us. We asked him about HENAC's book needs, neatly working in a minuscule lecture on the Reserve Book Room. He said what they were really interested in was books the library didn't have--radical books--but he didn't have a list of them. We handed him a copy of Sylvia Price's bibliography which appeared in the June 1, 1969 issue of L.J. and which we had annotated with our holdings and he brightened considerably. Yes, that was just what he and the others wanted and could he have a copy. We xeroxed the list for him and he went away and we never saw him again. A few days later another student came in, told us he had found a great book list, presented the Price bibliography and asked if we could get some of those books for them. We assured him that those marks meant we had those books. Well, what they needed was a room in which to meet and study those books. We were able to provide a good-sized room right off the main reading room for these remarkably independently motivated students, and we charged out a number of books they requested from our stacks, placed them in that room, and made them non-circulating. Provided with a place to meet and study, and with copies of the basic books they needed, some of the HENAC groups came to us for further assistance, which ranged from answering simple reference questions to preparing instant or overnight guides to the study of ecology in the College Library, to helping them compile fairly elaborate bibliographies, and in one case, giving a three-hour seminar on bibliographic research in military law. At the conclusion of this seminar we felt we might have been just a little over enthusiastic in our description of our resources when we were asked by one young novice to the ways of libraries: "Is this whole building devoted to just military law?"

We were invited to attend HENAC's weekly Director's meetings and we did attend as many as time allowed in order to keep up with who was doing what as there was quite a turnover in leadership.

HENAC was exciting for us and certainly for the students. It lasted for two quarters until the Academic Senate took a long, hard academic look at the program and decided to withdraw further credit and halt the experiment. But experiments continue, and at present we have our eye on a new pass-fail accredited course called "Freshman Seminar" which we will look into as soon as we can.

The third program we threw together had its genesis in a lunch table conversation with a grumpy music professor who having heard us talk about the High Potential program complained that he couldn't assign a library paper to his beginning music appreciation class for non-music majors because his students, unlike the Chicanos, couldn't find their way around the library. We accepted the challenge and by the end of the week had prepared for him a self-guided tour of the library which led his two hundred fifty students not only into and around the reference room but up to the specific reference tools he wanted them to use. It required the use of a narrative in one hand and a sheaf of maps in another. The assignment was to "compile a bibliography relating your major to music" and we were pleased to see students use the L.C. Subject Headings before they went to the catalog and other evidences of a bit more sophisticated use of the library. They appeared to enjoy the project and their end product indicated that they had indeed learned a great deal. The reason we know the end product was good is because the professor came to us with two hundred fifty bibliographies for us to correct. While we edged out of that responsibility we did glance

through a number of them and were gratified with what we saw.

College students need to know how to use libraries. Of that I am sure we are all convinced. However, these needs differ greatly, they differ with the students' individual backgrounds, with the content of the courses they are taking, and with their instructor's knowledge of and interest in library resources. At UCLA's College Library we have concluded that we cannot dictate the manner of library instruction. We cannot require courses in library instruction. We can only seek out those individuals and groups who seem to evidence a specific need for such instruction and respond to each in his own terms.

In the case of the Chicano High Potential program they approached us, but they did so because of the College Librarians' active role in dealing with the ethnic minority enrollment problem.

We knew to seek out the HENAC students because we are aggressive readers of the Bruin.

And the Self-Guided Tour *cum* Bibliographical Instruction was a result of an open channel of communication with a faculty member.

If we continue to seek out and respond to the needs we see around us every day we suspect we'll be in for another exciting year--and another--and another.

Audio-Visual Material at Library Instruction Conference

1. UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA.

- a. Orientation film. University of Alaska library.
20 minutes. color. super 8. sound.
- b. Video tapes. Single concept. Use of a College library.
THE CATALOG. Another. (1/2 inch Sony, 1969 model to project. 2 clips. 3-6 minutes each. (4 others not shown).
(Write to: Mrs. Millicent Hering, University of Alaska, College, Alaska 99701)

2. MCGRAW-HILL.

Films Division of McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 W-42nd Street
NYC, 10036. "Reference Materials."

Filmstrip. Color. 35 mm. Separate sound.

3. EARLHAM COLLEGE.

Videotape. 30 minutes. "Using government documents to find materials on pollution." (1/2 inch or Sony CV Series only)
Mimeographed lecture-guide to be used with film. sound.
(Write to: Mr. Thomas Kirk, Science Librarian, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana 47374)

4. MERRITT COLLEGE.

Library orientation-invitation. Approximately 15 minutes.
Super 8. color. sound.
(Write to: Mr. Irwin Mayers, Librarian, Merritt College Library
5714 Grove Street, Oakland, California 94609.)

Comments: The above films were selected through personal acquaintance by a few librarians involved in planning the conference. They illustrate some possible approaches to the problem of library instruction, based upon local needs (except for the general McGraw-Hill filmstrip, which is part of a series). As Mr. Kirk, of Earlham College, put it, "[They] might stir librarians to say 'I can do better than that' and then try it."

There are many films which were unavailable for this conference, because they were unknown. If you know of a good one, useful if imperfect, you may wish to contact persons attending this conference. They are interested in such materials and would appreciate such information, together with a brief description of the material and how to borrow it.

ATTENDANCE LIST (Partial)

*Conference/Workshop on Instruction in the Use of the College
and University Library, July 13-14, 1970, at U.C. Berkeley.*

Anderson, Barbara E.
Education Librarian
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, Calif.

Blobush, Barbara Anne
Reference Librarian
Sonoma State College
Rehnert Park, Calif.

Boyer, Laura M.
Reference Librarian
University of the Pacific
Stockton, Calif.

Brogan, Gerald Edward
College Librarian
College of the Redwoods
Eureka, Calif.

Caccese, Vincent
Coordinator of Branch Libraries
University of Calif.
Irvine, Calif.

Clark, Nancy S.
Head, Reserve Book Dept.
University of Calif.
Davis, Calif.

Clayton, Geraldine
Assistant Head, Moffitt Undergrad Library
University of Calif.
Berkeley, Calif.

Coden, Ann
Reference Librarian
Meyer Library, Stanford University
Stanford, Calif.

Combs, Adele M.
Deputy Assistant University
Librarian for Public Services
Northwestern University Library
Evanston, Illinois

Compton, Miles Stuart
Librarian
Simpson Bible College
San Francisco, Calif.

Crossman, David M.
Assistant Director of Libraries
Instructional & Research Services
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Davis, James G.
University of Calif.
Berkeley, Calif.

Donovan, Jerry J.
Manager of International Census
Documents Project, Dept. of
Demography
University of Calif.
Berkeley, Calif.

Durnell, Jane B.
Reference Librarian, Instructor
in Library Administration
University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon

Elser, George C.
Head Librarian
Chaffey College
Upland, Calif.

Endore, Marcia
Reference Librarian
University of Calif.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Feinstein, Leonore Hart
Residence Halls Librarian
University of Calif.
Berkeley, Calif.

Gibbens, Carol
Librarian II - Reference Dept.
University of Calif.
Berkeley, Calif.

Godfrey, Ann Kellen
Librarian and Instructor
Merritt College
Oakland, Calif.

Gould, Theodore Frederick
Educational Services Librarian
University of Calif.
Davis, Calif.

Hering, Millicent B.
Head, Reader Services Dept.
University of Alaska Library
College, Alaska

Hicks, June I.
Biomedical Librarian
Dartmouth College
Hanover, N.H.

Holm, Grace
Associate Librarian
Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, Calif.

Hyslop, Elizabeth Curry
Reference Librarian
Meyer Undergraduate Library,
Stanford University
Stanford, Calif.

Jacobs, Fred Rue
Assistant Librarian
Bakersfield College
Bakersfield, Calif.

Jensen, Marilyn Ann
Reference Librarian
University of Calif.
San Francisco, Calif.

Johnson, John E.
Head, Circulation Dept.
University of Calif.
Santa Barbara, Calif.

Johnson, Peter Albert
Assistant Librarian, Meyer
Memorial Library
Stanford University
Stanford, Calif.

Kahn, Margaret Ellen
Head, Reference Dept.
University of Calif.
Irvine, Calif.

Kelly, Genevieve Ruth
Librarian, American Baptist Seminary
of the West
Anaheim, Calif.

Kennedy, James R.
Reference Librarian
Earlham College
Richmond, Ind.

Kimball, Jane Allison
Assistant Head, Reference Dept.
University of Calif.
Davis, Calif.

Kistler, Winifred E.
Public Services Librarian, Health
Sciences Library
University of Calif.
Davis, Calif.

Knapp, Judith K.
Reference Librarian
Stanford University, Meyer Memorial
Library
Stanford, Calif.

Kohn, Shirley L.
Humanities Librarian
San Jose State College Library
San Jose, Calif.

Larsen, Hans L.
Librarian
Long Beach City College
Long Beach, Calif.

Loventhal, Milton
Librarian III, Bibliographic
Control Unit, San Jose State
College
San Jose, Calif.

Maleady, Antoinette Opal
Phonorecord Librarian
Sonoma State College
Rohnert Park, Calif.

McMahon, Betty Marie
Interlibrary Loan Librarian,
Reference Dept.
University of Calif.
Santa Barbara, Calif.

Mastin, Charles D.
Acquisitions Librarian
College of Marin
Kentfield, Calif.

Rebman, Elizabeth Huttig
Reference Librarian, Meyer Memorial
Library, Stanford University
Stanford, Calif.

Wale, Mary Manning
Associate Librarian
Mills College Library
Oakland, Calif.

Shawl, Janice H.
Head, Catalog Dept.
University of Calif.
Irvine, Calif.

Wensrich, Carl J.
Head of Reader Services
University of Calif.
Santa Cruz, Calif.

Stanley, Lana L.
Librarian I - General Reference
San Jose State College
San Jose, Calif.

Whitson, William Lester
Student, School of Librarianship
University of Calif.
Berkeley, Calif.

Taylor, Marion Elizabeth
Acquisitions Librarian
University of Calif.
Santa Cruz, Calif.

Wiggins, Marvin E.
General Reference Librarian &
Coordinator of Reference Services
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Turner, Carol A.
Reference Librarian, Meyer Library
Stanford University
Stanford, Calif.

Wilson, Lucy W.
Public Services Librarian
Laney Junior College
Oakland, Calif.

Wainwright, Judith Smith
Head of Reference
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, Calif.

Wolstencroft, Alan Lambert
Government Publications Librarian
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, Calif.

SUPPLEMENTARY ATTENDANCE LIST

Bennett, Helen Carol
Head Reference Librarian
San Fernando Valley State College
Northridge, Calif.

Lilja, Pauline
Librarian I, Reference Supervisor
Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington

Bentzler, Georgiane C.
Librarian
University of Wisconsin
Marshfield, Wood County Campus

MacLeod, Celeste Lipow
Librarian and writer
...

Dow, Gail Marie
Reference Librarian
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Marriott, Lois
Head of lower Division Library
San Diego State College Library
San Diego, Calif.

Gault, Robert D.
Librarian
Northwest Christian College
Eugene, Oregon

Parsons, Jill, Reference Librarian
San Diego Mesa College
San Diego, Calif.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC
Cley, Marjorie
San Francisco, Calif.

Phipps, Barbara, Associate Librarian
Pacific Union College
Angwin, Calif.

Tyson, Edwin L.
Reference Librarian and Instructor
San Jose City College and San Jose
State College
San Jose, Calif.

Wood, Clifford Porter
Assistant Humanities Reference
Librarian
Sacramento State College
Sacramento, Calif.