
Letters

BI and information literacy

To the Editor:

Being strong proponents of instruction, whether it be for bibliographic or other types of instruction, we are supportive of the exuberant sentiments expressed by Hannelore Rader in her article, "Bibliographic Instruction or Information Literacy," which appeared in the January 1990 issue of *C&RL News*. We should all be glad to have an advocate of instruction who is willing to discuss the issues so enthusiastically. Without doubt, the instruction arena will continue to broaden, presenting new challenges for academic librarians. The importance of striving to increase the visibility and value of librarians in the information retrieval process is a real concern and one where everyone's consciousness needs to be raised in a variety of ways. As the Steering Committee for the 1989 ACRL/BIS-sponsored Think Tank, "Educational Roles for Academic Libraries: State of the Art and an Agenda for the Future," we wish to provide some points of clarification to Hannelore's article.

It is important to remember, however, that information literacy was not the sole topic of discussion during the Think Tank's deliberations. In Hannelore's zealotry to share her ideas, she may have inadvertently misrepresented the purpose and rationale of the Dallas Think Tank. The Think Tank *did not* meet "under the auspices of ALA's *Information Library [Literacy] Report*," and information literacy was not the only issue discussed. The goal of the Think Tank was to identify strategic issues which would challenge the future development of instruction programs in academic libraries. Information literacy is certainly a key issue. However, the group identified other issues which merited equal consideration. The Think Tank began with a thought-provoking discussion of past accomplishments and unresolved issues presented by William Miller. Other issues included general curriculum reform and the manner in which libraries can participate in shaping new educational offerings for students, discussed by Maureen Pastine and Linda Wilson. The impact of changing demographics on the development of new instructional programs and the rise of new user education constituencies was addressed by James Shedlock and Betsy Wilson.

Also crucial in the profession is the effect of these issues on library school curriculum. An exciting new paradigm for library education was introduced by Martha Hale, Allison Level, and Elizabeth Frick (in absentia).

Another concern is that several reports are being confused and mixed and matched to the point where they are beyond recognition. Not only is there some confusion in Hannelore's piece in this regard, but the full potential of the stimulating BIS CE Discussion Forum, "Information Literacy or Bibliographic Instruction: Semantics or Philosophy," held at the ALA Midwinter Meeting, was not reached because the documents referred to were not clearly identified. It appeared that most of us became lost in a sea of references to documents, some of which had appeared in press and others which had not.

It seems beneficial to review these references so that we might familiarize ourselves more fully with them. First, in Hannelore's article she refers to the *ALA Library Report*. We suspect she is actually citing the American Library Association's Presidential Committee on Information Literacy Final Report (issued January 1989). This report is available from ALA. It is important to realize that this report represents the thinking of a diverse group of information professionals and is not connected to the BIS. Second, many of the ideas expressed in Hannelore's article were expressed in a co-authored paper she prepared for the Think Tank and presented by Hannelore and a colleague, William Coons of Cornell University. That paper will be included in the proceedings of the Think Tank, which we anticipate will appear later this year. It is not available for pre-publication distribution. Third, the only published account of the Think Tank, at this point, is the December 1989 *C&RL News* article (authored by Baker, Sandore, Hensley, Larson). Finally, an executive summary (unpublished) of the Think Tank has been prepared by Beth Sandore and Randy Hensley and is available to interested readers by contacting Betsy Baker, Northwestern University Library, 1935 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208.

We hope that the objective of the Think Tank will not become lost in the swell of the information literacy debate. The very nature of a think tank presupposes an intensive group process. Consequently the end result was one product shaped by a group, which touched on a multitude of concerns and topics. Because of this, we believe it is important that all participants receive recognition for the ideas generated by the Think Tank. By the same token, our aim is to highlight all of the important issues that emerged from the Think Tank, not to single out one, so that the profession can consider and prioritize the full spectrum of challenges that we face. Our objective throughout this process is to

maintain clarity of publications and ideas as they are developed and to encourage further discussion and action on the agenda that emanated from the Think Tank. We hope that this letter helps to achieve that goal. —*BIS Think Tank Steering Committee; Betsy Baker and Mary Ellen Larson, co-chairs; Beth Sandore, Randy Hensley, Melanie Dodson, Deborah Campana.*

Response from Hannelore Rader:

I appreciate the thoughtful letter submitted by the BIS Think Tank Steering Committee clarifying

the purpose of the BIS second think tank meeting held before the 1989 ALA Annual Conference in Dallas. It was not my intention to misrepresent the purpose, rationale, or content of this most important and exciting event. However, it was my intention to stimulate debate on the relationship of bibliographic instruction and information literacy and I am pleased that this is now beginning.—*Hannelore Rader, Director, University Libraries, Cleveland State University.*



INNOVATIONS

Fines for food: A citation system to control food and drink consumption in the library

By Pat L. Weaver-Meyers

*Access Services Department Head
University of Oklahoma Libraries*

and Stephen D. Ramsey

*Security Supervisor
University of Oklahoma Libraries*

Many libraries face the problems associated with food and drink consumption by patrons. Some institutions have student lounges within the library; others simply cope with food and drink brought in by patrons. Uncontrolled, the situation can pose a potential hazard to the collection and an unsightly custodial challenge. In 1985 the University of Oklahoma Libraries implemented a citation system to control food and drink consumption in unauthorized areas in the library. The system has proven reasonably effective and has provided some additional unforeseen benefits.

Background

In 1982 Bizzell Library at the University of Oklahoma opened a new wing that doubled the square footage of the main library structure. The new facility included a student lounge that con-

tained vending machines for snacks and drinks. The lounge was posted with signs indicating that consumption of food and drink outside of the lounge area was strictly prohibited. Not surprisingly, the signs were virtually ignored and library custodians soon began a losing battle with candy wrappers, drink cups, and associated litter. Library staff were drafted to confront violators and demand that they retire to the lounge with food or else dispose of it. Neither the custodians nor staff appeared to have any measurable impact on the consumption of food and drink, and concern for the safety of the collection began to develop.

At the same time the new wing was opened, student library security assistants were hired to patrol the library due to the increased square footage and remote, poorly lit areas of the building. Although not originally hired with this intention, the new assistants were soon conscripted into the