NANCY E. GWINN

Academic Libraries and Undergraduate Education: The CLR Experience

For more than ten years, the Council on Library Resources has been funding programs that have as their goal the closer integration of academic libraries with undergraduate education. The CLR Fellowship Program has stimulated some research. Bibliographic instruction has been the core of most projects funded under the CLR-NEH College Library Program and the CLR Library Service Enhancement Program. While the grantees have realized many benefits, staff and faculty turnover, lack of commitment from library and university administrators, and lack of evaluation remain problems. CLR is directing its efforts toward a new approach by supporting the Academic Library Program administered by the Association of Research Libraries' Office of Management Studies.

Is IT POSSIBLE for an academic library to find happiness as an active, committed partner in the education of college and university undergraduates? In true soap-opera style, for some ten years the Council on Library Resources, Inc., (CLR) has been preparing episodes in a continuing narrative whose climax, one might think, would resolve that question. Through a series of grant programs, each project has carried along the story line, with that question always pushing us to turn the page, to listen in again tomorrow, to keep searching for the answer. There have been subplots and side excursions along the way. It is time, now, to stop and see how far we've come.

As a foundation, the council awards grants

to other organizations and individuals for projects that fall within its program objectives; as an operating foundation, it also develops and administers programs of its own. CLR's program goals have shifted over the years as some problems were solved and new ones emerged. Its current interests include bibliographic services (particularly efforts toward developing a nationwide computerized service), library resources and their preservation, professional education and training, research and analysis, and, last but certainly not least, library operations and services.

CLR AND LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

The council's interest in user education in academic libraries began in 1964 when CLR supplied funds for a project at Mt. San Antonio College in Walnut, California, to develop a slide-tape program for use with a then-new "teaching machine." The purpose of the machine was to provide general information to students on the use of the library. Even the language used to describe the grant sounds a little antiquated to our more technologically sophisticated ears. It

was reported that the machines were effective in teaching about the use of the library and in reducing demands on library staff, but the equipment had severe mechanical limitations.[1]

In 1968, because the council was then interested in developing prototype equipment, it made a small supplemental grant for an improved design of a machine for use in academic libraries and suitable for commercial manufacture. Apparently it never reached the marketplace.

In 1970 the Model Engineering Library within the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Barker Engineering Library received the first of two grants as one component of Project Intrex.

Project Intrex (Information Transfer Experiments) was a program of research that attempted to establish the bases upon which the technical library of the future would be laid. The project involved the adaptation of technology to improve access to information through a full-text retrieval system coupled with a computer-based catalog. But through the Model Engineering Library, attention also turned to the instruction of library users. It was through this program that the well-known Library Pathfinders emerged, and successful experiments with point-of-use instruction using audiovisual equipment were made.[2]

In 1969, however, the council initiated two programs, under the umbrellas of which most of its projects involving user education have gathered: the CLR Fellowship Program and the College Library Program. The latter was jointly sponsored by the council and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

In 1975 a third program, the Library Service Enhancement Program, added another mechanism through which to explore the possibilities of establishing an effective union of academic libraries and teaching programs. None of these programs had user education as its specific goal.

THE CLR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Under its Fellowship Program, the council offered support to midcareer librarians who developed projects that would occupy a minimum of three months. The projects had to be designed to advance the individual's technical, administrative, or substantive skills in librarianship and could involve research, travel, or internship experiences—anything, that is, short of work toward a degree. Over the years, 215 fellowships were awarded, and thirteen of them focused, in whole or in part, on user education.[3]

The CLR Fellows approached the topic from a variety of angles, from an enumeration of strengths and weaknesses of various teaching strategies to methods of program evaluation, from a synthesis that would form a model program to a view of library instruction as part of a broader study, such as the role of the specialist librarian or interpersonal communication. Most of the research was keyed to the librarian's own work situation. The CLR Fellows most often were either attempting to start a library instruction program or to improve one already in existence.

The methods used were similar: visits to a number of libraries, usually preceded by a questionnaire (although we tried to discourage this) and followed up with interviews either in person or by telephone.

Thus CLR helped Allan Dyson look at how undergraduate library instruction was organized in ten U.S. and about a dozen British libraries, and the council assisted John Lubans' examination of instructional programs in twelve libraries and his conduct of a detailed user survey at the University of Colorado.

Many of the fellows' conclusions are consistent with the last ten years' history of interest and enthusiasm for the topic and would come as no surprise to persons familiar with the basic literature. In the early 1970s, for example, a fellow concluded that there "seems to be emerging an awareness of a need for a new breed of teaching librarian for academic libraries."[4]

By mid-decade many programs with dedicated staff had emerged, and the conclusions drawn by visiting fellows focused on obstacles as well as successes. Dyson, for example, concluded that "the overriding factor determining the success of an instructional program is the extent of commitment to it by the library administration."[5] Johnnie Givens' "clearest understanding" from her study was that "the development of skills in the use of the library by any instructional

method is likely to be sterile and void of general acceptance and success if it is separate from the other processes of educational experiences the learner is offered."[6]

By 1978 Hannelore Rader used her personal experiences and a fellowship study of ten academic library instruction programs in the U.S. and Canada in a classic nuts-and-bolts article on how to set up a program in a college library.[7]

THE CLR–NEH COLLEGE LIBRARY PROGRAM

The fellows generated useful information, but the program was supplemental to the council's main efforts of the past decade, which were embodied in two programs that supported experimental endeavors to improve the relationships of academic libraries with faculty, students, and the college or university as a whole.

Based on concepts generated by Patricia Knapp's Monteith College library experiment,[8] the CLR-NEH College Library Program provided thirty-six institutions with grants to explore innovative ways of enhancing the library's participation in the education process, of making faculty and administrators more aware of the collections and human resources at hand, and of imparting to students a clearer notion of the enriching cultural and educational role libraries can play throughout their lives.[9] The NEH participation brought with it the added focus of enhancing the role of academic libraries in respect to humanistic scholarship.

The thirty-six institutions had enrollments ranging from a few hundred students to more than 20,000. There was an emphasis in the early years of the program on helping historically black academic institutions; as the years passed the program grew more competitive and the proposals became more sophisticated. Thus, while at one end of the spectrum institutions such as Miles College in Alabama established very traditional orientation programs, at the other end, Northwestern University hired librarians with Ph.D.'s to carry on research and instructional activities (including developing a course on the history of written and printed communication), and Lake Forest College in Illinois built a program around on-line bibliographic services.

Those thirty-six institutions displayed (and continue to display, since the last institutions to be funded will not finish their programs until the early 1980s) a variety of activities in their search for the key that would unlock the door of library-faculty cooperation on their respective campuses.

Some of them brought faculty members into the library to staff the reference desk, keep regular office hours, survey the collection, redesign their courses to include library components, etc. Some used graduate or undergraduate student assistants and gave them special training so that they might help other students. Some brought speakers to campus and arranged exhibits, lectures, films, and other cultural events, around which were built seminars, special classes, workshops, and other educational scaffolding—all of which brought new people into the library. Some held workshops for faculty—one small college library even going so far as to hold two-week summer sessions, or refresher courses for faculty.

Collectively they have filled to overflowing a cornucopia of workbooks, handbooks, bibliographies, pre- and posttests, flyers, brochures, and a few audiovisual materials. New librarian positions were created with titles such as "Librarian at Large," "Humanities Librarian," "Scholar Librarian," "Coordinator of Instructional Services," "Orientation-Instruction Librarian," etc. Librarians have been appointed to curriculum committees and worked part-time in departments—in one case even holding half-time departmental appointments. All were committed to working closely with faculty (a requirement of the program), and most engaged in some form of bibliographic instruction, whether it meant developing a separate course, team teaching in the classroom, assisting faculty and students on an individual basis, or a combination of these.[10]

The College Library Programs were funded for three- to five-year periods. CLR and NEH invested more than $2,341,000, but each institution was also required to match its grant with funds above and beyond the library's regular budget. These stipulations were consciously inserted to help the library "institutionalize" the pro-

gram and to bring extra money to the library that, it was hoped, would continue after the grant period. In both cases, the results have been quite varied.

THE CLR LIBRARY SERVICE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

In 1975 the council decided that it would accelerate the demonstration process started in the College Library Program on a more modest basis by providing small planning grants to a variety of institutions.

CLR invested nearly $400,000 for the resulting Library Service Enhancement Program, which provided each of twenty-five institutions with the equivalent of one librarian's salary in order to relieve that person of normal duties and allow him or her to work full time for one year with faculty, administrators, students, and staff.[11]

The goal, again, was to find ways of integrating the library more fully into the teaching and learning process and to expand the library's role in the academic life of the college or university. Unlike the College Library Program, the science curriculum could be included. Again, nothing was said that would limit the design of the program to any particular form of bibliographic instruction. But, of course, that method continues to be a most attractive way of working with faculty and of developing a more tangible campus role for librarians as instructors.

The Enhancement Program had a particularly beneficial effect on the project librarians. They were required to be senior staff members who presumably were familiar with the institution and faculty. Their release time provided them with an opportunity to leave behind the established routine for a year and work with faculty and administrators outside of the library. Furthermore, many took the opportunity to travel and gather ideas from other programs in the vicinity. Some were invited to give conference presentations or workshops. Their year of intense, professional growth perhaps can best be summed up by the concluding comment of one Enhancement Program librarian's final report. "Thank you, Council," she wrote, "for the most demanding, fun-filled, frustrating, impossible, rewarding, *fast* year of my life."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In ten years of involvement, then, what has been accomplished in these programs? There have been two attempts on the part of the council to evaluate program activity.

In the summer of 1975, a team of CLR and NEH evaluators visited twelve of the College Library Program libraries. Despite the fact that nearly all of the participants had to make major modifications in their plans at the end of either the first or second year, the evaluators found that the effort had provided many benefits.

At a minimum, the team learned that the joint program focused the attention of the college and university administration on the importance of the library in the total teaching effort. At the most, the learning process was greatly strengthened, since the program brought faculty and librarians together (for the first time on some campuses) in efforts to enlarge the educational perspectives of students and to improve their investigative skills.

Clearly more students were using the libraries than had formerly been the case. And the participants were exchanging a great deal of information with nearby institutions, producing the well-known "ripple effect." After measuring these results against their necessarily flexible yardstick, the team members were convinced that the program should continue.

Last spring I conducted a rather unscientific evaluation by telephoning project and library directors. I called all of the College Library Program grantees who had finished the grant period and a selected number of Enhancement Program recipients—a total of twenty-two institutions.

In two cases it appeared that the program had been dropped in its entirety at the end of the grant period. In neither of these cases, I might add, was bibliographic instruction by librarians the focus of the program. In all of the others it was apparent that while most required adjustments, what had been started was continuing to develop, at least in part, often to expand, and that there was still enthusiasm for the activity.

At Cornell, former project director Joan Ormondroyd, an Enhancement Program grantee, credited some of the successful

growth of their program to changes in teaching style, a return to the basics of rhetoric, composition, and research papers. "The farther we get from the sixties," she said, "the closer we get to the fifties."[12]

It is impossible to measure quantitatively the effect that these grant programs have had, but it is clear that in many institutions, administrators and faculty are now more aware of the possibilities for productive integration of library and teaching programs.

The ripple effect observed in 1975 has increased, partly due to Project LOEX, the clearinghouse located at Eastern Michigan University (EMU), which grew out of EMU's College Library Program grant and was itself supported for several years by the council.[13]

Several institutions that prepared Enhancement Program proposals but were not funded wrote to say that the mere activity of putting together the document forced them to reevaluate their philosophies, missions, and service goals and encouraged them to find ways of carrying out their plans on their own, at least in part.

The council was not attempting to develop a single model program; one result of our experience that has been quite evident is the need for a variety of approaches on each campus that suit each institution's unique environment and personality. But many of the funded programs have become models, frequently cited in the literature and recognized for their innovative ideas and leadership in the field.

At the same time, a number of them have lacked a purposeful plan of evaluation that would objectively measure progress. Too often evaluation was not considered until the final year, when it was too late to gather statistics, to measure growth in skills, or to conduct more than a perfunctory survey. And despite the council's encouragement, with some outstanding exceptions (Earlham being one), few have disseminated their results widely, although many proposals and reports are available through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) System and Project LOEX.[14]

Lewis and Clark College, a small institution in Portland, Oregon, provides an example of what a little seed money can accomplish if it happens to land on particularly fertile soil. Lewis and Clark received an Enhancement Program grant for the 1976–77 academic year. Reference librarian Louise Gerity was released for the year to begin planning a coordinated program of orientation and instruction. Based on the soundness of her work, and in recognition of the fact that a new program of this sort needs time to grow, the college on its own extended the program for an additional two years, naming Gerity as bibliographic instruction librarian and continuing to give her the freedom to build on her past efforts. This past summer a college committee was appointed to evaluate the three-year effort and determine if it should be continued. The committee endorsed the activities that had been carried out and supported those planned for the next two years. The report emphasized the need for close working relationships and coordinated activity between faculty and library staff. It is clear that, through the grant process, the library was able to garner strong support for its activities, support that, it is to be hoped, will be continued.

In the telephone interviews I conducted, I asked such questions as "What were the greatest problems you had in establishing the program?" and, "If you had to do it all over, would you do the same thing?" The responses became a repetitive litany: poor cooperation from faculty; faculty and administrative turnover; library staff turnover; library director turnover; lack of adequate planning with faculty input, etc.

Turnover directly relates to commitment, of course, and it quickly became clear that the most progressive, well-organized programs had been blessed with stable staff and faculty from the beginning. This is one reason, of course, why the Earlham College program has been so successful.

Lack of support or, perhaps more accurately, indifference on the part of university officials remains a problem on several campuses. Although in the College Library Program the council required a personal letter of commitment and pledge of continuance from the college or university president, with some outstanding exceptions this seems to have made little difference when the grant period ended and competition for internal funds increased.

And where libraries were able to maintain new positions funded under the grant, the funds for the position were more often the result of adjustments or changes of priorities within the library rather than of an increase in the budget.

It is my impression from the telephone interviews, from reading the reports, and from a few site visits, that:

1. In those institutions that, in addition to developing an instructional program, tried such innovative ideas as bringing faculty into the library or training graduate students—ideas that depended on paying some sort of stipend or honorarium—only the instructional program has survived. Even the University of Richmond, which had the most promising program of incorporating grant activity into the campus' faculty development program, failed in the end to win approval of the effort as a recognized activity for tenure purposes.

2. Even the strongest programs will wax and wane depending on staff energies and faculty turnover. Turnover is endemic, a problem incapable of solution. It will continue to affect programs both positively and negatively. One must simply learn to live with it and work around it.

3. Nevertheless, building faculty relations —getting out of the library and into campus affairs—is still the key to building support for the library's instructional program and other services.

4. Finally, our sights may be too high. Perhaps we should not try to reach every student on campus but only those who are most interested or whose needs for research skills are clear. We should not be afraid to enlist faculty and, in some cases, turn instruction over to them. We should be realistic about our capacities and constraints. Perhaps more attention should be given to instructing the instructors, i.e., the teaching faculty.

LOOKING AHEAD

The council had enough funds to support only two years of the Library Service Enhancement Program. Last year NEH and the council arrived at a mutual decision to discontinue the College Library Program, and recently the council has suspended its Fellowship Program, although it still will fund research projects on an individual basis.

The reasons for these decisions are complex. True, in both the College Library Program and the Fellowship Program, fewer and fewer applications were appearing on the horizon. But perhaps more to the point, most foundations and funding agents—and CLR is no exception—see themselves as catalysts. It is not possible, with the limited funding at our disposal, for the council to help every library that exists or help any one library over an extended period of time. As a funding agent that in turn is supported by other foundations, CLR has itself no assurance of immortality. In fact, if programs are not seen as desirable and worthy of local support, few foundations will continue funding them just to keep them from dying.

The idea behind CLR's library services programs was to provide to the academic library world examples of things that could be done to integrate the library more fully into campus life so that other libraries would be able to learn and perhaps engage in similar activities.

This has happened and has contributed to the momentum of the last ten years. CLR's library programs, and bibliographic instruction programs in general, have not caused a major revolution among the American teaching faculty. They are not, for the most part, crowding into the library to enlist the aid of eager librarians. It will take much longer than ten years for a feeling of general acceptance of this activity to develop—and even then the idea may never catch fire in some institutions or in certain disciplines.

Nevertheless, it is clear that instructional programs are slowly having a positive impact on the educational process and on the image of academic libraries and librarians. The council would underscore the fact that it has not lost interest in the subject of enhancing academic library services and helping libraries improve their abilities to serve the causes of scholarship and teaching. It is time, however, for a new approach.

It is no secret that libraries have entered into a world of financial constraint and limited growth. We have left behind those expansionist years when, to add a new service, it was a simple matter to ask for and receive newly budgeted positions. Dyson

has found that where instructional programs have flourished, they are an expensive addition to, rather than a replacement for, traditional undergraduate library activities.[15]

Somehow, instructional activities have to become meshed with other library services; they must cease to be isolated or added on and instead must be viewed as part of the total operation, as one of a number of library functions that must be managed wisely.

THE ACADEMIC LIBRARY PROGRAM

Earlier discussion focused on the council's feeling that if it gave its College Library Programs enough time to evolve, they would become institutionalized. Perhaps given more time, they will. But perhaps the problem needs to be approached from another perspective, that of management and institutional planning, in order for instructional services to attain their rightful place among the library's priorities and goals. To this end, the council sees library services as one of the principal components of the Academic Library Program, a new program announced last year that is cooperatively funded by CLR, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL).

The Academic Library Program is operated by the ARL Office of Management Studies, which has applied a kind of self-help methodology to library operations in such programs as the Management Review and Analysis Program, the Academic Library Development Program, or the Collection Analysis Project. These programs provide guidance in the form of manuals, procedures, and personal consultation to academic libraries to help them examine themselves, analyze their operations, identify strengths and weaknesses, and outline areas and methods for change.

A high priority for development is a program that will emphasize services. Scheduled to be available in spring 1980, the Services Development Program will help academic libraries examine such services as reference, circulation, interlibrary loan, reserve book, and bibliographic instruction. It will draw in its design on both the College Library Program and the Library Service Enhancement Program.

In preliminary discussions on the design of the program, Office of Management Studies director Duane Webster listed six objectives of the new effort:

1. To provide tools and techniques to enable libraries to determine and analyze use patterns, user needs, and user satisfaction levels;

2. To provide assistance in relating use of the library to current operating policies and services;

3. To design measures of performance that can be applied in evaluating the success of current service programs and in planning future improvements;

4. To provide guidelines for a library to use in designing new service activities or remodeling current ones;

5. To suggest improved methods for promoting the use of library services and enhancing the image of the library on the campus; and

6. To develop and apply principles of effective library service.

All academic libraries in the United States are eligible for the Academic Library Program. It requires a modest fiscal commitment of $4,000–$7,000 for a library to participate. Such modest amounts, we hope, can be found among local sources of support and will result in an enormous pay-off in providing libraries with a capacity for change.

CONCLUSION

It is my view from working with CLR's services programs that service activities must be seen as an integral part of library operations and must be integrated into the local library environment. The objectives of this new program emcompass that perspective and also a very important function that has still to be adequately addressed: measures of performance.

Libraries cannot depend on outside funding for continuing operations but must find ways to provide services within current budget constraints and priorities. It is hoped that the Academic Library Program and its services development module will help with this process.

Most of the previous discussion has emphasized what librarians are doing to in-

struct users in response to the users' documented (through surveys) or perceived needs. Other than the use of pre- and post-tests, little has been done to really measure how much library instruction is retained by users and whether it truly contributes to academic performance.

In their review of research trends in library instruction, Young and Brennan point to the fact that "for nearly 50 years, librarians have attempted to document a positive correlation between library use and/or proficiency and academic performance."[16] In those studies that have been done, they say, statistically significant relationships have not emerged. Lubans has called for "a long-range program of evaluation . . . that would study groups of students through four or five years of college and [determine] what library use instruction or the lack of it means."[17]

Until a way of evaluating learning is found, library-use educators will have to find their motivation in the comments and reactions of faculty and of students, such as the undergraduate who, in response to a query of the University of New Hampshire Enhancement Program director, said that the library instruction program "made me see the library as a tool, rather than as a pain in the neck."

REFERENCES

1. Harriett Genung, "Can Machines Teach the Use of the Library?" *College & Research Libraries* 28:25–30 (Jan. 1967).
2. Charles H. Stevens, Marie P. Canfield, and Jeffrey J. Gardner, "Library Pathfinders: A New Possibility for Cooperative Reference Service," *College & Research Libraries* 34:40–46 (Jan. 1973); Charles H. Stevens and Jeffrey J. Gardner, "Point-of-Use Library Instruction," in John Lubans, Jr., ed., *Educating the Library User* (New York: Bowker, 1974) p.269–78.
3. For a list of these and resulting publications see appendix 1.
4. James Riddles, "Final Report to Council on Library Resources," mimeographed (Stockton, Calif., 1971), p.14.
5. Allan J. Dyson, "Organizing Undergraduate Library Instruction: The English and American Experience," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1:9–13 (March 1975).
6. Johnnie E. Givens, "A Study of Selected Academic Institutions within the Small and Medium Size Range to Determine What Has Been Done or Is Being Planned to Integrate the Library Service Program with the Instructional Program of the Institution," mimeographed (Clarksville, Tenn.: Austin Peay State University, 1974), p.44.
7. Hannelore B. Rader, "The Humanizing Function of the College Library, or Providing Students with Library Know-How," *Catholic Library World* 49:278–81 (Feb. 1978).
8. The U.S. Office of Education entered into a contract with Wayne State University in 1960 to conduct at Monteith College a research project concerned with exploring methods of developing a more vital relationship between the library and college teaching. As quoted in Patricia B. Knapp's *Monteith College Library Experiment* (New York: Scarecrow, 1966), p.11, the purpose of the project was "to stimulate and guide students in developing sophisticated understanding of the library and increasing competence in its use," by providing students with "experiences which are functionally related to their course work."
9. For a list of institutions that received College Library Program grants see appendix 2.
10. For details of individual programs see the bibliography in appendix 4.
11. For a list of institutions that received Library Service Enhancement Program grants see appendix 3.
12. At the end of Cornell's Library Service Enhancement Program grant, three professional librarians were assigned to support the program. In the last academic year, the group worked with 133 faculty and reached more than 2,800 students.
13. Project LOEX (Library Orientation-Instruction Exchange) was funded from 1975 to 1978, when Eastern Michigan University assumed full responsibility. As of June 30, 1978, more than 360 libraries had become fee-paying members of the clearinghouse. Over the years, members have contributed more than 12,000 items to the project's circulating collection.
14. ERIC is a national system that makes available unpublished, hard-to-find documents on all phases, levels, and subject areas of education. Information as to the availability of reports can be obtained from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, School of

Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210. Project LOEX is located at Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197.

15. Allan J. Dyson, "Library Instruction in University Undergraduate Libraries," in John Lubans, Jr., ed., *Progress in Educating the Library User* (New York: Bowker, 1978), p.101.

16. Arthur P. Young and Exir B. Brennan, "Bibliographic Instruction: A Review of Research and Application," in John Lubans, Jr. ed., *Progress in Educating the Library User,* p.15.

17. John Lubans, Jr., "Report to the Council on Library Resources on a Fellowship Awarded for 1971–72," mimeographed (Boulder, Colo: University of Colorado Libraries, 1972), p.6.

APPENDIX 1

CLR FELLOWSHIP REPORTS

The reports listed below are not available from the Council on Library Resources. They are the property of the individual Fellows. Where articles or books resulting from the research have been published, they are also listed.

Dale, Doris Cruger. "Current Trends in Community College Libraries." Paper read at Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries, 9 April 1976, at William Rainey Harper College. Mimeographed.

——. "The Community College Library in the Mid-1970s," *College & Research Libraries* 38:404–10 (Sept. 1977).

——. "A Question of Concern: How to Inform Community College Students about Library Services." Paper read at eleventh Annual Community College Learning Resources Conference, 20 April 1976, at Belleville Area College, Belleville, Illinois. Mimeographed.

——. "Questions of Concern: Library Services to Community College Students," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 3:81–84 (May 1977).

Dyson, Allan J. "Organizing Undergraduate Library Instruction: The English and American Experience." Mimeographed. Berkeley, Calif: University of California, 1974. (Available as ERIC document ED 152 309.)

——. "Organizing Undergraduate Library Instruction: The English and American Experience," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1:9–13 (March 1975).

Givens, Johnnie E. "A Study of Selected Academic Institutions within the Small and Medium Size Range to Determine What Has Been Done or Is Being Planned to Integrate the Library Service Program with the Instruc-tional Program of the Institution." Mimeographed. Clarksville, Tenn.: Austin Peay State University, 1974.

Fretwell, Gordon. "Programs of User Support That a Typical Group of Fifteen U.S. Colleges and Universities Provides Graduate Students in the Social Sciences and Humanities through Libraries and Library-related Services." Mimeographed. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Library, 1973.

Lubans, John, Jr. "Report to the Council on Library Resources on a Fellowship Awarded for 1971–72." (To study patterns of academic library use and nonuse and the effect library orientation and library use presentations could have.) Mimeographed. Boulder, Colo.: University of Colorado Libraries, 1972. (Available as ERIC document ED 093 311.)

——, ed. *Educating the Library User.* New York: Bowker, 1974.

——. "Evaluating Library User Education Programs," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 9:325–43 (July 1972).

Milby, T. H. "A Study of Instructional Programs in the Use of Biological Literature at Selected U.S. Universities." Mimeographed. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma, 1972.

——. "Teaching Biological Literature," *BioScience* 23:663–65 (Nov. 1973).

Nelson, Jerold. "A Search for Power: Librarian/ Faculty Communication in Academe." Mimeographed. Mercer Island, Wash., 1977.

Rader, Hannelore B. "An Assessment of Ten Academic Library Instruction Programs in the United States and Canada." Mimeographed. Ypsilanti, Mich.: Eastern Michigan University, 1976. (Available as ERIC document ED 171 276.)

——. "The Humanizing Function of the College Library; or, Providing Students with Library Know-How," *Catholic Library World* 49:278–81 (Feb. 1978).

Riddles, James. "Final Report to the Council on Library Resources." (To investigate administrative techniques that have been successful on the medium-size college campus in redirecting teaching objectives and techniques to utilize more fully the resources and services of the library.) Mimeographed. Stockton, Calif., 1971.

Roberts, Anne. "A Study of Ten SUNY Campuses Offering an Undergraduate Credit Course in Library Instruction." Mimeographed. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Albany, 1978. (Available as ERIC document ED 157 529.)

Rottsolk, Katherine. "Council on Library Resources Fellowship Final Report." (To examine orientation and instruction programs at several colleges for the purpose of designing a comprehensive program for students at St. Olaf

College.) Mimeographed. Northfield, Minn.: St. Olaf College, 1977.

Schwass, Earl R. "Library Orientation and Instruction in Military Graduate Professional Schools." Mimeographed. Newport, R.I.: Naval War College, 1976.

Smith, Eldred R. "The Specialist Librarian in the Academic Research Library." Mimeographed. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, 1971.

APPENDIX 2

CLR–NEH COLLEGE LIBRARY PROGRAMS (JULY 31, 1979)

INSTITUTION (STATE) AND
TERMINATION DATE OF PROJECT

Ball State University (Ind.): August 31, 1980
Brown University (R.I.): June 30, 1975
Clark College (Ga.): June 30, 1980
Colorado, University of: August 31, 1978
Davidson College (N.C.): January 31, 1978
DePauw University (Ind.): August 31, 1982
Dillard University (La.): June 30, 1975
Eastern Michigan University: September 1, 1975
Evansville, University of (Ind.): June 30, 1982
Franklin and Marshall College (Pa.):
  December 31, 1982
Hampden-Sydney College (Va.): August 31, 1978
Hampshire College (Mass.): September 1, 1975
Howard University (D.C.): August 31, 1976
Jackson State University (Miss.):
  December 29, 1978
Jamestown College (N. Dak.): August 31, 1978
Johnson C. Smith University (N.C.):
  December 31, 1981
Kearney State College (Nebr.): July 1, 1980
Kentucky, University of: July 31, 1979
Lake Forest College (Ill.): December 31, 1983
Manhattanville College (N.Y.): October 31, 1978
Miles College (Ala.): August 31, 1978
Mills College (Calif.): July 31, 1979
North Carolina Central University:
  January 31, 1977
Northwestern University (Ill.): June 30, 1982
Occidental College (Calif.): December 31, 1978
Pacific University (Oreg.): July 1, 1980
Richmond, University of (Va.): July 31, 1978
St. Olaf College (Minn.): June 30, 1982
Salem College (Mass.): June 30, 1981
Swarthmore College (Pa.): August 31, 1977
Toledo University of (Ohio): September 30, 1980
Tusculum College (Tenn.): June 30, 1982
Utah, University of: June 30, 1980
Wabash College (Ind.) (CLR funding only):
  December 31, 1976
Washington & Lee University (Va.):
  June 30, 1976
Wisconsin-Parkside, University of:
  December 31, 1980

APPENDIX 3

CLR LIBRARY SERVICE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS

1976–1977

Cornell University (N.Y.)
DePauw University (Ind.)
Earlham College (Ind.)
Lawrence University (Wis.)
Lewis and Clark College (Oreg.)
University of New Hampshire
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University
Oregon State University
Presbyterian College (S.C.)
University of South Carolina
State University College at Potsdam (N.Y.)
West Georgia College

1977–1978

Beloit College (Wis.)
Colorado College
Georgia Southern College
Georgia State University
Glenville State College (W.Va.)
Guilford College (N.C.)
Hampton Institute (Va.)
Joint University Libraries (Tenn.)
Lake Forest College (Ill.)
Tusculum College (Tenn.)
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Missouri at Kansas City
Wayne State University (Mich.)

APPENDIX 4

PUBLICATIONS ABOUT CLR-SUPPORTED PROGRAMS INVOLVING ACADEMIC LIBRARIES AND THEIR USERS, 1970–79

GENERAL

Association of Research Libraries. Office of Management Studies. "Library Use Instruction in Academic and Research Libraries," *ARL Management Supplement*, vol.5, no.1. Washington, D.C., 1977.

Gwinn, Nancy E. "The Faculty-Library Connection," *Change* 10:19–21 (Sept. 1978).

CLR Annual Reports, starting with the 14th. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources, 1970–

Marshall, A. P. "This Teaching/Learning Thing: Librarians as Educators," in Herbert Poole, ed., *Academic Libraries by the Year 2000; Essays Honoring Jerold Orne*, p.50–63. New York: Bowker, 1977.

COLLEGE LIBRARY PROGRAM*

Andrew, Ann, and Rader, Hannelore B. "Library Orientation Is Reaching Out to People," in Sul Lee, ed., *Library Orientation; Papers Presented at the First Annual Conference on Library Orientation Held at Eastern Michigan University, May 7, 1971*, p.36–45. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1972. (Eastern Michigan University).

Bodner, Deborah. "CLR-NEH Library Programs," *North Carolina Libraries* 36:3–10 (Summer 1978).

Brittain, Michael, and Irving, Ann. "The Work of the Council on Library Resources (CLR)," in *Trends in the Education of Users of Libraries and Information Services in the USA*, p.6–10. Loughborough, England: Loughborough University, 1976.

Brown, Barbara. "The Consciousness IV Library Program at Howard University," in Hannelore B. Rader, ed., *Academic Library Instruction; Objectives, Programs, and Faculty Involvement*, p.23–25. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr. 1975.

"Clark, Kearney State Colleges, Pacific University, U. of Utah Receive Grants," *CLR Recent Developments* 3:3 (July 1975).

"Course-related Library Instruction Program: A Three-Way Involvement of Librarians, Faculty and Students," *Featuring Faculty at Ball State University* 2:1–2 (Oct. 1978).

Dusenbury, Carolyn. "University of Utah Receives CLR/NEH Grant for Humanistic Approach to Library Orientation," *MPLA Newsletter* 20:12 (1975–76).

Edwards, Susan E. "Faculty Involvement in the University of Colorado Program," in Hannelore B. Rader, ed., *Faculty Involvement in Library Instruction*, p.7–22. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1976.

——. "Library Use Studies and the University of Colorado," in Hannelore B. Rader, ed., *Library Instruction in the Seventies*, p.105–7. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1977.

Evrard, Connie F.; Schumann, Elizabeth S.; and Swift, Janet M. "Graduate Reference Assistants at Brown University," in John Lubans, Jr., ed., *Educating the Library User*, p.368–75. New York: Bowker, 1974.

——, and Waddington, Charles C. "The Undergraduate Survey: Its Role in Changing Patterns of Reference Use," *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 7:351–56 (July & Oct. 1971). (Brown University)

"Final CLP Grants Go to Lake Forest, Tusculum,

*The College Library Program is jointly supported with the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Franklin and Marshall," *CLR Recent Developments* 6:3 (Nov. 1978).

"Four Win College Library Program Grants." *CLR Recent Developments* 5:3 (Dec. 1977). (Ball State University, DePauw University, University of Toledo, University of Wisconsin-Parkside)

Henning, Patricia A. "Council on Library Resources Activities," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 7:343-45 (July & Oct. 1971).

"Jamestown, University of Colorado Get CLR-NEH Joint College Library Grants," *CLR Recent Developments* 1:3 (May 1973).

LaBue, Ben. "Evaluating Faculty Involvement in Library Instruction," in Hannelore B. Rader, ed., *Library Instruction in the Seventies*, p.109–11. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1977. (University of Colorado)

Marshall, A. P. "Library Outreach: The Program at Eastern Michigan University," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 7:347–50 (July & Oct. 1971).

Millis, Charlotte Hickman. "Developing Awareness: A Behavioral Approach," in John Lubans, Jr., ed., *Educating the Library User*, p.350–63. New York: Bowker, 1974. (Wabash College)

——. "Involving Students in Library Orientation Projects; A Commitment To Help," in Sul Lee, ed., *A Challenge for Academic Libraries: How to Motivate Students to Use the Library*, p.63–85. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1973.

——. "The Wabash Project: A Centrifugal Program," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 7:365–74 (July & Oct. 1971).

——, and Thompson, Donald E. "Wabash College Library Project," *Library Occurrent* 23:311–16 (Feb. 1971).

"Mills College, University of Kentucky Receive CLR-NEH Grants; LOEX Funded," *CLR Recent Developments* 2:3 (Dec. 1974).

"Occidental and Manhattanville Colleges Receive Grants under CLR-NEH Program," *CLR Recent Developments* 2:4 (Jan. 1974).

Rader, Hannelore B. "EMU's Library Instruction Experiences in the 70's," in her *Library Instruction in the Seventies*, p.85–98. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1977.

Taylor, Robert S. "Orienting the Library to the User at Hampshire College," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 7:357–64 (July & Oct. 1971).

"Three-Year-Old, NEH-Assisted Program Is Broadening Library Role on 16 Campuses," *CLR Recent Developments* 1:1–2 (July 1973).

Tucker, John Mark. "An Experiment in Bibliographic Instruction at Wabash College," *College & Research Libraries* 38:203–9 (May 1977).

"University of Evansville, Northwestern, St. Olaf Receive College Library Program Awards," *CLR Recent Developments* 5:1 (July 1977).

LIBRARY SERVICE
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Collins, John W., and Gillespie, David M. "Library Services in Colleges," in "Bibliographic Instruction; West Virginia Library Association Working Conference of the College and University Section, Bethany College, April 21, 1977," compiled by Barbara Mertins, p.4–11. Mimeographed. (Available as ERIC document ED 144 582) (Glenville State College)

Farber, Evan I. "Bibliographic Instruction and Library Organization: Problems and Prospects," in Sul H. Lee, ed., *Emerging Trends in Library Organization: What Influences Change*, p.49–59. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1978.

———. "Library-Faculty Communications Techniques," in Cerise Oberman-Soroka, ed., *Proceedings from Southeastern Conference on Approaches to Bibliographic Instruction*, p.71–80. Charleston, S.C., 1978.

Frick, Elizabeth. "Some of My Best Friends Are Faculty," *Colorado Libraries* 4:7–9 (June 1978).

Hardesty, Larry; Lovrich, Nicholas P., Jr.; and Mannon, James. "Evaluating Library-Use Instruction," *College & Research Libraries* 40:309–17 (July 1979). (DePauw University)

Kirkendall, Carolyn, ed. "Library Instruction; A Column of Opinion," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 3:344–45 (Jan. 1978). Question posed: In your opinion, what will be the permanent effects of the past year's Library Service Enhancement Program (LSEP) activity on your library's instruction program?

"Library Service Enhancement Program Leaders Work to Improve Library Services," *CLR Recent Developments* 6:3–4 (April 1978).

Werking, Richard Hume. "Library Service Enhancement," *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* 73:279 (Nov.–Dec. 1977). (Lawrence University)

PROJECT LOEX

Bolner, Mary. "Project LOEX: The First Year," in her *Planning and Developing a Library Orientation Program*, p.53–59. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1975.

Butterfield, Mary Bolner, "Project LOEX and Continuing Education," *Michigan Libraries* 41:11–12 (Fall 1974).

———. "Project LOEX Means Library Orientation Exchange," *RQ* 12:39–42 (Fall 1973).

Kirkendall, Carolyn. "Project LOEX—The Third Year," in Hannelore B. Rader, ed., *Faculty Involvement in Library Instruction*, p.41–42. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Pr., 1976.

———. "The Status of Project LOEX," in Hannelore B. Rader, ed., *Library Instruction in the Seventies*, p.25–30. Ann Arbor, Pierian Pr., 1977.

PROJECT INTREX—
MODEL LIBRARY PROJECT

Canfield, Marie P. "Library Pathfinders," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 8:287–300 (July 1972).

Gardner, Jeffrey J. "Point-of-Use Library Instruction," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 8:281–85 (July 1972).

Stevens, Charles H.; Canfield, Marie P.; and Gardner, Jeffrey J. "Library Pathfinders: A New Possibility for Cooperative Reference Service," *College & Research Libraries* 34:40–46 (Jan. 1973).

———, and Gardner, Jeffrey J. "Point-of-Use Library Instruction," in John Lubans, Jr., ed., *Educating the Library User*, p.269–78. New York: Bowker, 1974.

Yagello, Virginia E. "Model Library Program of Project Intrex," *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 36:752–57 (Dec. 1972).