Transforming the One-Shot Library Session into Pedagogical Collaboration

Information Literacy and the English Composition Class

Heidi LM Jacobs and Dale Jacobs

Heidi LM Jacobs *is Information Literacy Librarian, Leddy Library, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.* ***Dale Jacobs*** *is Associate Professor, Department of English Language, Literature and Creative Writing, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.* *Submitted for review August 1, 2008; revised and accepted for publication November 24, 2008.*

Reference & User Services Quarterly, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 72–82
© 2009 American Library Association. All rights reserved.
Permission granted to reproduce for nonprofit, educational use.

This article examines the programmatic and philosophical changes that resulted from a collaboration between a librarian and a composition and rhetoric professor. In particular, this article examines the ways in which a focus on research as a process arose from this ongoing dialogue and how the collaboration itself put two disciplines in conversation, thereby transforming thinking beyond this one relationship.

MAPPING THE COMMON GROUND

It all began with a casual observation between an information literacy (IL) librarian and a professor of composition and rhetoric: research is as much a process as writing. Like effective writing, effective research does not happen in just one sitting but involves iterative processes such as revision, reworking, rethinking, and above all, reflection. Why is it, we wondered, that we incorporate these concepts into the teaching of writing in our composition courses but not into the teaching of research? This article examines two central questions that emerged over the months that followed that casual observation: first, what might a focus on research as a process contribute to the teaching of IL in English composition courses and second, what can be gained by a collaboration that not only puts into dialogue two practitioners in two different disciplines but also two bodies of scholarship and professional knowledge? Through this collaboration, each of us began to look at our individual work and disciplines in broader terms and consider larger questions related to student learning and learning communities on our campus. Further, it made us think about the nature of collaboration and the need for all parties involved to be able to contribute meaningfully to a common pedagogical goal.[1]

Those of us who work in the fields of IL and English composition would say that we are student-centered, that we are involved in pedagogical practices that enhance teaching and learning for the benefit of all students on campus. At the heart of both disciplines lies attention to student engagement in research and writing processes. However, when we focus only on our own disciplines, we miss opportunities to see the larger picture of student learning on campus and to learn from each other's pedagogical practices and discussions. When we talk only to those who teach what we teach, we run the risk of mistaking our part for the whole

or thinking about what we teach in isolation from other forms and forums of teaching and learning. Christy R. Stevens articulates such thoughts in terms of IL:

> The [ACRL] standards acknowledge that neither librarians nor subject faculty are equipped to meet IL objectives on their own. . . . Creative collaborations that are responsive to the specificities of a given institution and its constituencies are, ultimately, what the document implicitly calls for, and they are precisely what instruction librarians should attempt to develop and deliver to their campus communities."[2]

In other words, we should be asking ourselves about the diverse needs of our diverse student body. How does what we teach fit into those sets of needs? How might our teaching relate to other teaching on campus? What could we learn from the ways in which teaching and learning happen in other parts of campus?

As we—Heidi, an IL librarian, and Dale, a composition and rhetoric professor—began the collaboration that is detailed in this article, it became apparent that both of us had, each in our separate spheres, been asking these questions of ourselves. Further, we realized that by engaging in a sustained dialogue about teaching and learning with each other, we could not only better engage the immediate learning needs of students on campus, we could also enhance our own pedagogical theories and practices through exposure to new ideas and new questions. Of course, this view of collaboration is not new. Nor are the notable parallels between library and information science (LIS) and composition and rhetoric. Jeff Purdue, James Elmborg, and others have convincingly described the intellectual and conceptual parallels between the two fields.[3] Purdue, a former composition teacher, has noted "any writing process is provisional, subject to constant change, and never neatly sequential. And, in fact, the research process is quite similar."[4] Elmborg has written astutely about the connections between IL and Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs and argues that "one of WAC's strengths, according to its practitioners, is that it has integrated a multitude of theoretical perspectives into a dynamic theory of writing. Many of these perspectives could be employed just as effectively to understand information literacy."[5] What remains to be discussed in greater detail is how collaborations between composition and rhetoric and IL might work both in theory and in practice. This article is not meant as a description of how such collaboration could be replicated elsewhere but is, instead, an attempt to show how one librarian and one professor collaborated on a shared pedagogical vision and to illustrate what emerged from a collaborative venture.

The challenges and potentials of librarian–faculty collaboration are well documented in LIS scholarship. For example, Ruth Ivey writes,

> A review of the literature from the last decade identified many existing information literacy programs, as well as the key issues and barriers to developing effective programs and collaborative partnerships between librarians and academics. But it failed to find information about the roles of partners and the collaborative process of planning, delivering and evaluating learning programs.[6]

Further, as Claire McGuinness writes, "despite an ideological commitment to pedagogical innovation within the post-secondary sector, in many cases the inclusion of IL, both as a desired outcome, and as a tool of undergraduate education, remains an aspiration rather than a fully realized ideal."[7] She adds, "To date, the actual voices of faculty have been featured to only a marginal extent in LIS papers in general and in those dealing with IL in particular, which are written largely 'by librarians for librarians.'"[8] This essay seeks to address the gaps described by Ivey and McGuinness and to provide two voices and two perspectives on how we might attempt to move IL from an aspiration to a "fully realized ideal." We ask, what is possible in pedagogical collaboration? What does meaningful pedagogical collaboration between a librarian and a faculty member look like? In short, we examine the programmatic changes that resulted when a librarian and a professor engaged in creative and critical dialogues about composition and IL.

NEGOTIATING THE COMMON GROUND

When Heidi started as an IL librarian at the University of Windsor's Leddy Library, one of the first areas she wanted to consider was English composition because it was an area in which she taught before becoming a librarian. In examining LIS scholarship, Heidi began to see that when she taught composition, her assumptions about the teaching of research were deeply flawed. After talking, both of us realized that even though each of us had spent years of trial and error honing our own research methodologies and processes, we

somehow expected that the librarians could teach students everything they needed to know about research within an hour. Even though as teachers we insisted that students see writing as a process, we tended not to say the same things about research. We both knew that scholarly research was never linear and never replicable from project to project, yet our course schedules and assignments revealed an assumption that that a single "dose" of library instruction would teach students all they needed to know about research. Even though we constantly challenged the recurrent view that a first-year composition course is one-stop site at which to "fix" student writing or that composition could be an inoculation for "bad" student writing, we did not apply the same ideas to the teaching of research within composition courses.

In retrospect, we now see that our conception of research pedagogy was very much in keeping with McGuinness's findings that many faculty assume "that students would somehow absorb and develop the requisite knowledge and skills through the very process of preparing a piece of written coursework."[9] In our shared discussions, we have come to understand that if we are indeed committed to teaching IL skills to students, IL needs to be fully integrated into a course, its assignments, and all of the habits of mind related to the course and its learning communities. The immediate challenge remains: How do we go about doing that?

To begin, we needed to articulate and build on the commonalities that exist between our pedagogical projects. At the University of Windsor, composition is a class that helps students to critically examine the ways in which they are situated by and can situate themselves in discourse and learning—in effect, to read and write not only the word, but the world as well. The aim of the program is to help students develop a set of habits of mind through which they become self-reflective, flexible, and critical, able to negotiate their positions in relation to many different types of discourse and many different discourse situations. IL initiatives at Leddy Library are also rooted in a belief that students need to be able to be self-reflective, flexible, and critical in relation to information and different informational situations. Given the common ground between our two areas, the first-year composition course is perfectly situated as a site of collaboration.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR COMPOSITION PROGRAM

All composition sections taught by masters-level graduate instructors use a common syllabus; as director of composition, Dale chooses the course texts and sets the assignments, but each graduate instructor has flexibility within that framework for planning the course. Each graduate instructor also takes a graduate seminar, Composition Pedagogy: Theory and Practice, in the first semester that she or he is teaching. This course serves both as an introduction to the field of composition and rhetoric and as a support for the graduate instructors' development as teachers. In the course, students read and write about composition and pedagogical theory and discuss that theory in relation to their own classrooms. Through the course, the graduate instructors are asked to become self-reflective teachers for whom theory and practice are mutually informing. In addition, the graduate instructors attend weekly staff meetings. The aim is to give the graduate instructors as much support as possible as they embark on their teaching careers, instilling in them self-reflective habits of mind about teaching and emphasizing the need to continually think about the relationship between theory and practice, while at the same time introducing them to the discipline of composition and rhetoric.

While the first-year composition course has continually evolved, the basic idea—that students use writing critically, flexibly, and self-reflectively in a variety of contexts—has remained constant. The aim is to have students come to see writing not only as communicative, but also as a way of learning—of making meaning for themselves. Close attention is paid to rhetorical ideas such as purpose, audience, and context in a self-reflective manner that will allow students to transfer these habits of mind to a variety of discourses. In this way, the University of Windsor composition program is squarely in line with the Writing Program Administrators (WPA) Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, which focuses on developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes in four areas: rhetorical knowledge; critical thinking, reading, and writing; processes; and knowledge of convention (see appendix A).[10] While the textbooks, readings, and assignments have changed over the years, these learning outcomes have remained central to the first-year composition course at the University of Windsor.

Along with changes to texts and assignments, there have been continual changes to the research component of the course. Originally, the syllabus included a research packet in which students were expected to demonstrate their ability to find, critically assess, and use four types of research resources from the following list: books from the university library's holdings, periodicals

from the university library's holdings, newspaper articles from archives (pre–2000), articles from current popular periodicals or newspapers, websites, write-ups of participant observation, photographs, interviews, or films. After students had done their research and found their information, they were expected to write annotated and critical descriptions about each item they found and then to incorporate their research into a piece of writing of their own choice and devising. At this stage in the development of the course, there was some attention to research as a process, but it was still rudimentary, involving what we now see was a problematic lock-step approach to research. Even though Dale knew differently from his own experiences as a researcher and user of information, the research assignment made the collection of information more like a scavenger hunt than a critical, self-reflective process. In doing so, he was falling in line with a standard approach to research found in many composition programs across North America, ironically contradicting the well-established commitment to the teaching of the writing process within those programs.

For the first few years of the course, Dale was working with the library in a very loose way that will be familiar to readers. He asked the library to do one session for each section of the class in order to teach students how to use the library, and the library issued a call for volunteers to do these sessions. Upon reflection, Dale now sees that he was asking the library to inoculate *his* students against bad research habits, much as others on campus were asking him to inoculate *their* students against bad writing habits. It was at this point that we began to talk about possible theoretical and practical connections between composition and IL. In doing so, we began to see ways in which our individual and collective work could dovetail productively and creatively in both theory and practice.

EXPLORING THE COMMON GROUND

The Development of a Collaboration

As we began to talk, we quickly discovered our dialogue must encompass more participants than one faculty member and one librarian. The success of collaboration depends on meaningful, creative dialogue between all stakeholders, rather than just two. The previous model for this course was based on what Joan K. Lippincott describes as "library instruction," which is highly structured, of limited duration, and focused on the library. In this model the librarian is cast as expert guest lecturer.[11] This organizational approach meant that the coordinator of the composition classes would contact a librarian coordinator who would then enlist other librarians to provide library sessions. Librarians could meet with the director of composition, graduate teaching instructors, or with other librarians if they initiated such contact, but in practice this rarely occurred. Our new model is akin to what Lippincott describes as a learning community. She characterizes such learning communities as opportunistic, lasting for the duration of the course, and focused on the information environment. Here the librarian is a faculty partner who both learns and teaches.[12] A learning community is, of course, made up of numerous constituents, including, in this case, the director of composition, the IL librarians, the English subject librarian, the librarians teaching within the composition program, the composition graduate instructors, and the composition students. In the previous model, any discussions between members of these groups were informal and spontaneous, but in the current iteration, organized discussions form an important part of the planning and delivery of the course.

An important shift in the partnership between the library and the composition program happened when the IL librarians decided to establish a team of librarians for the English composition courses. The IL component of the collaboration was no longer staffed by whoever would volunteer but by a consistent team of librarians interested in IL. The idea of a team of librarians emerged from an innovative course taught at the University of Windsor called Ways of Knowing. In this course, groups of students were each assigned a librarian who would help them negotiate for the entire semester the information environment of their particular projects. The five to six librarians working with Ways of Knowing were, for the most part, the same librarians working concurrently with the English composition course. Librarians working on these two courses saw the benefits of working as a team, having a comprehensive understanding of the assignment and the course, and helping a particular group of students with the specific challenges of assignments throughout a course.[13] In this model, librarians formed an important part of the learning community of the course. Such an approach seemed perfect for composition. This shift helped create a community between the library and the director of composition, between teaching librarians, between librarians and graduate instructors, and between librarians and undergraduate students. Through these communities, librarians had opportunities to share ideas and talk about their teaching and their roles as teachers on campus in ways many librarians had not previ-

ously experienced. While the previous model had been to have the librarian as a solitary teacher, each doing his or her own sessions, the team approach encourages librarians to think of their teaching as part of a larger collective effort and themselves as part of a larger teaching and learning community.

The model of collaboration at the library complements the approach to teaching composition in which the graduate instructors and the director of composition act as a team to deliver the course. Both these collective efforts ensure that there will be productive discussions around teaching and learning within each sphere. However, we also began to see how vital it is that there are similarly productive discussions of teaching and learning *across* these spheres. Rather than limiting the contact between the library and the composition program to organizational talk between coordinators, the librarians and graduate instructors needed to talk to each other so that a learning community could begin to form within each of the classes and within the program as a whole. To further enhance this community, librarians and graduate instructors were paired for both semesters of the academic year, meeting one-on-one and working closely around the teaching of the research process and the completion of the particular assignment. The focus of our collaboration was no longer the library sessions themselves but the conversations, relationships, and learning communities that developed over the course of the year. This collaborative model helped us to engage in more effective thinking about how to approach the teaching of research and the particular research component of the introductory composition course.

One of the challenges of teaching research as a process within the composition program as it is conceived at the University of Windsor is that students taking composition come from all programs, all majors, and all years; an average class might include a visual arts major, a computer science major, a sociology major, and several undeclared students. Thus we (instructors and librarians) are not teaching discipline-specific research methods in the way that we might teach history majors how to do archival research or biology majors how to do scientific research. To complicate things further, we cannot assume that fourth-year students have had training in research or that first-year students have had none; some fourth-year students will never have been asked to do research for their classes while some first-year students will have done a number of research assignments. The realities of the course make the planning of the research component challenging for all parties. Realizing that the research assignment was not as productive or useful as it needed to be for students, we asked for substantial input from the IL librarians and the graduate instructors in redesigning the assignment and our approach.

The Development of an Assignment

Thinking about how to teach IL in composition brings information—not disciplinary concerns—to the forefront, especially because students are asked to devise and select their own topics. How, for example, could we talk about what makes for "appropriate" research sources when the most appropriate source for one student's topic will be *Rolling Stone* and another's might be statistical information from the Government of Canada's website. We could not say, for example, "only use peer-reviewed articles or scholarly monographs" since, for many topics like iPods or parkour, monographs or peer-reviewed articles simply do not exist. More importantly, we began to see in practical terms what Shannon L. Reed and Kirilka Stavreva have described: "Severing information literacy from critical thinking reduces it to a skill set, devoid of meaningful connection to ways of knowing and constructing information. Teaching it only as a part of a specific assignment likewise neglects its utility as a thinking process, relegating it to a means to an end."[14] As the discussions around possible revisions to the research assignment unfolded, we quickly realized that the previous research assignment Dale had designed and used for several years was inappropriate for the kinds of learning outcomes we wanted for our students because of its rigid categories of research. Instead of teaching rules and predetermining what sources of information were appropriate for their topics, we realized teaching a highly flexible and reflexive research process would better help students develop critical habits of mind regarding their topic's specific information requirements.

Further, we wanted to develop an assignment that would, as Reed and Stavreva describe, put information literacy "beside write-to-learn activities, which reinforce writing not as a means of producing a paper but as a way of critically thinking about and producing knowledge."[15] Like Reed and Stavreva, we wanted to develop an assignment that would "ask students not only to locate information but also to use prior knowledge in interpreting information, to evaluate the information they have found, and to use it to generate new knowledge. Viewed in such a pedagogical framework, information literacy becomes a powerful way for students to learn how to learn."[16] We also concur with Purdue, who cogently argues, "Information literacy

cannot exist in a vacuum; it has to be part of a *lived* response to research. In other words, theory and practice must combine with our experiences to create a pedagogy whose goal is to fully engage students, and ourselves, to work with them to achieve their goals, and also, perhaps, some goals that they don't know that they have."[17] Our rethinking of the research assignment not only made us theorize our existing practices but also made us work toward putting our theories into day-to-day practice throughout the various learning sites of this course. These realizations, as well as the assignment and activities we conceived, would not have been possible without input from both the library and the composition program. Together we were able to create a much more integrated assignment that arose organically from those involved. Critical, flexible, and self-reflective thinking by the team writ large allowed us to design an assignment that was more productive than would ever have been possible if it had come from only the library or the composition program.

EMERGING FROM THE COMMON GROUND

Our Assignment

In the two-part assignment sequence that we created, students are asked to research, explain, and contextualize a trend.[18] The first part of this assignment is the research packet; the second part is the research article (see appendix B). In the research packet (worth 20 percent of the final grade), students write about why they chose their topics and then consider the potential of their topics as researchable subjects. They then articulate research strategies and demonstrate that they have found and evaluated information for their topic. In the research article (worth 20 percent of the final grade), students build on the work they did in the research packet as they write articles in which they prove their trends exist, analyze the causes and effects, and contextualize it for their audiences. As conceived, this assignment draws on both the WPA Learning Outcomes Statement and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. However, it also works toward the goals of the Alexandria Proclamation on Information Literacy and Lifelong Learning that states that IL is "at the core of lifelong learning. It empowers people in all walks of life to seek, evaluate, use and create information effectively to achieve their personal, social, occupational and educational goals."[19] In this way, the revised assignment works toward integrating both literacy and IL into the fabric of students' lives, both inside and outside of school.

Because process is so important to the assignment and the course—not to mention the field of composition as a whole—we built process and reflection upon that process into the assignment itself. As James B. Tuttle and Steve McKinzie have described, requiring a research record in students' research assignments not only provided "another platform for sustained scholarly student conversation, but it also made the student's research process transparent, susceptible to instruction and guidance, and creditable by the instructor, who otherwise would know little of the unique research experiences of his or her students."[20] While process is often invisible in assignments that emphasize the final product, we wanted to make those often-hidden processes visible by asking students to include written reflections on how they engaged with research at all stages. By making the students' ability to articulate their research processes part of their grade, we emphasized the importance of such self-reflective thinking. As McGuinness has noted,

> Criteria for grading assignments almost always focus on the final outcome, rather than the information *processes* that led to the completed project. As a result, students receive no useful feedback on whether their research approach was effective. . . . Overworked students, who recognize that their information skills are unlikely to be graded separately, are unwilling to spend time in developing competency in this area—inevitably, they will put in the minimum amount of effort required to gain a pass grade.[21]

Not only does our research assignment sequence give students the opportunity to write reflectively about their research processes, but they are also given feedback on their research practices in the middle of the assignment sequence. This feedback is not only helpful for the present assignment but for future research as well. Students benefit from doing metathinking about their research, while we, in turn, benefit from seeing how students engage with and negotiate the research process. This feedback is invaluable in our ongoing conversations.

Our Information Literacy Classes

Students' self-selected topics for the 2006–07 academic year ranged from tattoos to mercury levels in fish, from steroid use in baseball to doctor

shortages in Ontario, from Sudoku to MP3s, and from extreme sports to phytoestrogens. When students arrived with their self-selected topics, it became even more apparent that librarians and graduate instructors could not teach one overarching research method or a lock-step research process. Further, we wanted to stress the concepts of IL and processes of research rather than teaching the tools of research. In the words of Reed and Stavreva, we wanted to focus our instruction on "critical engagement with the various forms and kinds of information available," not on the "technical know-how."[22] Because we wanted to emphasize process, the librarians structured their two to three sequential workshops around the research processes students would encounter in the course of doing the assignments. Here, librarians would walk through a small-scale version of the assignment students would be completing in order to model processes students might use as they considered and evaluated their topic's specific research needs. After talking about how to focus a topic and how to articulate information needs, we discussed the myriad sources of information and what each source's particular merits might be in terms of authority, reliability, currency, and suitability for their specific topics. We described to students the various sources of information they might find useful for their research (current or historical newspapers, monographs, reference works, statistical sources, government information sites, popular magazines, websites, scholarly journals, interviews with experts, etc.). Librarians would then, echoing the students' in-class activities all semester, ask students in groups to focus a topic into a trend, consider what kinds of information might be needed to discuss this trend, and then discuss what resources and tools would be useful for analyzing that trend. Heidi, for example, asked students in groups to consider the topic of gambling and to brainstorm ideas for trends related to this topic. Groups came up with trends such as increases in online gambling, the popularization of poker in popular culture, the rise of gambling among school-aged children, and the increases in gambling addictions in college-aged men. In sharing these different subtrends within a topic, students were able to see the numerous ways in which a single topic could be narrowed down and focused. Groups were then asked to select one trend and identify what kinds of information would best suit their needs. When students discussed these needs with the whole class, it became apparent that, although all groups were addressing the same topic, each trend required specific kinds of information. Some might need statistical data, others might need ethnographic research, others would need to consult the local newspaper, and others needed peer-reviewed articles or scholarly studies.

Discussions about information needs reminded students that before they began looking for resources using library tools, they first had to consider what information they needed to find and then consider what the best sources for their particular information needs might be. In reflecting on how to help students think about information for their projects, we wanted to underscore that, as David Weinberger succinctly states in *Everything is Miscellaneous: The Power of the New Digital Disorder*, "*discovering* what you want is at least as important as *finding* what you know you want."[23] Asking students to do some metathinking about information and discovering what they wanted to find for their projects greatly facilitated the finding part of the research process. Between the first and second workshops, for example, students in Heidi's sessions were asked to complete a brainstorming worksheet on their own topics to consider and identify their information needs. Bringing their completed worksheet to the second session—a hands-on workshop—students received instruction about some basic search strategies. Heidi and another librarian then worked one-on-one with students to help them consider their information needs and choices and to find the information and sources the students had identified.

Librarians teaching these workshops encouraged students to e-mail or come for follow-up help after the formal sessions; students frequently did. Students, seeing their librarian at the reference desk, often stopped by for further assistance. Follow-up sessions, whether formal or spontaneous, allowed librarians to see first-hand what barriers students were encountering when completing projects. Further, informal discussions with members of the reference staff also served to help guide and hone this assignment. Students, understandably, are often more frank with their librarians or with reference staff about what they like or do not like about a particular assignment. We discovered, as Stevens has described, that "reference librarians have a particular advantage in some cases, as they work with students when they are actively engaged in the research process. As such, librarians have valuable insight into both the common research problems that confront students and the types of research assignments that work well or that need revision."[24] Using librarians' observations and feedback about various incarnations of this assignment, we were able to fine tune the assignment and, in one case, delete a component

about Library of Congress Subject Headings that students struggled with in terms of its relevance or usefulness.

SEEKING NEW TERRAIN

Perhaps the most exciting part of our collaboration is not what we have done to date but the possibilities of what we might do in the future. As we reflect on what we have done, we see that it is not enough to simply recognize that research and writing are similar processes. Instead, we must work to facilitate and support the teaching of research as a process. To this end, both of us have been reading the scholarship of each other's disciplines to find new avenues of inquiry and new lenses through which to scan our common ground. In our most recent conversations, we have been focusing on the vital role played by graduate instructors in our students' learning. Our attempts to pair a librarian with a graduate instructor over the duration of the student's teaching assignments have proved to be fruitful in facilitating dialogues between instructors and librarians about recurrent questions or problems composition students encounter with these assignments. We have not, however, found ways to fully draw upon the dialogues happening between individual librarians, graduate instructors, and students in order to make programmatic changes. Tapping into graduate instructors' insights into their students' research processes is complicated because of the constantly shifting cohort of graduate students and the short duration of the masters program in English. We are currently developing a number of projects intended to support graduate students' roles as stakeholders in the ongoing reflection and development of the course. Finally, both of us understand that the model of collaboration we have developed might have other applications and might take other forms across campus.

REFLECTIONS ON THE COMMON GROUND

As we reflect upon this collaboration, we realize that what stands out as most important to us are not necessarily the changes made to the composition course or its assignments but rather the conversations that have started as a result of this collaboration. For Heidi, this collaboration has sparked conversations with other faculty members as well as other librarians. In these conversations, ideas and approaches gleaned from her collaboration with the composition program have led to discussions about how such a model could be applied in different courses and disciplines across campus. For Dale, this collaboration has led him to consider ways in which research and IL skills might be incorporated into other courses he teaches and ways in which other collaborations across campus might inform his teaching practices. Perhaps most importantly, the collaboration between the library and the composition program has mentored graduate instructors (many of whom pursue PhDs) in areas of research pedagogy not often addressed in graduate education. Further, graduate instructors leaving this program take with them a sense of the potential for campuses to be sites of collaborative teaching and learning. For graduate instructors who go on to teaching careers, we are hopeful they too will forge creative collaborations in their teaching.

In discussing her collaboration with English composition with other librarians, Heidi is often asked, "But how do I do this?" Although this particular collaboration was rooted in a preexisting relationship, such relationships are not imperative for collaboration. What is imperative for collaboration is the discovery of a common ground through conversation and dialogue. Collaboration, like research and writing, is a process that has to start somewhere. In our collaboration we began by noticing the areas of shared interest and inquiry and proceeded from there. It is important to note that our collaboration did not begin with an agenda to transform the composition program—it began with a casual observation that led to an informal conversation, which led to articles being exchanged through campus mail, which led to longer dialogues with more people, which led to changes that grew in scope over the months and years. Had we begun with large-scale questions and programmatic changes instead of small conversations, the scale would have intimidated us. Indeed, as Shelley Gullikson rightly notes, modifying the ACRL standards "to suit one's own institution, let alone the disciplines within it, would take a luxury of time most librarians do not have."[25] Considering large-scale modifications to programs is a daunting enterprise for most faculty and librarians given their workloads. Collaborations need to be grassroots: manageable and organic to a course, a teacher, a librarian, a library, an institution, and, above all, connected with all stakeholders—especially students. Starting locally and immediately, as we have tried to do with the English composition class and assignments, is one way we can begin to move forward and explore new terrain collaboratively.

References and Notes

1. Collaboration, by its very nature, must develop, evolve, and respond to particular situations, realities, locations, and individuals. For this reason, this article cannot be a guide on how to collaborate. Instead, this article is a description of why meaningful collaboration is important not only to IL and composition but to various teaching and learning initiatives in universities and colleges.
2. Christy R. Stevens, "Beyond Preaching to the Choir: Information Literacy, Faculty Outreach, and Disciplinary Journals," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 33, no. 2 (Mar. 2007): 255.
3. James Elmborg, "Critical Information Literacy: Implications for Instructional Practice," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 2 (Mar. 2006): 192–99; James Elmborg, "Information Literacy and Writing across the Curriculum: Sharing the Vision," *Reference Services Review* 31, no. 1 (2003): 68–80; Jeff Purdue "Stories, Not Information: Transforming Information Literacy," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 3, no. 4 (2003): 655.
4. Purdue, "Stories, Not Information," 655.
5. Elmborg, "Information Literacy and Writing across the Curriculum," 71.
6. Ruth Ivey, "Information Literacy: How Do Librarians and Academics Work in Partnership to Deliver Effective Learning Programs?" *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 34, no. 2 (June 2003): 100.
7. Claire McGuinness, "What Faculty Think— Exploring the Barriers to Information Literacy Development in Undergraduate Education," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 6 (Nov. 2006): 573–74.
8. Ibid., 574.
9. Claire McGuinness, "What Faculty Think," 577.
10. Illinois State University Department of English, "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition," www.wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html (accessed Nov. 27, 2007).
11. Joan K. Lippincott, "Developing Collaborative Relationships: Librarians, Students, and Faculty Creating Learning Communities," *College & Research Library News*, 63, no. 3 (Mar. 2002): 191.
12. Ibid.
13. We acknowledge that this collaboration is made possible by the small size of the composition course at the University of Windsor and also by our library's commitment to collaborative IL initiatives. We also acknowledge that a collaboration such as the one we describe would be difficult to achieve on a much larger scale; however, there are elements from our collaboration that could be adapted or modified to fit larger programs.
14. Shannon L. Reed and Kirilka Stavreva, "Layering Knowledge: Information Literacy as Critical Thinking in the Literature Classroom," *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture* 6, no. 3 (2006): 437.
15. Ibid., 438.
16. Ibid.
17. Jeff Purdue, "Stories, Not Information," 660.
18. For information about researching and writing about a trend, see Susan Blau and Kathryn Burak, *Writing in the Works Rhetoric, Reader, and Handbook for College and Beyond* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2006).
19. International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, "The Alexandria Proclamation on Information Literacy and Lifelong Learning," (2006), www.ifla.org/III/wsis/BeaconInfSoc.html (accessed Nov. 27, 2007).
20. James B. Tuttle and Steve McKinzie, "Reconstructing the Research Project: A Case Study of Collaborative Instruction," in *Information Literacy Collaborations That Work*, ed. Trudi E. Jacobson and Thomas P. Mackey (New York and London: Neal-Schuman, 2007): 119.
21. McGuinness, "What Faculty Think," 580.
22. Reed and Stavreva, "Layering Knowledge," 438.
23. David Weinberger, *Everything is Miscellaneous: The Power of the New Digital Disorder* (New York: Times Books, 2007): 9.
24. Stevens, "Beyond Preaching to the Choir," 257.
25. Shelley Gullikson, "Faculty Perceptions of ACRL's Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 6 (Nov. 2006): 591.

APPENDIX A: WPA OUTCOMES STATEMENT

According to the WPA Outcomes Statement, by the end of first-year composition, students should be able to perform the following:

Rhetorical Knowledge

- Focus on a purpose
- Respond to the needs of different audiences
- Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations
- Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation
- Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality
- Understand how genres shape reading and writing
- Write in several genres

Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing

- Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating
- Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources
- Integrate their own ideas with those of others
- Understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power

Processes

- Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
- Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading
- Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and rethinking to revise their work
- Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
- Learn to critique their own and others' works
- Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
- Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences

Knowledge of Conventions

- Learn common formats for different kinds of texts
- Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics
- Practice appropriate means of documenting their work
- Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

Source: www.wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html (accessed July 17, 2009)

APPENDIX B: ENGLISH 26-100 ASSIGNMENTS (RESEARCH PACKET AND RESEARCH ARTICLE)

The Research Packet

The research packet consists of five sections. The instructions for students are reproduced here in full:

1. A 1–2 page description of your topic, including a description of how you decided on this topic and an assessment of its potential as a research topic. Consider the following questions: Is there a pattern that points toward a trend? Are there significant causes driving this change? Are there significant effects of this change? Does this topic raise questions you would like to answer? Do you feel strongly about the topic? Do you have ideas you would like to explore? What kinds of research are possible in pursuing this topic? Will this topic present an intellectual challenge? Will it force you to reflect on what *you* think?
2. A 2–3 page narrative of the research strategies you used to approach your topic. In this section, you are demonstrating the process you used to research your topic, describing the kinds of resources you found and their appropriateness to your topic, and showing why you chose to use particular methods of research and particular resources. Essentially, this section asks you to detail what research you did and why you made those choices about how to pursue your research.
3. A research question that focuses and guides your research and a paragraph describing how and why you decided on this question. Think about this question as the piece of curiosity that drives your research.
4. Annotated summaries for one sample from each of three different types of research resources (including, but not limited to, reference books, online reference materials, newspapers, popular periodicals,

books, reputable websites, and scholarly journals). In these entries, you should briefly summarize what the source says, evaluate its reliability and biases, evaluate its usefulness to your project, and think about where it might lead in terms of future research. See page 47 of *Writing in the Works* (Houghton Mifflin, 2006) for a list of questions for critical thinking and reading and pages 64–66 for a list of questions regarding the bias of sources. Consider these questions as you think about the following: What does the source say? Is it reliable and how do you know whether or not it is reliable? What are its biases? How is it useful or not useful for your project? Does this research give you ideas about other places to look for information?

5. A 1–2 page description of how your research has contributed to your thinking about your topic and about the research process as a whole. Consider the following questions: What did you learn in doing your research, both about your particular topic and about the process of doing research? How has your thinking about the topic changed since you began your research? How has your thinking about doing research changed since you began this project? Be specific in showing the connections between your research process and your thinking.

The Research Article

The research article consists of two parts. The instructions for students are reproduced here in full:

1. A 5–7 page piece of writing in which you explain a trend, prove the trend exists, analyze its causes and/or effects, and contextualize it for your audience. You will be expected to document all of your research and use proper citation throughout your writing.
2. A 1–2 page description of the connections between your research process and your research article. Consider the following questions: How did your research help to shape your writing? Does your writing answer the research question you posed? If so, how? If not, explore how and why you went in a different direction in your writing. What did you learn about the connections between writing and research in doing this project?