

The Primary Source

Volume 35 | Issue 1

Article 1

2018

Effective Archival Instruction When Embeddedness Won't Work

Greg Johnson

University of Mississippi Main Campus, gj1@olemiss.edu

Jennifer Ford

University of Mississippi, jwford@olemiss.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/theprimarysource>

 Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), and the [Information Literacy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Johnson, Greg and Ford, Jennifer (2018) "Effective Archival Instruction When Embeddedness Won't Work," *The Primary Source*: Vol. 35 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/theprimarysource/vol35/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Primary Source by an authorized editor of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

Effective Archival Instruction When Embeddedness Won't Work

The standard “one shot” archival instruction session has recently been overshadowed in archival literature by a focus on the importance of embedded instruction, with an emphasis on multiple guided instruction sessions for classes. While these innovative techniques offer many advantages, this paper argues that the “one shot” model still holds relevance, especially for small institutions with limited staff sizes. The authors’ collaboration on such sessions over the course of a decade have resulted in changes to archival instruction at the University of Mississippi. This article discusses these changes and offers both lessons learned and examines benefits of a flexible “one shot” approach as well as limited multi-session instruction.

History of Archival Instruction

The recent attention to the evolution of archival instruction has produced an astounding plethora of surveys, articles, books, pamphlets, and websites.¹ Although many approach the topic in varying ways, most of these treatments share some familiar points, especially regarding the history of the archival education movement. Most scholars cite the first in-depth attention to instruction in archives to the late 1970s, when Elsie Freeman initially coined the term “archival education” and urged professionals to include instruction as a part of their mandate, as well as the traditional focus on collection access.² Before this time, it is clear that most archivists saw themselves simply as liaisons between the researcher and the collections, a vehicle to ensure the right material made its way

¹ A literature analysis of the field reveals both an exponential growth of attention to the topic, as well as a distinct evolution in its growth since the early 2000s. Some of the first methods of analyzing the issue during this period developed from authors such as Elizabeth Yakel (2003), Deborah A. Torres (2003), and Marcus C. Robyns (2001), who attempted to define effective archival instruction and examined the best ways of teaching what Yakel and Torres termed “archival intelligence.” The effectiveness of problem-based learning paradigms in archival instruction were a natural outgrowth within the field, with authors such as Debora Cheney (2004), Barbara Ferrer Kenny (2008), Barbara Rockenbach (2011), and others examining the issue. Many authors during this period have also examined the ways in which outreach has impacted the effectiveness of archival instruction, including studies by Greg Johnson (2006), Doris Malkmus (2010), Justin Tomberlin and Matthew Turi (2012), and others. Much of the current literature addresses the nature of embedded archivists and librarians, such as the work by Cassandra Kvnid and Kaijsa Calkins (2011), Cory L. Nimer and Gordon Daines III (2012), David Shumaker and Mary Talley (2009), and others. Many recent scholars have also continued earlier calls for more systematic study and further surveys into the effectiveness and nature of embedded teaching, such as M.G. Krause (2011).

² Magia Krause, “Undergraduate Research and Academic Archives: Instruction, Learning and Assessment” (Ph.D., The University of Michigan, 2010), 7-8.

to the right patron at the right time.³ A number of factors worked to change this worldview from the 1980s through the early 2000s, including: an increase in the availability of primary sources to students, the Carnegie Foundation's 1998 publication *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities* (i.e, the Boyer Report), the Common Core State Standards Initiative in 2010, as well as other developments in education scholarship.

The concept of students retaining information while working as “active builders” was the main thesis of education literature during this period, and it directly influenced the scholarship about archival instruction. Much of the research in the last thirty years has indicated students retain little if placed in a “passive” instruction environment but remember much more when placed in situations where they are actively engaged using a problem-based learning method. In the 2016 Society of American Archivists (SAA) publication, *Teaching with Primary Sources*, the authors describe this type of learning as one where a student has to “struggle to make sense of new information by integrating it into an existing framework or building one around it.”⁴ Under these parameters, it is this “struggle” and use of critical thinking skills that increase retention because students are allowed to “do” history instead of merely attempting to absorb it in a lecture.⁵

The publication of the Boyer Report in 1998 coincided well with this sea change in education scholarship. This report advocated teaching students through discovery with instructors serving as “mentors” rather than deliverers of information.⁶ Noting that information was more effectively conveyed to students through this active method, the authors of the Boyer Report went on to campaign for more research-based instruction. They even went so far as to include this objective in their list “Ten Ways to Change Undergraduate Education.”⁷

³ Aaron G. Noll, “Teaching Archival Skills to Undergraduates” (History/Archives Capstone Paper 2, University of Massachusetts Boston, 2014), 1.

⁴ Christopher J. Prom and Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, eds., *Teaching With Primary Sources* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2016), 34-35.

⁵ Noll, 1-2; Marcus C. Robyns, “The Archivist as Educator: Integration Critical Thinking Skills Into Historical Research Methods Instruction,” *The American Archivist* 64 (Fall/Winter 2001): 376; Barbara Ferrer Kenney, “Revitalizing the One-Shot Instruction Session Using Problem Based Learning,” *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (2008): 390-391; John S. Riddle, “Where’s the Library in Service Learning? Models for Engaged Library Instruction,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 29, No. 2 (2003): 73.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

In 2010, in response to alarmingly low student performance, most state education departments adopted the Common Core State Standards Initiative.⁸ This national set of curriculum standards would directly impact archival instruction, as it especially promoted primary source research as one of the central tenets of teaching K-12. Aaron Noll states that Common Core “emphasized the development of research skills and critical thinking about primary sources.”⁹ The National Archives and Records Administration further emphasized these principles in their Digital Classroom site, which provides freely available K-12 lesson plans based around digitized primary documents.¹⁰

The American Memory Project from the Library of Congress also added to the availability of primary documents nationwide, which included enhanced corresponding lesson modules created with input by archivists.¹¹ Based on these developments, students entering as undergraduates are overwhelmingly much more familiar and at ease with primary documents as a part of their classroom experiences than in previous years.¹² In response, the archival literature has also broadened to incorporate these new theories and attention.¹³ However, in reviewing these recent publications there is a distinct focus on undergraduate instruction. Graduate students and outside groups are rarely mentioned. Several models of archival instruction are documented in the literature but there is one which seems to dominate in recent years as the form of preference—embedded teaching.¹⁴ In order to understand the arguments for all these models it is essential to review the various methods currently in discussion amongst archivists.

Models of Archival Instruction

Two models of archival instruction at opposite ends of the spectrum are the one-shot instruction session and embedded instruction. In the former, students

⁸ Prom and Hinchliffe, 17.

⁹ Noll, 4.

¹⁰ Krause, 8; U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. “Educator Resources,” accessed September 6, 2017 <https://www.archives.gov/education>

¹¹ Krause, 8-9; The Library of Congress. “Classroom Materials,” accessed September 6, 2017 <http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/>

¹² Noll, 4.

¹³ Noll, 4; Julia Hendry, “Primary Sources in K-12 Education: Opportunities for Archives,” *The American Archivist* 70 (Spring/Summer 2007): 115-116.

¹⁴ Stephanie J. Schulte’s article, “Embedded Academic Librarianship: A Review of the Literature.” *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 7, No. 4 (2012), accessed August 31, 2017, <https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ebliip/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/17466/14528> provides one of the most comprehensive reviews of recent scholarship regarding embedded librarianship and its development.

essentially have one instruction session with an archivist, while in the second model, students meet with an archivist multiple times over the course of a semester, sometimes outside of the traditional library environment. At its most embedded form, the archivist sits in with students during class. In other forms of archival instruction, there could be no face-to-face interaction between an archivist and students at all. Instruction could still occur through engaging students through online means, such as video or audio conferencing, or posting materials in Blackboard, Canvas, or other online classroom platform. Archivists could even be farther removed from direct engagement by creating online tutorials for students. There are also many hybrid forms of these models of instruction, which makes rigid definitions and roles difficult to set in most situations.

Pros and Cons of Embedded Instruction

While it seems clear from much of the research that having an archivist embedded with a class over the course of an entire semester is likely more effective than a one-shot instruction session for students truly learning archival research skills, it is not without problems. Scholars such as Matthew Brower and others note that the definition of “embedded librarianship” itself differs widely among institutions, often making standardization of programs difficult, though common characteristics do exist.¹⁵ Brower outlines several commonalities of successful library embedded programs, including: emphasis on collaboration between librarians and users; focus on developing partnerships; creating a service perspective; engagement with user experience and environment; among others.¹⁶

However, differences between institutions can often make for vastly different levels of engagement. For institutions with large numbers of archives staff or ones with staff whose jobs are dedicated to instruction, embedding in a class might not be too much of a drain on the resources of the archive. The potential time commitments for embedding with multiple classes could pose a burden on archives staff at institutions with too great a ratio between archives staff and potential classes. Unlike some larger institutions, where job responsibilities can be more narrowly focused, archivists at lesser-staffed institutions often have to “wear multiple hats.” It is not uncommon for staff

¹⁵Matthew Brower, “A Recent History of Embedded Librarianship: Collaboration and Partnership Building with Academics in Learning and Research Environments,” in *Embedded Librarians: Moving Beyond One-Shot Instruction*, eds. Cassandra Kvenild and Kaijsa Calkins (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2011), 3.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.

responsibilities at smaller institutions to include meeting with donors, acquiring collections, physically processing collections, describing collections in finding aids, digitizing materials from collections, creating metadata for these digital objects, creating physical and online exhibits, working at reading room reference desks, paging materials, answering detailed reference questions, filling AV use requests from researchers, and much more, all the while having to serve on committees and conduct their own research to meet tenure and promotion requirements.

In these situations, finding time to embed within one or more classes for the length of a semester can prove to be difficult. Not only can it be hard to find the time to do this, the time an archive staff member is away or engaged with these classes strains the others in the department who have to ensure all of the other job responsibilities get done.

Embedded archival instruction has some differences with general library embedded instruction. One is that the often rare and fragile nature of archival materials makes it problematic to transport them out of the archive into classrooms across campus. Some of this could be overcome by highlighting archival materials that have been digitized and are available remotely, but the nature of the materials adds an additional layer of complexity to taking the archive outside the building.¹⁷ In other cases, some professors simply do not want archivist intervention into their classes at the levels seen in some forms of embedded instruction. Some professors simply have too much of their own material to cover during the course of a semester to have their students spend extra class time devoted to archival research instruction.

History of Archival Instruction at the University of Mississippi

The instruction program in the Department of Archives & Special Collections at the University of Mississippi was formally established in the spring of 1999. Before that time, there were infrequent presentations and tours based primarily around campus events but by late 1998 a dedicated effort to incorporate archival education into curatorial responsibilities began. Early numbers were weighted towards outside group sessions, as there has traditionally been a great deal of interest in the collections from non-campus users. University of

¹⁷ One article addressing some solutions to these problems is Anne Bahde's "Taking the Show on the Road: Special Collections Instruction in the Campus Classroom," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 12, No 2 (Fall 2011), accessed December 14, 2017, <http://rbm.acrl.org/index.php/rbm/article/view/354/354>

Mississippi faculty are gradually becoming more aware of opportunities for archival instruction in their courses. Statistics reflect this interest in tailored instruction sessions for both UM classes and outside groups. Since 2007, the staff of Special Collections have taught 290 instruction sessions for approximately 6330 students, as well as tailored sessions for 281 outside groups totaling 6603 people. In addition, from 2012- 2017 instruction numbers have increased by 35%.

Many of the classes taught for University classes are from disciplines or academic units with a traditional association with primary source research, such as English, History, Southern Studies, Political Science, and the Honors College, among others. However, over the last six years faculty from more areas without a historical connection to archival research have been bringing their classes to Special Collections, such as Journalism, Accountancy, Anthropology, Military Science, English as a Second Language, and Management. These classes are roughly split between graduate level classes and undergraduate courses.

The majority of the archival instruction for outside groups is for undergraduate and graduate classes from universities across the country but there are also tailored classes for regional and nationally located high schools, international touring groups, civic organizations, senior groups, book clubs, churches, historical societies, and summer camps, among others.

Some outside group instruction coincides with conferences at the University, such as the Faulkner & Yoknapatawpha Conference or the Blues Symposium. In addition, the exhibit program and lecture series in Special Collections draw the interest of many directors of groups who then seek sessions. In all cases, the archives tailors its instruction program to the subject focus of the University class or outside group and all instruction involves some interaction with the archival materials by the participants.

The growing demand for classes developed due to word of mouth across campus, knowledge of collection strengths of interest to specific groups, as well as from the outreach efforts of Special Collection staff. To keep up with these elevated numbers and limited staff size, the department established a cross-training program whereby all staff and faculty in Special Collections would be able to teach certain subject areas which are of prime interest.

Department specialists began creating templates for historically popular subjects, and shared them across the department for potential future use. As staff update and create new templates, instructors place copies in the shared folder for future use. In addition, archives instructors share copies of their specialized

handouts for instruction sessions amongst department members. Specialized PowerPoints created for archival education orientations and scans of primary documents relevant to the subjects of various classes are now part of the program and shared within the department. In addition to the cross-training program, many instruction sessions in Special Collections are co-taught by staff. This co-teaching allows for more variety of subject specialization in the programs, as well as aids staff in learning more about new acquisitions in other units of the archives.

As alluded to earlier, staff size can be a limiting factor when facing the development of an instruction program. The University of Mississippi's Special Collections has recently faced both increased interest in instruction, growing collection responsibilities, and decreasing numbers of staff. The cross-training program and co-teaching helps to spread the ability to teach sessions but the prospect of adding a robust semester long embedded program, although exciting, is currently daunting. After evaluating the types of classes most frequently requested it is clear that embedding staff into classes would in many cases be impossible and often not of interest to the primary instructor.

However, the staff of UM's Special Collections have long been interested in making the "one shot" session more relevant for students and outside groups, as well as teaching multiple sessions whenever appropriate and possible. Based on staff experiences, input from class instructors, and research into the archival literature, several types of sessions incorporating different methods of instruction have evolved. All the variations of instruction sessions share certain common denominators, especially the goal of teaching students "archival intelligence" through forms of active learning whenever possible.



Photo of an archival instruction session. Photo by Robert Jordan/Ole Miss Communications

Various Approaches Taken at the University of Mississippi

Multiple approaches to instruction are currently practiced by UM's Special Collections. These include: a form of the "one-shot" orientation for outside groups; another more detailed "one shot" session for University classes; "active learning" classes for one class period; and "active learning" sessions comprising two class periods.

Although many classes taught for outside groups have similar features as a traditional "show and tell," there have been some adaptations in order to make the experience more enduring for the participants. University of Mississippi staff tailors all sessions to the focus of the group. The normal structure includes a brief overview of the department, examples of archival searching techniques (although this is often abbreviated), as well as an in-depth discussion of the archival materials related to the subject which are pulled for interaction. Special Collections staff also frequently work with the instructors/leaders in advance to learn specific works being studied by the groups, as there are always items in the collection offering the opportunity of encountering an unexpected aspect of the work or subject of interest.

For sessions taught to groups from beyond the university, the staff frequently asks for their syllabus in advance, allowing for more focused presentations. Archives staff encourage questions throughout the session and, after the main session concludes, participants are invited to interact with the materials and pose one-on-one questions with the curators. In addition, many of students are required by their professors to write reaction papers about these sessions which are a part of their coursework. Professors from these classes also often involve the archivist in the planning of their own instruction approaches to the topic, utilizing facsimiles of materials from the University of Mississippi collections after returning home. In addition, groups unaffiliated with the university frequently reach out to the archivist to ask for suggestions as they pursue their own research interests.

The current form of the “one-shot” session normally used for University of Mississippi classes also has features similar to a traditional orientation, although it incorporates techniques to encourage retention and return visits. These tailored sessions normally include information about the department, examples of archival searching techniques, a discussion of the archival materials pulled for the session, and a period for student interaction with the sources and the curators. However, a noteworthy deviation from the more general orientation is that most of these single sessions are often the result of an extended planning process involving collaboration with faculty.

The planning process itself varies in many cases, although there are commonalities among all. The professor lets the archivist know the course theme(s) and then the archivist selects applicable potential primary sources for the initial meeting with the professor, as many professors are unfamiliar with the collections. Following the initial meeting, the archivist and faculty often enter an email dialog which helps refine and finalize the list of sources. The majority of these classes also involve the creation of handouts which usually follow a similar format, including: instructor contact information; instructions about archival searching; a list of selected online resources; descriptions of relevant primary and secondary resources in the archives (physical and digital); as well as often including instructions about citing archival materials. [See Appendix 1 for an example of a class handout.] Reaction papers or semester long research projects are often the impetus for these sessions. As a result, curators are also often involved with multiple office visits from students throughout a semester as they work on their papers.

As the staff became more aware of some of the benefits of “active learning” more single sessions began to focus on demonstrably fewer archival sources and incorporated longer interaction with associated activities for particular types of university instruction. As with the other types of teaching models, these classes are the result of collaboration with faculty, often over the course of weeks. [See Appendix 2 for an example of an archivist working with an instructor to plan such a class session in the Archive.] After extensive planning, the archivist and professor determine if an active learning module would be the best fit. The work between the archivist and professor for these types of classes is similar to the process used for the more traditional orientation, however there are distinct differences that are outlined below.

In addition to handouts created for the classes, the faculty and archival instructor normally develop a series of questions or an activity oriented around specific sources chosen during these collaborative planning meetings. The questions relate to the overall course goals of the professor, encourage archival education, and offer an opportunity for the student to spend time actively engaging with primary sources. The questions devised are normally open-ended and invite personal reflection as well as historical interpretation by the student. The archivist also usually helps to create context for the students by including a short history of the collections from which the source is taken. In addition, the professor frequently provides advance discussions about the session in order to help prepare students. Professors and archivists create “stations” where themed groups of documents are situated. After a very brief orientation by the archivist, students work with the selected materials, use the handout, and answer questions, as the professor and archivist remain on hand to assist whenever needed. However, students are left on their own as much as possible so that they take agency in their work and own interpretations. [See Appendix 3 for an example of questions asked at one of these archives class stations.] The professor normally spends some time in another class session to discuss and reflect. Research papers are often assigned after these classes, although this type of session is often simply to introduce the students to the archives.



Photo of one of the themed stations for an interactive instruction session.

Recently Special Collections instruction has expanded beyond the one-shot session. These normally take the form of one class devoted to department orientation by the archivist, an extensive overview of archival searching methods, a brief discussion of the project in the next class period, and plenty of time for questions and interaction from students. The first class is normally shorter than the second session. The next class period involves student work with the selected sources and an activity involving the materials. The archivist and professor remain on hand to assist when needed but again student work is overwhelmingly self-motivated. These tailored sessions are again the result of extensive collaboration with faculty, with specific sources selected, questions developed and context created for student handouts. Just as with the one class “active” session, the decision to engage in this type of multi-session instruction develops

out of the work in advance between the archivist and professor. Professors interested in these classes normally decide to devote two class periods since they have students unfamiliar with archives who are required to use primary sources in their semester long research papers. Lesson plans created by the professor and archivist have recently also become a component of this type of instruction.

Selected Reactions of Students and Professors

Several professors who have brought their classes to Archives and Special Collections offered their perspectives about these one-shot instruction sessions. One professor wrote, “In a single class session, students become much better educated, thanks to the well-organized, enthusiastic, and substantial presentations by the Special Collections Librarians.” This professor continued, “I bring my classes to the Archive because most of them have no idea of the resources, rare artifacts and otherwise fascinating material housed [there].” This professor brings classes every semester because she “. . . realized that the Archive would be not only an interesting field-trip but, especially a rare supplement to my course material . . . I realized what an impact these visits made to my classes when I first asked for written reports on the presentations. Students used words like ‘awesome,’ ‘amazing,’ ‘fantastic.’” The classes from this particular professor consist of all undergraduates, who are not given specific research assignments requiring them to use archival resources. They are, however, required to write reaction papers to these presentations. In some of the reports, “several students have mentioned that they see great potential for their future research, especially for honors theses.”¹⁸

Another professor, who brought students to the Archive for a one-shot instruction session, wrote, “I wanted my students to have the hands-on experience with history that Special Collections allows. I wanted them to reflect on how the archival material they were handling constituted the building blocks of the historical scholarship they read in our class. Secondly, I wanted them to have the opportunity to examine primary sources with different perspectives and put those sources in conversation so as to have a multi-dimensional understanding of the past.” She continued, “I am teaching the introduction to US history after Reconstruction in the Honors College. It’s a smallish class of 17 students. I thought the class size would be small enough to make a visit realistic, in contrast to the times I’ve taught this course with 70 students. It’s part of my general approach to teaching history to give students an opportunity to actually *do* history

¹⁸ Email from Dr. Joan Hall to Dr. Jennifer Ford, March 15, 2017.

at some point during the course. For them to have even a basic understanding of what historians do, I think it's important for them to see the kinds of spaces historians occupy while they do research—to see a reading room, to glimpse the process of requesting boxes, to see archival material.”¹⁹

To do this type of instruction effectively within the space of one session takes careful planning. This professor wrote, “The curator was tremendously helpful in identifying sources that would be helpful for my students to examine since she has such a deep knowledge of UM’s holdings. This would have been a difficult task for me to do on my own given that I have zero knowledge of the material in Special Collections. In addition to her expertise on the content, the curator also helped me to imagine how we might organize class time, setting up thematic stations where students could look at sets of documents in small groups. She also helped me create handouts that students completed while visiting the stations.”²⁰

For this particular class, the archivist and professor agreed on a limited topic area of race relations, and created stations with only a few archival items each. The professor wrote, “I think this approach also gave students enough time to really engage with a few documents—to do close reads and really consider the worldviews of the people who created the sources. Too many sources would have likely given them a view of the past at too high an altitude for what I was hoping they’d experience.”²¹

Our department gives many presentations to groups from outside our university. The quote below illustrates the perspective of one such group leader about the process. In response to an informal question by the archivists regarding the effectiveness of this type of outside group instruction he wrote: “Without exception all of the groups with whom I have come to your Archives have been enriched by their experiences in your Library. When I encounter my former Faulkner class students at alumni functions, to a woman or a man, they all talk about how enlightening and memorable the trip to Oxford was for them, and they always mention the presentations put on by you at the Archives as having expanded their understanding of the environment in which Faulkner lived and worked and also the magnitude of his contributions to American and global literature.”²² A group leader from an academic institution who has been bringing

¹⁹ Email from Dr. Rebecca Marchiel to Dr. Jennifer Ford, April 11, 2017.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Email from Dr. Charles Chappell to Dr. Jennifer Ford, April 11, 2017.

students annually since 2008 included a reference to the benefits of active learning in correspondence with the archivist: “Students are required to keep a journal during our weeklong trip [to Mississippi], and consistently students...highlight our visit to the archives as an important time of learning.” Expanding upon this statement the group leader explained why he initially sought out the archives for such a session: “We originally began visiting the archives to help students engage history in a more intimate way, and it has indeed given a more personal encounter of the historical course material.”²³

True pre- and post-testing of students is needed to accurately assess the effectiveness of archival instruction techniques, but we gained some insight into student perspectives through comments in their reaction papers. It is often unclear how well students might have learned archival research techniques, but they usually learn something from these sessions. After seeing materials presented from the James Meredith Collection one student wrote, “I was excited to learn that there was a place, such as Special Collections, that I could further pursue my interest in a figure so integral to the University’s history.”²⁴

Summary/Room for Improvements

It is clear that although providing more of the elements of embedded instruction would offer many advantages, it would pose numerous issues, as well as not always being possible, or in some cases appropriate for the majority of classes we teach. However, the archivists have made a concerted effort to enrich the “one shot” session, so that students retain more from the experience and make return research visits. Although many of these additions have been very well received, there is always room for growth and improvement. For example, a professor recently suggested an organizational change to the overview portion of a multi-session class, which will allow students to interact with the documents in the first session more frequently throughout the discussion, thereby encouraging even more engagement. We try these types of changes, whenever possible, to keep archival education techniques flexible and open to new ideas from non-archivists. Undoubtedly, there are a myriad of other ways to make this type of instruction more relevant. It is our hope that these types of discussions will begin to occur even more frequently within the archival community, as we contend that a majority of archives are in a situation similar to that of our department.

²³ Email from Mr. Ray Jordan to Dr. Jennifer Ford, April 26, 2017.

²⁴ Email from Dr. Joan Hall to Dr. Jennifer Ford, March 15, 2017.

Unless the number of archives staff increases, it is clear that the most embedded forms of archival instruction are not plausible at the University of Mississippi. In addition, traditional embedding is impractical for groups and classes from outside the confines of the University, and such groups form a large part of the department's instruction efforts. For now, incorporating more active learning activities into "one shot" sessions, and holding multi-session instruction for some graduate classes is manageable and effective for introducing students to primary source collections and teaching the skills needed for effective archival research.

Appendix 1: Abbreviated example of a class handout for an archival instruction session.

Mississippians and WWI: Selected Archival Resources in the Department of Archives & Special Collections, University of Mississippi. History 309, Dr. Susan Grayzel

Contact Information

Dr. Jennifer Ford Head of Archives & Special Collections 662.915.7639 jwford@olemiss.edu	Ms. Lauren Rogers Library Specialist 662.915.7408 Leroger4@olemiss.edu
---	---

Using the Archives

Researchers may access collections between **8am and 5pm Monday through Friday**; Before beginning research in manuscript collections, turn in a [researcher registration form](#) at the Reference Desk and show a photo ID. **If possible, please give two days advance notice of an intended visit, indicating which collection and box numbers you would like to review** (see above contact information for Jennifer Ford or call 915-7408 for the Reference Desk).

Subject Guide

Although material related specifically to the World War I is listed below, researchers may find additional material on the subject by exploring other resources described on our [Wars \(Excluding the American Civil War\) Subject Guide](#).

Selected Manuscript Collections:

Allan Boyce Adams Collection. This collection contains the World War I correspondence from Allan Boyce Adams, a member of the 42nd Rainbow Division. Most of Adams' correspondence is with his mother, Evie Lowrey Adams in Claremont, Mississippi. Writing from his stations in France and Germany, Adams offers insight into soldier morale, training, weather conditions, medical care, and the gratitude extended to soldiers by local citizens. Finding aid available online at <http://purl.oclc.org/umarchives/MUM00003/> Also available as a [digital collection](#).

Jennie and Lucia Adams Collection. 1845-1925. Contains correspondence between Jennie Adams, Lucia Adams, Boyce Adams, Frank Black, and Mrs. L.E. Bobo during the Spanish-American War and World War I. In addition, the collection includes photographs and miscellaneous cards from the World War I period. Finding aid available online at <http://purl.oclc.org/umarchives/MUM00004/>

Potential Subject Areas of Interest for Selected Manuscript Collections:

Note: These are a few potential topics of interest for a few of the collections listed above. There are many others to consider within all of the listed collections.

The Disconnected Homefront: Allan Boyce Adams Collection

Soldier Morale: Allan Boyce Adams Collection

Peacekeeping: Boyce Henderson Collection, Allan Boyce Adams Collection, Ralph Mitchell Weed Collection

African Americans and WWI: Ralph Mitchell Weed Collection, Boyce Henderson Collection

Women at War: Nelson Collection

Women and the Homefront: James E. Edmonds Collection, Womans Book Club Collection

Selected Primary Source Publications:

Horace L. Baker, *Argonne Days: Experiences of a World War Private on the Meuse-Argonne Front Compiled from his Diary* (Aberdeen, MS: Aberdeen Weekly, 1927). Born in Greenwood Springs, Mississippi, Baker served in the 32nd Division of the U.S. Army during World War I. Call Number: [D570.9 B23](#).

Martha Reece Bone, *Itawamba County, MS World War I draft registration records : with selected information from censuses, cemetery books, and Social Security death indexes* (Greenville, MS : M.R. Bone, 2007). Call number: [D570.85.M71 I83 2007](#)

Selected Secondary Sources:

Sarah Lucas Loggins, *Military Annals of Leflore County, Mississippi Battery C, 140th Field Artillery World War I* (Greenwood, MS: Baff Printing, 1969). Contains a history of Battery C as well as the individuals who belonged to it. Call number: [D570.32 140th L6](#).

Lafayette County, Mississippi, in the World War, 1917-1918, A.D. compiled by the authority of David Reese Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, through their Regent, Mrs. Calvin S. Brown [D570.85.M71 L3 1926](#) (OVRs)

W. Allison Sweeney, *History of the American Negro in the Great World War : his splendid record in the battle zones of Europe* (Chicago : Printed by Cuneo-Henneberry Co.], c1919). [D639.N4 S8](#)

Citations:

Citing primary sources gives appropriate credit to the creators of documents and also assists future researchers to rediscover the source.

While conducting research in archival manuscript collections, keep track of the following information about any non-published item that may be useful in your project:

- Author
- Title or description of item
- Date(s)
- Collection name (including box number and folder number)
- Name of archive or repository

- URL or identifier if consulting digital collection material

Based on *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.), 2010. See pages 749-752.

Full identification of most unpublished material usually requires giving the title/description and date of the item, name of the collection, and name of the depository. In a note, place the item first followed by the remaining elements, maintaining consistency in the sequence adopted. In bibliographies, the main element is usually the entire collection in which specific items were found and the repository. Citations for material consulted in digital collections will usually be the same as citations of physical collections, aside from the addition of a date accessed and a URL.

Example note:

Letter from Julie Smith to James Meredith, 3 October 1962, James Meredith Collection (Box 5, Folder 7), Department of Archives and Special Collections, University of Mississippi.

Appendix 2: Abbreviated example of collaboration between a class instructor and an archivist to plan an active learning class session in the Archives.

The portions in black are the session activity questions and prompts, the text in red contains questions and points from an archivist to the instructor, and the highlighted portions are responses from the class instructor. This example is included to demonstrate the planning of Archives sessions to ensure the topics covered best meet the needs of the class.

Questions for History 106 Special Collections Visit

[JF: After we discuss next steps and I incorporate whatever suggestions you might have, I'd be more than happy to add your brief introductory notes if you send my way. I'd also be happy to format the handouts so students have room to write their answers. And I'll assume the responsibility of bringing the handouts to the meeting.]

Big picture:

As you go through the four stations, find evidence from any of the archival sources to fill in the following prompts:

1. Find two examples in which the authors argue that the South is unlike the rest of the United States:

- a. ___
- b. ___
2. Find two examples of authors referencing history to make their arguments:
 - a. ___
 - b. ___
3. Find two examples that reveal the persistence of scientific racism [JF: this is a theme we discussed a lot in class so far]:
 - a. ___
 - b. ___

Stations:

[JF: Any feedback would be great, but also don't spend too much time on me! At first I wrote (and saved) a few questions for each of the individual documents, but I thought those questions might be too narrow. What I have here instead are broader questions for the whole station rather than a particular document. What do you think about this strategy? I'm happy to revise to make the questions more specific, and to include references to specific documents (like I did with "religion question 2"). Thanks for your help!]

Popular Culture:

[JF: I had a hard time coming up with questions here. Do you have any suggestions? I'm not a strong material culture scholar, unfortunately!]

Contextual information: The postcards date from the late 1930s and reflect a segment of the popular culture of that time. The sheet music dates from 1916 and again reflects a dominant belief at that time in the benign nature of the antebellum South. They were individual purchases and a part of two artificially created collections in Special Collections known as the Race Relations Collection and the Race Parody Sheet Music Collection. The publication, *When the Spirit Says Sing!* is from the cataloged collection in the Blues Archive in Special Collections.

1. What specific images and texts reinforce stereotypes about African Americans?
2. What key themes do the songs emphasize as elements of African American identity?

Appendix 3: Example of questions asked at one of the Archives stations during the second session of an active learning class.

Station – Religion

1. What are some thoughts that came to mind as you read the letter to Wofford Smith?
2. What are some thoughts that came to mind as you read the letter to Duncan Gray from Frank Smith?
3. What are some thoughts that came to mind as you read the letter to Governor Ross Barnett from the campus ministers?
4. Using the letter to Wofford Smith and the letter to Duncan Gray, how can two people from one religion have different views about issues (i.e., integration)?
5. Describe how the people and/or situations in these artifacts promoted and/or hindered diversity and inclusion?

References

- Bahde, Anne. "Taking the Show on the Road: Special Collections Instruction in the Campus Classroom." *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 12, no 2 (Fall 2011), accessed December 14, 2017, <http://rbm.acrl.org/index.php/rbm/article/view/354/354>
- Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, S.S. Kenny (chair). *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*. State University of New York-Stony Brook, 1998.

- Brower, Matthew. "A Recent History of Embedded Librarianship: Collaboration and Partnership Building with Academics in Learning and Research Environments," in *Embedded Librarians: Moving Beyond One-Shot Instruction*, eds. Cass Kvenild and Kaijsa Calkins, 3-16. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2011.
- Cheney, Debora. "Problem-Based Learning Librarians as Collaborators and Consultants." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 4, no. 4 (2004): 495-508.
- Hendry, Julia. "Primary Sources in K-12 Education: Opportunities for Archives." *The American Archivist* 70 (Spring/Summer 2007): 114-129.
- Johnson, Greg. "Introducing Undergraduate Students to Archives & Special Collections." *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 12, no. 2 (2006): 91-100.
- Kenny, Barbara Ferrer. "Revitalizing the One-Shot Instruction Session Using Problem-Based Learning." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (2008): 386-391.
- Krause, Magia. "Undergraduate Research and Academic Archives: Instruction, Learning and Assessment" (Ph.D., The University of Michigan, 2010).
- Krause, M.G. "It Makes History Come Alive For Them: The Role of Archivists and Special Collections Librarians in Instructing Undergraduates." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 36, no. 5 (2010): 401-411.
- Kvenild, Cassandra and Kaijsa Calkins, eds. *Embedded Librarians: Moving Beyond One-Shot Instruction*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2011.
- The Library of Congress. "Classroom Materials," accessed September 6, 2017 <http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/>
- Malkmus, Doris. "'Old Stuff' for New Teaching Methods: Outreach to History Faculty Teaching With Primary Resources." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 10, no. 4 (2010): 413-435.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. *Common Core State Standards*. Washington, D.C.: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010.

- Nimer, Cory L. and Gordon Daines III. "Teaching Undergraduates to Think Archivally." *Journal of Archival Organization* 10, no. 1 (2012): 4-44.
- Noll, Aaron G. "Teaching Archival Skills to Undergraduates" (History/Archives Capstone Paper 2, University of Massachusetts Boston, 2014).
- Prom, Christopher J. and Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, eds. *Teaching With Primary Sources*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2016.
- Riddle, John S. "Where's the Library in Service Learning? Models for Engaged Library Instruction." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 29, no. 2 (2003): 71-81.
- Robyns, Marcus C. "The Archivist as Educator: Integrating Critical Thinking Skills into Historical Research Methods Instruction." *The American Archivist* 64 (Fall/Winter 2001): 363-384.
- Rockenbach, Barbara. "Archives, Undergraduates and Inquiry-Based Learning: Case Studies from Yale University Library." *The American Archivist* 74, no. 1 (2011): 297-311.
- Schulte, Stephanie J. "Embedded Academic Librarianship: A Review of the Literature." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 7, No. 4 (2012), accessed August 31, 2017, <https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ebliip/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/17466/14528>
- Shumaker, David and Mary Talley. *Models of Embedded Librarianship Final Report*. Special Libraries Association, accessed August 28, 2017, <https://www.sla.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/EmbeddedLibrarianshipFinalRptRev.pdf>
- Tomberlin, Jason and Matthew Turi. "Supporting Student Work: Some Thoughts About Special Collections Instruction." *Journal of Library Administration* 52, nos. 3-4 (2012): 304-312.
- U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. "Educator Resources," accessed September 6, 2017 <https://www.archives.gov/education>
- Yakel, Elizabeth and Deboarh A. Torres. "AI: Archival Intelligence and User Experience." *The American Archivist* 66 (Spring/Summer 2002): 51-78.