At long last Scoop Sheet has a printed masthead, and in one way this number is most appropriate for its formal presentation. Content is almost entirely devoted to the issue of faculty status for librarians at a time when results of years of effort in this area are becoming evident. Thus, Scoop Sheet changes its image to match the changing image of Indiana University librarians.

Once again the Monthly Staff Meeting was held too late to receive coverage in our regular issue, so we plan to put out a supplement for that purpose. We can look forward to a contribution from Miss Sarah Reed, Assistant Dean of the Graduate Library School, at that time.

An announcement in NEA News (Feb. 13, 1972, newsletter of the National Education Association) of special interest to those involved with ordering and acquisitions, will come as no surprise to many librarians. "Americans spend twice as much money on food for their dogs and cats as they do for textbooks for their children." Perhaps the present crunch in academic financing, especially library financing, could be alleviated if priorities were re-evaluated and realigned.
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
AND FACULTY STATUS

by

Carol Tullis

Several I.U. librarians attended the Two-State AAUP Meeting of Academic Librarians, held at Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, on April 8.

Robert Van Waes (Associate Secretary, AAUP) and Marthe Friedman (librarian, University of Illinois) presented a joint statement by the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of American Colleges, and AAUP promoting faculty status for librarians. (Final approval and publication of the statement are pending with the organizations involved.) Much comment was elicited from a sentence which based faculty status on the function of one's job. Van Waes explained this was inserted by AAUP members with the intent to omit clerical and support staff. However, most librarians felt this would be open to interpretation in the context used and might preclude many librarians from eligibility to faculty status. The statement read also referred to a 1966 statement by AAUP asserting the autonomy of the faculty, and proposed that the library could be considered a separate faculty with its own governance. In general most librarians present agreed with the intent of the document, although many felt it ought to be more specific and less open to varying interpretations on the local campuses. Watch for publication of the statement this spring or summer.

Librarians speaking on the topic "Personnel Evaluations for College and University Librarians: Practices and Problems," were Jane Flener, Ann Kerker (Purdue) and Lois Mills (Western Illinois University). Miss Flener presented the historical perspective leading up to the position librarians are in today regarding faculty status.

Miss Kerker presented a new promotion committee structure (not yet finalized) for Purdue librarians, who have had full faculty rank and title since 1969. The criteria and specifications for faculty promotions are revised somewhat for librarians; for example, "excellence of performance within the libraries and AV center" replaces "excellence of teaching performance." A few of the many other criteria mentioned are: effective use of subject knowledge, stimulation of use of the library collections, and familiarity with the course curriculum.

At Western Illinois University the library director is equivalent to a dean, although the librarians vote with the College of Arts and Sciences for membership on the faculty senate. For librarians, an MLS plus 30
hours, or an MLS plus another masters is considered equal to a PhD.

Speaking on "Models for Academic Self-Government for College and University Librarians" were James Connor (Provost, Western Illinois University), Ralph Simon (Indiana AAUP president and Purdue faculty), and Harriet H. Zack (librarian, Northern Illinois University). Connor spoke of some institutions' attitude toward the library as a separate "service" unit, comparable to a janitorial service unit (!) and outside the academic (teaching) function of the university. He emphasized that the library not only services the university, but is an instructional unit, and therefore should have the same organizational structure as other academic units. Connor concluded it is in general preferable for the library to be represented as an autonomous unit on faculty councils, with budgetary matters, etc.

A librarian reporting from the floor noted that Southern Illinois University's library is a school, its director a dean, and the librarians are faculty in the same ratio as other faculty. SIU librarians also vote every three years on their director and assistant directors. It was explained that in this manner they are able to convince the director that his interests are the same as the library faculty's interests!

An interesting question from the floor was whether any library faculties have budgetary control, since the director's power usually stems from control of the budget. Or is it even possible to disperse such control over a library faculty, when one person (the director) must ultimately be responsible?

Other discussion from the floor centered on the advisability of a dual system for handling faculty promotions and tenure. The two channels, running parallel to each other, are: 1) the present administrative structure (appointed), from department head to library administration, to dean, to university president, to Board of Trustees; and 2) an elected committee structure of library-faculty, from librarians' committee on promotion and tenure, to college or campus committee, to all-university committee. The intent here is to have two separate and non-conflicting channels for input and recommendations. In principle, the recommendations from both channels on one individual should be in agreement, although if they are not, there would be definite means of appeal through each channel. A mixed system, with input criss-crossing from appointed to elected bodies and back (as from department head to librarians committee to library director to all-university committee, etc.) is to be avoided as being unworkable in practice. (I.U. librarians should take note of this, as the proposal for implementing career status for li-
brarians suggests a criss-crossing pattern.)

The session ended with a call from Van Waes for librarians to join the AAUP and become active in their local chapters. He pointed out the many advantages to librarians: contact with the teaching faculty, and support for campus issues involving the library, particularly faculty status for librarians. (All college and university librarians are eligible for AAUP membership whether or not they have faculty status.)

Dr. Frank Franz, president of the local AAUP chapter, has reiterated this invitation, and is anxious to welcome new members into the organization. Membership application forms are available from Polly Grimshaw.

FORUM

OLEG KUDRYK ON THE STATUS OF LIBRARIANS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

"The struggle is not yet ended," said Oleg Kudryk in an interview with Monty Maxwell and Marty Joachim on Thursday, April 6. "Career status is not faculty status. If we relax now and do not continue, we shall have succeeded only in attaining second class citizenship in the university community." Kudryk's comments were in reaction to the disclosures of J. Gus Liebenow, Acting Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs, in a talk presented to IUNLA members on March 30. (See Scoop Sheet, Supplement 2, April 10, 1972.)

Quoting from the Faculty Handbook (see below) Kudryk indicated that librarians at I.U. have always been second class citizens in the university community and that career status would not raise them to a higher level.

When asked if he thought the librarians should reject career status in favor of making an all-or-nothing push for faculty status, he replied: "Definitely not. Fringe benefits are important. The danger lies in equating career status with faculty status. You see, the fringe benefits look good to some of us, and they make it tempting to simply accept a little without demanding what is rightfully ours.

"You must understand that this was a bargaining situation; so it was only natural for the buyer to try to get his commodity for less than the asking price. The commodity in this case was the library professional staff, and the price was faculty status. What we have to do is accept the proposed program as a down payment and not as payment in full. It was wrong of the Carmony Committee to reconcile the minority and majority reports."

Kudryk was then asked whether he thought that the fringe benefits had
been the real reason for pursuing faculty status. Doesn't career status give us everything we had wanted? "Perhaps," he answered. "Perhaps some librarians feel that way. I understand that, but I do not agree with it. Look, the library is central to the purposes and functions of a university. If the library is bad, then the university is bad. Faculty status for librarians is one way of insuring high quality librarianship. Only when librarians are on an equal footing with the faculty and only when we have first class citizenship in the university community can we hope to place the library in its proper location. Otherwise, as second class citizens, our ideas are ignored and the library also becomes second rate. This is very dangerous for the university."

What, then, Kudryk was asked, did he think of the notion of a separate but equal status for librarians? Some librarians have indicated that they would favor such a situation, and others have said that career status is a de facto separation with equality.

"Why division?" he asked. "The university should be one sound, healthy body. Why do we have to have separation? This is not war. We do not need separate camps. There is no reason for division. If you look at Carmony's report (report of the Committee on the Career Status of Library Personnel, Appendix III, Historical Background and Committee's Charge, released by Dean Liebenow with his communique of March 24, 1972, Further Developments on Career Status for Librarians; see below) you will see that something has gone seriously wrong.

"The language is clear," said Kudryk. "It is not open for interpretation. The Faculty Council and the librarians were in agreement: librarians were to be given faculty status. Some people say that the Faculty Council's resolution was passed in the last ten minutes of the meeting, but this makes no difference. It could be passed in the first, middle or last ten minutes of the meeting; it is still a resolution. In the State Legislature they stop the clock when there is no more time and important legislation must be made. A bill passed by Congress is still a passed bill, no matter when it is passed.

"But notice the name change. It is no longer faculty status, but career status when the committee is charged by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. There is nothing about considering status in the Faculty Council resolution. The charge then was to implement faculty status.

"This is why I say we may need legal assistance. We are concerned here with our legal position in the university community. So what can we do when we are treated unfairly? I don't know, but legal counsel
might help us. We should also petition university authorities involved in recommending and implementing faculty status until they act in full accordance with the Faculty Council's resolution. We should use the support of the AAUP, long interested in the special problems of college and university librarians. The AAUP voted last year to admit librarians to national membership without requiring that they have faculty status. Also, assistance to academic librarians might be available from the Association of College and Research Libraries. I strongly believe that our endeavor to achieve full position in the university community started several years ago will bring positive results."

1 Faculty Constitution, Article 1, Section 4: Associate Members

Persons who are administrative officers of the University who do not hold academic rank and all persons holding academic appointment but who do not qualify as voting members shall be associate members of the faculty. An associate member shall have all membership privileges except that of voting.

2 In response to the Byrnes Report and the request of an ad hoc group representing professional librarians, the University Library Committee studied anew the status of librarians and submitted a report and two recommendations to the Faculty Council:

a) That professional librarians be accorded full faculty status and,

b) That a special committee be established to formulate principles and procedures for determining faculty rank of librarians and to revise where necessary the language of the Faculty Handbook to reflect the proposed change.

The motion to adopt the report and the two recommendations was passed unanimously by the Faculty Council.

In response to the resolution of the Faculty Council the Committee on Career Status of Library Personnel was appointed by Vice President Joseph R. Hartley on February 16, 1970, with the following charge:

a) Formulate the minimum academic and professional requirements one must meet to be considered a professional librarian.

b) Formulate the principles and procedures for determining the rank of individual professional librarians. Rank does not necessarily mean the faculty ranks instructor through professor but could be a progression through such titles as Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian and Librarian.

c) Indicate revisions where necessary in the language of the Faculty Handbook (on promotion, tenure, retirement plan, etc.) to reflect
any proposed changes in the status of librarians.

On April 14, 1972, Oleg Kudryk circulated the following petition to professional librarians:

Dr. John William Ryan, President
Indiana University
Dear Dr. Ryan:

We, the undersigned librarians, have become acquainted with the Report of the Committee on the Career Status of Library Personnel which was just recently released and discussed with Dr. J. Gus Liebenow, Acting Vice-President and Dean of Academic Affairs. We have also become aware of the letter accompanying the Report, signed by Dr. Don Carmony, Chairman of the Committee, which explicitly stresses "not to recommend faculty status and rank for librarians." We therefore wish to express our disappointment, frustration and disagreement concerning such recommendation. The Committee did not act according to the resolution passed by the University Faculty Council on June 3, 1969: "That professional librarians be accorded full faculty status; and, that a special committee be established to formulate principles and procedures for determining faculty rank of librarians and to revise where necessary the language of the Faculty Handbook to reflect the proposed change." Therefore, we request that you re-initiate positive action on the unanimous resolution of the Faculty Council by adopting the Report of the Faculty Library Committee and the Council's two recommendations as presented in the attached copies. We sincerely hope that under your leadership the goal of years of hard work may be realized, and full faculty status will be accorded to professional librarians in the full spirit of the resolution of the Faculty Council and under its authority according to Article IV, Sections 16b and 17 of the Faculty Handbook.

cc: Mr. Donald C. Danielson, President
    Board of Trustees

Dr. Robert H. Shaffer, Secretary
University Faculty Council

More than 60 signatures were affixed to this petition. Dean Liebenow responded with a telephone call to Oleg Kudryk on Monday, April 24. Kudryk's memo of the same date referred to that conversation.
"This is to inform you that I have received this morning a telephone call from Dr. Liebenow, Acting Vice-President and Dean of Academic Affairs, regarding our petition which was mailed to President Ryan. Dr. Liebenow assures us that channels of communication with him in this matter are open."

In addition, on Thursday, April 27, Kudryk sent the following memo to Dean Liebenow.

"With reference to our telephone conversation of Monday, April 24, concerning the interpretation of the petition addressed to President Ryan, I wish to reiterate that the petition was in no way intended to stop the present process of implementation of faculty status for I.U. Librarians. The intent was rather to stress that in this process of implementation the spirit and validity of the Faculty Council resolution should be preserved."

THE CARMONY LETTER WITH A FOOTNOTE

Quite a few librarians have already seen, unofficially, the cover letter to the report of the Carmony Committee, released by Dean Liebenow on March 24, 1972. The letter was itself referred to in the discussion on March 30. Some librarians have expressed an interest in the letter, and some who have seen it have expressed dissatisfaction with it. It is reprinted here in toto with the consent of Dean Liebenow and Dr. Carmony.

Dr. Joseph R. Hartley
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dear Dean Hartley:

Enclosed is the final report of the Study Committee concerning the career status of librarians. Both it and this letter have been unanimously approved by members of the committee (with the exception of Jared Curtis who has not met with the committee since last summer because of his absence from campus during all of this academic year). Enclosed are signed responses indicating the concurrence suggested. Such concurrence is complete save for the item regarding voting and representation — as noted in the report.

In this final report the committee has centered its attention upon the particular niche and circumstances which apply to Librarians within the academic structure of the University. The increasing emphasis on limiting faculty to persons who actively participate in classroom teach-
ing, the special place which librarians occupy within the University's academic structure, and the growing realization that librarians would presumably fare better as regards promotion, tenure, leaves, grants, and the like if evaluated principally by their own peers on the basis of criteria immediately relevant to them have been key considerations which have resulted in an unanimous decision not to recommend faculty status and rank for librarians.

Our report presupposes Librarians to be professionals and presumes that their professional contributions are central to and of growing importance to the University's achievement of its academic goals. Our recommendations place librarians firmly and securely within the academic structure and body of the University. We believe they will enable the University to attract and retain librarians having outstanding talents and strong commitments to the academic program of the University as well as to their own professional growth and achievement as librarians.

It goes without saying that the ultimate effectiveness of these recommendations depends in large part upon the spirit as well as the manner in which they are implemented. We urge that they be sympathetically interpreted by representatives of the general administration of the University, and we also urge that such sympathetic interpretation be a continuing responsibility of the administrative officials of the various library systems — currently Bloomington campus; Indiana University—Purdue University, Indianapolis; and Regional Campuses. We hope that these recommendations can be implemented at an early date. Although we trust that the question of voting and representation will be appropriately resolved by the key faculty bodies involved, it is recommended that the remainder of the report be implemented without waiting for the resolution of this important item.

If additional elaboration regarding any of the items in the report or this letter would be helpful, such will gladly be offered through conference or letter in accordance with your preference. I regret that completion of this report has taken months longer than originally anticipated, but I believe that the best interests of the librarians and the University have been served by the prolonged and forthright exchange of views among members of the committee and the consultants.

With cordial regards, I am

Very truly yours,
Don Garmeny, Chairman
University Committee on the Career Status of Librarians
When Dr. Carmony was contacted by Monty Maxwell to gain permission to reprint the cover letter, he asked that these additional remarks be included.

As indicated, I have no objection to your use of the letter under my name transmitting the report of the committee re career status of librarians to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Since, however, it was not addressed directly to librarians, I am adding these remarks pursuant to our telephone discussion. They are essentially a personal footnote concerning the deliberations of the study committee.

Although I have served on a number of general university committees, I have never served on any in which the discussion was as protracted and the exchange of views as full and frank as in this instance. The library representatives shared generously, freely, and vigorously in this discussion.

The most fundamental—and it seems to me the only truly basic—point of cleavage within the committee concerned faculty versus library status for librarians. For a number of sessions this was almost the sole topic considered. During this phase of its work the three library representatives on the committee spoke persistently and forcefully for faculty designation. The remaining members divided on this issue—three favoring and three opposing faculty status. (As I have stated on various occasions, my support was on behalf of library ranks and status.)

Somewhat past midway in our deliberations the committee made known its fundamental cleavage re faculty versus library ranks. Its members then participated in and listened to the feedback which came. As a result, agreement followed to seek general and all-university approval for library ranks. This decision developed from the view that more could be accomplished by such a change than by any other course which had been suggested.

From here on consensus developed rapidly as regards what should go into the final report of the committee. Moreover, from here on substantial additional emphasis was put upon matters which had heretofore had lesser consideration. The final report speaks for itself re these matters, but it gives emphasis to librarians as professionals, to the importance of librarians sharing in financial and professional benefits generally available to faculty, to "tenure" for librarians, to increased participation of librarians in decisions regarding personnel and professional status, and the like. These items—apart from library versus faculty status—are items of very great importance and potential for librarians.
In this "footnote"—already a bit extended—I do not argue the pros and cons of faculty versus library designation. I grant, as I have from the outset, the evident conviction and devotion of those with whom I disagree. I may indeed be incorrect in my conviction that librarians have more to gain—and will have fewer headaches to face—through an appropriate professional library status than through faculty status. If the substance of the committee's report is implemented in a cooperative, understanding, and appropriate manner the advantages therefrom accruing to librarians should be increasingly recognized.

The response to the committee's report sets the stage for librarians to participate significantly in decisions concerning their own professional status and at the same time to augment their academic niche within the University. But all this doubtless depends in no small degree upon the ability any willingness of librarians to accept the professional standards and obligations, both implicit and explicit in the report, and demonstrate their ability and willingness to make important additional and continuing contributions to the Library and University as a result thereof.

I know of no one who contends that the current study is the "last" such effort. It could not possibly be. There have been various prior studies, and there will be others from time to time. The existing report has given librarians a much better chance than ever before to become a significant factor in their own affairs and also to gain a larger niche within the University. This is an opportunity—and a challenge—which librarians can neglect only at their own peril.

My thanks to you and many other librarians for numerous courtesies extended during the last few years as I have gained increased information and understanding concerning matters pertaining to librarians.

Most sincerely yours,
Donald F. Carmony

COMMENTS ON CAREER STATUS BY THOMAS J. MICHALAK AND ALAN R. TAYLOR

It is understandable that many librarians should be concerned with the Carmony Report's deviation from the principle of full faculty status for librarians, a goal towards which librarians at I.U. have been working for over four years.

All the arguments as to why librarians should be granted full faculty status, and why the resolution of the Faculty Council in this regard should be followed, have been aired at library staff meetings, were given full exposure in numerous discussions with librarians concerned with the status movement, and were reiterated exhaustively in the working sessions
of the Carmony Committee and in the discussions with university administrators which followed. It should be pointed out however that a university is not an institution governed by a single set of moral principles. On any question there is usually more than one legitimate point of view. The problems of university governance are invariably problems of the allocation and deployment of scarce resources—men and women, money, and materials—and the principles invoked tend to be political considerations. The faculty status movement has been, and remains, essentially a political struggle.

The creation of the Carmony Committee did not provide a market-place in which commodities were to be bought and sold; it provided a bargaining table. It became quite clear very early in the meetings of the Committee that we were negotiating faculty status with representatives of the faculty and the university administration who certainly did not feel bound to a strict interpretation of the faculty council resolution, furthermore the wording of Dean Hartley's charge provided an immediate clue to this effect. Nevertheless the library representatives, Dean Buhner, and Professors Richards and Curtis argued forcibly for over a year that the Faculty Council resolution should be adhered to without emendation, and proceeded (in our majority report) to give substance to those views. A meeting with the then Chancellor Ryan, Chancellor Carter, Chancellor Hine and Dean Hartley provided the opportunity for them to demonstrate the depth of their implacable resistance to the notion of full faculty status for librarians.

Many different arguments have been raised and are still being raised against the granting of full faculty title and status to librarians by different members of either the faculty or the university administration. From our point of view the most important argument against full faculty status at I.U. arises out of the very nature of this university. The policies and procedures for promotion and tenure are determined by the ideals prevailing in the arts and sciences where senior faculty members by and large set, maintain, and apply the criteria. Those criteria are research and publication to the tenth power, teaching to the fifth power, and service to the second power. While librarians may have observed a number of inconsistencies in the application of this formula in the past, and while many faculty members consider the formula to be patently unfair—pointing out the inherent paradox in giving undue emphasis to criteria based on research capabilities to individuals whose supposed prime responsibility is teaching—there is little doubt that in a university with an important graduate school there are powerful forces operating to maintain the status quo. Indeed when a period of economic
stress and an overloaded job market in academia is coupled with a cry for higher standards there is little inclination on the part of university administrators or senior faculty to depart from the formula. For most librarians the very nature of our positions and the type of work in which we engage preclude an academic performance which would enable us to meet those criteria. And AAUP rules demand that a faculty member be given tenure or be released. It should be emphasized that there exists a positive unwillingness to expand or re-structure the criteria so that they become more appropriate to librarians, or indeed any other members of the academic community other than teaching faculty. When it was pointed out that admission to faculty rank, promotion and tenure had been done quite flexibly in the past, current attitudes indicated that this had constituted a grievous error on the part of the administration, and would never be repeated in the future. While the library representatives did not agree with the arguments presented we became convinced that, for the present, they were unsurmountable. Stalemate.

The entire period of negotiations was charged with enormous difficulties. It should be realized that the faculty status movement was initiated, led, and supported by members of the professional staff without the active support of the library administration. There was moreover a considerable range of opinion on the question of faculty title and on the very question of status itself within the professional ranks of the library. Clearly we were not bargaining from a position of maximum strength, and the university administration was well aware of this. It was seriously suggested that full faculty rank and status be offered to those librarians who had already demonstrated their ability to survive faculty promotion and tenure procedures by virtue of their already possessing a record of research, publication, and teaching. We rejected this suggestion because it was felt to be elitist, divisive, and failing to meet the professional and academic needs of the majority of librarians.

By March of last year the nature and extent of the obstacles to progress had been fully determined and a fresh tack was adopted. Our position was explained in a memorandum dated March 26, 1971 which was sent to all librarians. A general meeting was called for April 6, 1971, and the set of alternative proposals was discussed and voted upon. These proposals, which subsequently formed the heart of the Carmony recommendations, called for the establishment of a separate structure of ranks analogous to those of the teaching faculty, a separate promotion and tenure procedure, and a number of other points, which, if approved would
effectively give librarians academic parity with the faculty. These proposals were endorsed by the vast majority of librarians present at the meeting.

The university administration has made only minor changes in the recommendations approved by librarians at the April meeting, and has proceeded to implement them in a spirit of good faith. The administration furthermore has indicated that its policy is to bring about complete parity between librarians and faculty, and we have been invited to bring to the attention of the Dean of Faculties' office any further instances of official discrimination.

We cannot share some librarians' pessimistic interpretation of what has been achieved thus far. For all practical purposes librarians have indeed joined 'the faculty' where 'faculty' means 'academic community.' We have not gained faculty titles; but many faculty members and librarians alike feel quite strongly that a professorial title should be reserved for an individual who earns his living by class-room teaching.

Another 'loss'—if indeed it can be called that—is that for the time being librarians have a separate promotion and tenure track whereby librarians will be evaluated on the basis of professional criteria broad enough to be appropriate to the individual's role in the library structure wherever he or she may be. Of considerable significance however is the acquisition of a set of instruments (sabbatical leaves, access to research funds, and participation in the academic life of the university) by which librarians may set about demonstrating that they are indeed central to the academic process by upgrading the scholarly practice of our profession. The next few years will be of enormous significance, particularly to the younger members of our staff who will have the opportunity to develop our professional criteria and to make them more scholarly so that, at the appropriate time librarians may return to the issue of full faculty rank and status armed with the certainty of being able to pass through the faculty promotion and tenure procedures. We need now to work together to ensure an effective implementation of the proposed structure and accompanying professional standards.
INTERFACE:

The U.G.L. Listening Room
by
Jean Taylor

A performance of Hamlet featuring Paul Scofield. Sound tracks of W. C. Fields on radio and screen. An interview with Angela Davis. Ralph Nader's latest appearance on campus. Eugene Ionesco reading Les Chaises in French. The morning calls of a gibbon in China. What do these all have in common? They are all part of the Listening Room collection on the second floor of the Undergraduate Library. The Listening Room now contains about 2500 tapes and is still growing. The emphasis has always been on spoken word recordings, but some musical tapes that apply to cross-disciplinary courses have been included. About 1000 to 1500 students use the collection each month. Among the heaviest users are students in literature, drama, speech, Afro-American studies, and radio and television. The Listening Room does not have any foreign language instructional tapes, but does include a considerable amount of poetry, prose, and drama in their original languages.

In building its collection, the Listening Room has worked closely with several campus agencies. Much of the original collection was obtained from the Language Laboratory. The Listening Room now purchases most of its new materials out of the UGL book budget, but all taping and duplicating is still done by the Language Lab. The Language Lab also services Listening Room equipment. Halls of Residence Libraries notifies us when they have new recordings of interest to us and allows us to tape them; we, in turn, give our new records to them once we have a master tape. The Audio-Visual Center taping many campus events for us and Radio-Television is also an occasional source of new tapes. We also receive recordings that are supplementary materials to books; the morning calls of the gibbon in China is an example of this type of tape. The books are kept in the stacks; patrons are referred to the Listening Room by notes in the book and the card catalog.

The past year has brought some major changes to the Listening Room. Always a non-circulating collection of open reel tapes in the past, the Listening Room has been transferring the entire collection to cassette tapes and has been circulating them since January, 1972. It will still be some time before the transfer is complete, but student response so far has been good. The most enthusiastic reaction, though, has been for the ten portable playback cassette players we loan out. Very often all ten
of them are out at once. Both cassette tapes and players are subject to
two-day loan periods. Most gratifying so far to Listening Room person-
nel is that the students who have used the machines have been very care-
ful with them; we have as yet had no problems with theft or major damage.
This may renew our faith in humanity.

Our goals for the coming year are to complete the transfer to cassette
and to make the collection more accessible to potential patrons. In or-
der to accomplish this latter goal, we are recataloging the entire col-
lection and plan to put referral cards in the UGL catalog this summer.
We would also like to listen to those anthologies that lack complete con-
tents notes and thoroughly analyze them. Since cassettes don't have
tables of contents, the patron is completely dependent upon the card
catalog to know which works are included on a recording. We would also
be interested in compiling an index to our poetry anthologies, since
there is no Granger's Index for recorded poetry. We are following de-
velopments in the field of video cassettes with great interest. It will
probably take a couple of years for hardware and software to become com-
pletely standardized, but once this happens the medium could be of great
use to I.U. students. As with everything else, the deciding factor will
be the budget.

**OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

April 30 - May 3: Annual Clinic on Library Applications of Data Pro-
cessing with theme of "On-Line Systems Applied to Library Automa-
tion." Information: Mr. Sigler, Division of University Extension,
Illini Hall, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

May 4 - 5: The Second Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Aca-
demic Libraries will be at Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti,
Michigan 48197.

May 9 - 12: The Convention of the National Microfilm Association to be
held at the Coliseum in New York City.

May 18 - 20: Annual meeting of the Midwest Academic Librarians Confer-
ce will be held on the Northwestern Campus. "Momentum for Aca-
demic Library Change" will be the theme this year. The conference
schedule will include program meetings, formal tours of the North-
western University Library and the Regenstein Library (University of
Chicago), and general luncheon and dinner sessions on Friday. Charles
Stevens and Walter Metsch, Jr. will be dinner and luncheon speakers.
Mr. Stevens is Executive Director of the National Commission on Li-
braries and Information Science, and Mr. Netsch is the architect of Northwestern's Library and the Regenstein Library at the University of Chicago. The five program meetings scheduled for Friday are: "Copyright Law Confrontation," "The Periodical Bank Concept," "The MINITREX Program: Minnesota Interlibrary Teletype Exchange," "The Northwestern University Library Building," and "Automation in the Northwestern University Library." Information: Mr. Theodore F. Welch, Chairman, MALC Planning Committee 1972, Assistant University Librarian for Public Services, Northwestern University Library.


May 22 - 23: Institute on Teaching Special Librarianship will be held at the School of Library Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. The event is being co-sponsored by the SLA Education Committee.

June 4 - 8: 63rd Annual Conference of the Special Libraries Association will be held at the Statler Hilton in Boston, Mass. Information on the conference program can be found in the February 1972 issue of Special Libraries.

June 11 - 15: Annual meeting of the Medical Library Association will be held at the Del Coronado in San Diego.

June 25 - July 1: ALA Annual Conference.
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