CHAPTER 1

WRITING INFORMATION LITERACY: A RETROSPECTIVE AND A LOOK AHEAD

Rolf Norgaard and Caroline Sinkinson
University of Colorado at Boulder

Roughly a decade ago, two paired articles published in *Reference and User Services Quarterly* under the title "Writing Information Literacy" voiced what became a rather widespread call for more broadly shared ownership of and responsibility for information literacy (IL) on our college campuses (Norgaard, 2003; Norgaard, 2004). In these articles, Rolf Norgaard claimed that enhanced collaboration between librarians and writing faculty would yield improved educational opportunities for students. By pairing Rhetoric and Writing Studies with IL, Norgaard argued that a more robust understanding of IL as a situated, process-oriented, and relevant literacy would ensue. More specifically, he encouraged a collaboration that extended beyond librarian service to the discipline and course structures. He envisioned a collaboration that was steeped in dialogue on both theory and practice, going far beyond our more traditional roles as "classroom colleagues" or "curricular compatriots" (Norgaard, 2003, p. 124).

The call voiced in those paired articles, although appreciatively recognized, has not been fully realized. Therefore, in the spirit of collaboration, this chapter engages Rhetoric and Writing Studies scholar Norgaard (RN) and librarian Caroline Sinkinson (CS) in a dialogue that explores reactions and outcomes in the intervening decade. In doing so, the authors hope to identify barriers which hindered progress and to identify suggestions for the decade which lies ahead.

ORIGINS

CS: Your articles resonate with many librarians who are eager to break down the perception of IL as a generic, skills-based, and normative behavior. Instead, many view IL as a critical habit of mind, which functions within situated and contextual information landscapes (Lloyd, 2006, p. 572). I return often to your articles, and each time I reread your words, I am curious about what factors invited you, a Rhetoric and Writing Studies scholar, to so deeply engage with IL.

RN: The paired articles were the direct result of a very powerful moment of radical institutional change. Rather high-level, campus-wide discussions led to the formation of a new Program for Writing and Rhetoric. With the new program we engaged in a fundamental reconceptualization of our suite of first-year writing courses, which provided the initial platform for working with IL. These efforts have since expanded to our upper-division curriculum. The prior writing program had no investment in IL. Indeed, I doubt if its leaders and much of its faculty would even have recognized the term.

The opportunity to fashion a new program and a new curriculum made it possible to integrate IL into our pedagogy and our program mission, instead of treating it, as it most often is, as a supplement, an add-on. We were fortunate at the time to have forward-looking IL advocates, at the highest levels of campus discussions. Additionally, we had dedicated librarians to shepherd our IL efforts during the early stages of program building. So, when I speak of partnerships in these two articles, the call for reconceptualizing and broadly sharing IL is not merely abstract or theoretical. It is grounded in an institutional landscape and in deeply rewarding personal and intellectual friendships. But it goes well beyond those particularities to advance a vision of IL that has been widely appreciated, if not always implemented.

CS: Well, your articles have influenced many librarians, both pedagogically and conceptually. Your work helped librarians frame IL rhetorically, to justify enhanced collaborations with writing colleagues, and to build or revise programs, which is evidenced by the several examples in the literature (Jacobs & Jacobs, 2009; O'Connor et al., 2010; Holliday & Fagerheim, 2006; Gruber et al., 2008; Artman, 2010; Davidson & Crateau, 1998). In addition to practical applications, your work has had significant influence on IL theorists, specifically in the discussions surrounding critical IL (Elmborg, 2006; Elmborg, 2012; Jacobs, 2008; Accardi et al., 2010).

RN: As truly gratifying as that reception has been, it is unfortunate that the two articles failed to elicit a similarly robust discussion in my own field, Rhetoric and Writing Studies. Important work is being done; Rebecca More Howard and the Citation Project come to mind (Howard et al., 2010; Jamieson & Howard, 2013). Nevertheless, we have a ways to go to foster the disciplinary dialogue and disciplinary cross-fertilization that I envision in the two articles.

With a decade of hindsight, I now realize that I should have written not two but three articles. The first article focused on how Rhetoric and Writing Studies can contribute to the conceptualization of IL (Norgaard, 2003). The second focused on pedagogical enactments of that concept in the classroom (Norgaard, 2004). That missing third article should have focused on the institutional identities and roles whose transformations are likewise necessary if we are to make

progress in IL, both conceptually and pedagogically. I am imagining an article that maps strategies and methods for institutionalizing IL, and as Sharon Weiner (2012) has argued, these strategies must acknowledge specific institutional contexts and cultures in order to meet success.

INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITIES AND DISCIPLINARY ROLES

RN: Both of our faculties—in Writing and Rhetoric and in University Libraries—have historically been marginalized groups whose identities, roles, and "place" have been defined more by others than by ourselves. We are in some sense natural allies. But as each faculty seeks to overcome its historical burden in distinctive ways, address new institutional challenges, and realize disciplinary aspirations, our roles and identities may in part conspire against the dialogue and partnership we seek, and the more robust understandings of IL that we wish to enact.

LIBRARIANS IN INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

CS: At the very least, traditional roles compound our challenges. If asked, students might describe the library as a location for study or as a resource for accessing course materials; fa culty might describe the library as a service in support of their research, scholarship and teaching. These descriptions reinforce the pervasive image of the traditional campus library as a storehouse of resources offered up to support and serve. However, the iconic library image obscures the work of librarians, specifically the work of teaching librarians. To an individual walking through the stacks or even posing a question at the research desk, that work is not visible or apparent. Libraries have historically been rooted in concepts of information, knowledge, and learning, but the librarian as an active educator invested in pedagogy and praxis has not fully matured. We continue to confront perceptions of the librarian role that undermine IL, both internally in the profession and externally with campus colleagues.

Internally, as Courtney Bruch and Carroll Wilkinson (2012) observe, tensions may exist between librarians who embrace a teaching identity and those who resist it (p. 14). This tension is increased when library structures and administration do not demonstrate a commitment to a culture of teaching. It is not uncommon for institutions to employ one individual, an instruction coordinator, primarily responsible for instruction programming and coordination. Bruch and Wilkinson (2012) point out that these positions often lack the authority and management oversight necessary to impact change (p. 21). Furthermore, for other library positions, teaching is a peripheral responsibility, if one at all,

and must compete with other more traditional library tasks such as reference, collections or cataloging. Structures across library organizations and institutions vary widely, but these observations highlight an ongoing tension surrounding librarians' identity as teachers and educators. Equally, the emphasis placed on teaching roles within Masters of Library and Information Science curricula varies drastically across institutions. For example the University of Missouri, Columbia School of Information Science and Learning Technologies offers a robust slate of courses on instructional design, assessment and pedagogy which clearly demonstrate an expectation of librarian as educator. Yet, several other programs offer only one or two course options related to IL theory and practice (ACRL Instruction Section, Professional Development Committee, 2013). These variations underscore an unequal approach to the librarian's teaching role within the profession at large.

Despite these barriers, some individual instruction librarians have embraced a teaching identity and have developed as experts in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

RN: And as this expertise grows, our institutions and our students stand to lose if we don't tap into and highlight that expertise. Librarians occupy a unique and distinctly valuable position in the university. Your active integration of several domains—knowledge construction, new media, information networks, and information technologies—places you at the center of the educational enterprise, not at its periphery. Disciplinary faculty members across campuses are slow to recognize this expertise.

CS: Indeed. Even as librarians work to advocate for internal support of our teaching role, we also must work to showcase our value as pedagogical partners to disciplinary teaching faculty. A frequent narrative in the literature is that faculty members do not understand the librarian's teaching role or are unaware of our pedagogical knowledge (Elmborg, 2003, p. 77; Derakhshan & Singh, 2011, p. 227; Phelps & Campbell, 2012, p.16). However, as librarians, we need to consider how our actions reinforce perceptions of the librarian simply as a service provider. For example, more often than not, librarians adjust teaching strategies to faculty-outlined objectives and goals, which are typically bound up in research assignments. Yvonne Meulemans and Allison Carr (2013) suggest that if libraries truly value collaboration, they must become more brazen in their approach with faculty. If librarians disagree with an assignment design, or wholeheartedly find fault with a stand-alone tour, they should converse with faculty about those opinions and their beliefs as educators (Meulemans & Carr, 2013, p. 82). This approach might be very fruitful if, as Laura Saunders (2012) found, the lack of faculty-initiated collaboration is not a result of disrespect but rather a lack of awareness about how librarians can help in teaching and learning (p. 232).

WRITING TEACHERS IN INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

RN: If librarians struggle to make their role as educators visible and appreciated, writing teachers suffer from a role definition that is different but equally problematic. Our role as teacher and educator is a given, but what we are expected to teach, and who is seen as qualified to teach, have been shaped by disciplinary, campus, and public expectations. Rhetoric and Writing Studies differs from any other discipline in that our field has historically been tied to but one course: first-year writing or freshman English. This traditional curricular moment, occurring in the first year, tends to privilege a narrow perspective on IL, emphasizing preparation for general academic work in college but neglecting broader civic and workplace contexts for IL. Moreover, the focus on the first-year composition course tends to promote a skills-oriented "inoculation" approach to IL, and tends to obscure how IL ought to be seen as a rich, multifaceted literacy that is responsive to changing contexts and opportunities. Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) programs and Writing in the Disciplines (WID) initiatives do offer a far more expansive set of contexts for IL. But here too, writing faculty are often seen as merely providing a service to various disciplines, and are relegated to secondary status with respect to their expertise and their pedagogical roles. As Rhetoric and Writing Studies expands its curricular offerings, it can embrace a more capacious understanding of IL, for example by developing a more vertical curriculum that engages writing and IL at various points and for various purposes throughout the undergraduate experience (Gregory & McCall, Chapter 18, this collection). At our institution, we are fortunate to have a robust upper-division curriculum, and as a free-standing program not located, as most are, within an English department, we may have greater latitude to seize new opportunities for teaching IL. The growing number of Writing Studies majors, as well as certificate programs, provides fertile ground for greater integration of IL throughout the writing curriculum. Likewise, the growing number of free-standing writing programs provides an opportunity to reach beyond the orbit of English departments to reach whole campuses.

CS: I can easily understand how this historical emphasis on first-year writing tends to place a lot of expectations on that single course. My sense is that writing teachers often feel overwhelmed by the many goals and objectives they are expected to meet, and that IL adds but one more item to an already full plate.

RN: Yes, feeling overwhelmed comes with the territory. First-year writing is one of the very few courses that nearly all students take on campus, and campus administrators often look to the course as a platform for a variety of campus initiatives.

With these external pressures, writing instructors continue to deal with misunderstandings of our role on campus. For a surprisingly large number of faculty members, we are still the grammar police whose purview extends little further than correct style, organization, and, yes, citations. Writing is still all too often seen as the transcription of finished thought rather than central to the generation of insight. What matters to all too many disciplinary faculty are that the citations are in correct shape, not that the process of acquiring and evaluating information has given students insight into the discursive and cognitive features of a discipline. Ten years ago, in the first of the two paired articles, I noted how the still widely entrenched "current-traditional" paradigm of writing instruction limits our ability to enact a more robust approach to IL. That very same paradigm also limits our institutional roles and identities.

As to internal pressures, one of the greatest ongoing concerns is staffing. Our field is all too reliant on contingent labor—part-time lecturers and graduate students for whom writing instruction and IL may not be central to their long-term career interests. This reliance on contingent faculty has only gotten worse in the last ten years, especially with the Great Recession, and has become the subject of explicit concern and national discussion. Turn-over in personnel is constant, and puts pressure on effective training, professional development, and quality control and assessment. At large state universities, the sections of first-year writing offered during any one semester can easily reach well over 100 (Bousquet, 2008; Bousquet, Scott & Parascondola, 2004; Palmquist & Doe, 2011; Schell & Stock, 2001). Last minute accommodations to enrollment demand can easily lead to the impression that virtually anyone can teach writing. No matter how well conceived, an IL initiative in a writing program can only succeed if it has buy-in and intellectual engagement from people in the trenches, not just the writing program administrator, several tenure-track faculty, and a handful of full-time instructors.

As a discipline, Rhetoric and Writing Studies has continued to mature over these last ten years, with more graduate programs, and more undergraduate majors and certificate programs. The very limitations to our institutional roles that I note above are gradually being addressed on campuses that have active writing centers, and robust WAC and WID programs. But the higher disciplinary profile that Rhetoric and Writing Studies has achieved can also limit intellectual partnerships. However gregarious we might be by nature, an interest in establishing disciplinary authority adds just one further disincentive to institutional and disciplinary partnerships. Incentives and reward structures tend to recognize work done on one's own home turf. Librarians and writing faculty are natural partners, but historically determined identities and campus roles can conspire against that partnership.

MOVING FORWARD ON CAMPUS

CS: Despite the barriers that we have discussed, librarians and writing teachers across the country are engaged in successful partnerships. For some, the collaborations are the outcome of campus level change. For example, at Purdue University there was a "perfect storm" of campus curricular initiatives, library-invested initiatives, and local experts engaged in IL which resulted in a broad campus initiative as well as an endowed chair of IL (Seamans, 2012, p. 228; "W. Wayne Booker Chair," 2014). On our own campus, a similar "perfect storm" enabling new approaches to IL accompanied the formation of a new Program for Writing and Rhetoric.

However, other local or individual IL partnerships shared in the literature describe a different story. A solitary librarian is driven by intrinsic motivations to actively extend IL education. She may identify an amenable faculty member with whom she shares her ideas for collaboration in the classroom. Often, these efforts may end successfully and work as exemplars for other librarians and faculty. For example, Heidi Jacobs and Dale Jacobs (2009) describe a partnership that grew organically from a casual conversation but resulted in significant curricular and programmatic change to IL integration in English Composition courses. In this example, had the process begun with a goal to impact full programmatic change, the authors admit that the magnitude, and one may assume the associated time commitment, may have halted their efforts (p. 79). For that reason, the authors argue for initiatives led by individuals and stakeholders who pursue manageable commitments and responsibilities in unison with existing workloads.

RN: But as effective as "stealth innovation" can be (and I'm a fan of working undercover until the right institutional moment emerges), this approach can have its downsides. Unless IL initiatives become part of core identities and core budgets, they easily get pushed to the side. The impact of accreditation agencies on an institution's commitment to IL can have significant impact on local buy-in. For example, in 2002 the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools required "Quality Enhancement Plans" from its member institutions (SACS, 2012). Colleges and schools were asked to create proposals that broadly improved student learning. As a result, 18 institutions focused the plan on IL while at least 100 institutions included IL to some degree (Harris, 2013, p. 175). Similarly, organizations and IL leaders are encouraging librarians to actively participate on local national assessment and curriculum reform committees in order to explicitly include IL in student learning outcomes (GWLA, 2013; Iannuzzi, 2013). Placing IL at the core of a writing program's mission helps to create a more cohesive sense of IL and helps guard against this notion that it is a peripheral add-on.

Also, it is worth noting that we have endured a modest budget crisis in 2003 and the Great Recession starting in 2008. Fiscal crises tend to have administrators circle the wagons to protect core responsibilities and identities.

CS: Moreover, Barbara D'Angelo and Barry Maid (2004) caution that when change is led by individuals, it is typically the individual who "absorbs the increased workload and time commitment without institutional change or support" (p. 212). Similarly, Barbara Fister (1995) warns that these programs will dismantle when collaborators withdraw due to burnout, career advancement or general turnover. Or alternatively, the programs will be handed off to junior colleagues who may view the project as superfluous to their core functions (p. 34). While it is clear that energetic individuals are essential to sparking improvements to IL teaching and learning, like you, I agree that garnering institutional support is essential.

RN: I believe the trick is to find the institutional "sweet spot": high enough on the institutional food chain to garner real support, visibility, continuity, and investment, but also low enough so that on-the-ground expertise is not neglected and can be leveraged effectively through personal relationships.

CS: Assuming we can find that "sweet spot," Fister (1995) suggests a few central characteristics and conditions for collaboration. The first is a "need to trust one another and have a sense of shared ownership" (p. 47). In order to reach that trust, writing instructors need to understand the evolution of librarians as educators. Similarly, it will be helpful for librarians to appreciate the demands and expectations placed on the writing teachers. Second, Fister recommends that goals be set together by librarians and writing instructors, which will inevitably encourage a sense of shared ownership and understanding. Third, Fister encourages the sharing of "insights both practical and theoretical" (p. 16).

ADVANCING CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSIONS

RN: As we continue our discussion here, the need looms large for more clearly articulated shared goals and understandings between librarians and writing instructors. Only by sharing conceptual discussions can we improve student learning.

LACK OF SHARED LITERATURE

CS: Alas, that shared conceptual discussion has not developed as we hoped. In your first article, you recognize that few IL-related articles have successfully invoked theoretical foundations or pedagogical frameworks from Rhetoric and Writing Studies. I believe that your observation prompted many to begin doing

just that, with the intention of theorizing IL to a greater degree. (Here I'm thinking of the work of Jacobs (2008), Veach (2012), Elmborg (2012), and Fister (1993, 1995), to name a few.) However, while both writing instructors and librarians have pursued investigations into IL, they have failed to directly speak to one another through this work.

RN: Quite true. The literature produced by both fields has largely remained siloed and directed to an audience of peers within their home disciplines, rather than reaching beyond these boundaries. The politics of publication and the reward systems of, and criteria for, tenure may play a role in this.

CS: That seems like a solid assumption, and represents a problem not unique to Rhetoric and Writing Studies faculty. According to Sue Phelps and Nicole Campbell (2012), the models of successful librarian-faculty partnerships for IL are mainly written by librarians (72%) and appear in library journals (82%) (p. 15).

RN: My own paired articles from ten years ago share in that dynamic: although writing as a rhetorician and writing teacher, those articles appeared in a library journal that goes largely unread by my colleagues in Rhetoric and Writing Studies. The library community has warmly received this "interloper"; I just wish that such work would no longer be seen as interloping!

CS: These findings might be interpreted to mean that collaborative partnerships are of a higher priority to librarians, or perhaps, they may simply indicate a lack of awareness from writing instructors, or the lack of shared language and understanding between fields. Regardless, we can safely conclude that formal written collaborations have not yet crossed disciplinary boundaries to the extent you encourage. However, conference presentations and papers offer evidence that cross-disciplinary conversations are taking place in less formal settings. For example, papers from the Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy (2013) include works co-authored by librarians and writing teachers as well as presentations that indicate a desire for increased collaborations (Dew et al., 2013; McClure & Toth, 2013; Carter & Schmidt, 2013; Gola & Creelman, 2013). Similarly, the 2013 Conference on College Composition and Communication included at least three sessions that integrated IL into composition and curriculum discussions (CCCC, 2013). This evidence reveals that collaborations continue to grow between cross-disciplinary colleagues, yet, perhaps still not to the degree that you suggest.

LACK OF SHARED DEFINITION

RN: A prerequisite for that discussion, but also a valuable outcome, is a shared definition of IL. Definitions—acts of naming—are not trivial, and carry with

them political and disciplinary dimensions (Scheidt et al., Chapter 10, this collection; Kissel et al., Chapter 20, this collection).

CS: Clarifying a definition of IL has indeed been an area of debate and conversation in librarianship (Owusu-Ansah, 2005). There are numerous standards and definitions devised by international, national, regional, and state organizations (International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), Australian and New Zealand Information Literacy (ANZIL), Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL), Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), Middle States Commission). Scholars and practitioners, on a global scale, have devoted considerable energy without reaching a uniformly accepted definition or understanding of IL. A reader of the complementary and competing definitions will quickly understand that IL is a complex concept interwoven with myriad other literacies.

RN: In a similar vein, Rhetoric and Writing Studies was plagued by disparate understandings of what the outcomes of first-year composition should be. After broad consultation, the national Council of Writing Program Administrators adopted in April 2000 the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" (2000). This statement has had an amazing galvanizing influence on curricular design in writing programs across the country. It omits the term IL, and yet the original document, and the several revisions that have followed it, remain quite amenable to the concept.

CS: While it is unfortunate that the WPA Outcomes Statement and the *Information Competency Standards for Higher Education* (ACRL, 2000) were written in isolation, writing instructors and librarians have taken it upon themselves to mesh these two documents while pursuing local initiatives (McClure, 2009; Jacobs & Jacobs, 2009; Gruber et al., 2008; D'Angelo & Maid, 2004). The documents provide a strong means for one to enter discussion in the other's community, because the precepts and beliefs had already been endorsed by the broad professional community. While many faculty members may not be familiar with the term "information literacy," when the concept is defined they easily comprehend the value and importance. Furthermore, Laura Saunders (2012) surveyed faculty from 50 colleges and universities and found that a faculty member's awareness of standards or defining documents increased her enthusiasm for integrating IL (p. 232).

RN: A more recent foundational document in the Rhetoric and Writing Studies community, the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, published by the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Writing Project (2011), holds much promise for collaboration. Although this document, too, fails to highlight IL as I would like, it does a great service by highlighting "habits of mind" that underpin success, among them the need for metacognition. Such habits of mind

are necessary complements to the more instrumental definitions that have dominated IL discussion thus far.

CS: Indeed, such "habits of mind" are similar to elements found in the American Association of School Libraries Standards for the 21st Century Learner (2007). So we can clearly identify overlap between professional documents authored by writing teachers and those written by librarians.

RN: Perhaps it is not enough to recognize the similarities in our reform impulses; we need to advocate strongly for our associations and national groups to join in intellectual partnership through shared documents (Maid & D' Angelo, Chapter 2, this collection).

CS: Yes, I think that would prove very fruitful and could add depth to our existing guiding documents. While the *IL Standards* have been invaluable in developing momentum for IL initiatives, the standards are problematic due to their decontextualized and linear structure. The document's performance indicators suggest that an individual's IL might be measured against precise action, regardless of circumstance or context; one may be judged to have or not have IL based on measured performance. Furthermore, the *IL Standards* fail to clearly articulate that information is bound in conversations between ourselves and others and between varied contexts or situations. Information is not represented as a "product of socially negotiated epistemological processes and the raw material for further making of new knowledge" (Elmborg, 2006, p. 198). Rather, it is presented as a static entity, which learners may acquire and evaluate based on codified and imposed criteria. In 2011, the ACRL, having noted the shortcomings of the *IL Standards*, took initial steps to consider a revised document. Beginning March 2013, a taskforce, whose membership included an array of stakeholders, not only librarians, worked to develop the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (ACRL, 2015), which approaches IL through conceptual understandings rather than standards. In the *Framework for IL*, IL is defined as "a spectrum of abilities, practices, and habits of mind that extends and deepens learning through engagement with the information ecosystem" (ACRL, 2015).

Because the *Framework for IL* resists defining IL through a "prescriptive enumeration of skills," it may strengthen your argument against misconceptions of IL as a neutral, on/off skill (ACRL, 2015). Perhaps, the *Framework for IL* will encourage advocacy for a situated literacy as you have done.

RN: The academy, however, situates IL in narrow ways. And the historical connection, indeed identification, between Rhetoric and Writing Studies and but one first-year course further limits how we might situate IL in innovative and genuinely useful ways. To broaden our approach, we might tap into WAC and WID programs and writing center activities, which offer more expansive and differentiated venues for discussing IL.

CS: You also call for a process-oriented approach to IL rather than a product-focused approach. The *IL Standards* present IL as neatly packaged skills which result in a successful product, performance, or presentation. Yet, lived information experiences are far more complex, problematic, and entwined with one's own identity, beliefs, and experiences. Instead of an intellectual process in which the learner is an active agent, as written in the *IL Standards*, IL positions the learner as passive recipient. A brief nod to an individual's past experiences and beliefs is given in standard three: the information literate individual "determines whether the new knowledge has an impact on the individual's value system and takes steps to reconcile differences" (ACRL, 2000). The *Framework for IL* improves that shortcoming by recognizing that "students have a greater role in creating new knowledge" (ACRL, 2015). Still, a process-centered IL needs to place great attention on the learner's construction of knowledge, whether in past information experiences, current experiences, or through reflection on experiences (See Yancey, Chapter 4, this collection).

RN: As you suggest, the myth of the student as "blank slate" pervades higher education, and is related to our focus on purveying information, the domain content of a field, and not on cultivating rhetorical and cognitive aptitudes and strategies. Our traditional approaches to IL have much in common with the "banking concept of education" that Paolo Freire (1970) so roundly criticized. We have much to gain by leveraging students' varied IL activities, and by better understanding how they might misinterpret contexts and misuse tools. Appreciating how people construct their world through information is where we need to begin, not end.

CS: The third dimension of your interest in rhetoricizing IL is the need for a relevant literacy—that is, relevant to a "broad range of social, political, and intellectual endeavors," and appreciative of the dynamic early moments of invention when we launch inquiry and formulate problems (Norgaard, 2003, p. 128).

RN: It is not surprising given the intended audience of the *IL Standards*— higher education—that they have been used within one particular context and have become representative of one information landscape alone, namely academic. To be genuinely useful, our conception of IL needs to be attentive to what we might call "information ecologies," in all their varied forms. Higher education, broadly speaking, is becoming more aware of the need for a new culture of learning that has similar ecological impulses. All of this underscores the exigence of extending our understandings of IL, and the relevance of the *Framework for IL*, as it defines IL as situated and contextualized.

CS: Indeed. Much of the practice surrounding IL in higher education has privileged textual and codified norms of information such as the peer reviewed article and academic research databases. And very little attention is paid to the

social, economic, political, and cultural influences on the creation, dissemination, and the use of information (Luke & Kapitzke, 1999, p. 11).

An essential aspect of IL is a critical stance towards information systems (Elmborg, 2006, p. 196). In other words, learners would scrutinize information systems, in any mode, understand the systems' norms (what counts as knowledge), and identify the voices included or excluded (Luke & Kapitzke, 1999, p. 484; Simmons 2005, p. 301). Students are not provided the opportunity to do so when academic values are imposed without question, and students are told to use peer-reviewed articles and to limit searching to academic databases.

Accepting one frame or focusing on one information landscape is not only a misrepresentation; it may alienate students and deter the transfer of critical dispositions to other contexts. As students enter alternate information landscapes, they will need to examine the unique contextual information and learning tools therein and to acclimate to the specific "skills, practices and affordances" required (Lloyd, 2006, p. 572). In order to offer a more holistic and authentic view, IL education should expand across domains as well as to new information modes and formats. As educators, if we hold our focus to textual information only, we ignore the "mediascapes and infospheres" in which students live presently, not to mention the new modes they will encounter in the future (Luke & Kapitzke, 1999, p. 469).

RN: As you mentioned, ACRL has filed the *Framework for IL*. What promise does this revision hold for fostering the kind of collaboration I called for a decade ago?

CS: The current draft revision strongly encourages librarians to introduce the document at home institutions in order to identify "synergies" with other educational initiatives (ACRL, 2015) The task force chairs recognize that the *IL Standards* limited conversation between librarians and course instructors because of their skills-based approach (Jacobson & Gibson, 2013). The new model abandons the "standards-like inventory" in favor of identifying core dispositions that may be cultivated in varied information contexts, including workplace and lifelong learning (Jacobson & Gibson, 2013). The goal is to be more flexible and responsive given the current environment and the speed with which the information ecologies change. Additionally, the intended audience is all educators, not only librarians, as evidenced by sections dedicated to faculty and administrators, "For Faculty: How to Use the Framework" and "For Administrators: How to Support the Framework" (ACRL, 2015). According to the task force chairs, the new document provides "a conceptual approach for collaboration, pedagogical innovation, curriculum planning, and a weaving together of literacies that is critical for today's Information Literacy" (Jacobsen & Gibson, 2013). Given these guiding principles, the revised *Framework for IL* has the

potential to foster conversations between course instructors and librarians (Maid & D'Angelo, Chapter 2, this collection).

REFINING PRACTICE AND PEDAGOGY

RN: New national standards are most welcome. Indeed, the *Framework for IL* is especially promising in that it resonates with the "habits of mind" stressed in the 2011 *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* developed by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2011). Yet there remains the issue of what is often the yawning gap between concept and implementation, theory, and the practical demands of the classroom. Many inherited and now ossified norms compete with the more holistic and dynamic view of IL and writing to which we have been pointing. Ten years ago I felt the need to complement my first article on "Contributions to a Concept" with a second on "Pedagogical Enactments and Implications." Today, that need to connect concepts with classrooms is as pressing as ever.

CS: And it is pressing because of the disconnect that we see. The process we dearly hope students experience is one in which information seeking, reading, and writing are recursive and intertwined. Through these experiences, students would begin to build their own meaning, their own knowledge, and contribute their own voices into a wider conversation. Yet, in failing to deeply engage in reciprocal relationships, writing teachers and librarians present a fragmented process to students in which writing and information may appear vastly disconnected.

RN: One culprit in this disconnect is the sedimentation of classroom practice. We tend to recycle our pedagogy—handouts are photocopied yet again, and while files may now be posted electronically, with all the speed and freshness that such technology implies, those files (and the classroom approaches that inform them) may themselves be years old.

CS: The research paper, another inherited practice, has significant influence on the ways in which librarians and writing teachers collaborate. The common one-shot library seminar is often designed to directly support students' completion of the research paper (Blackwell-Starnes, Chapter 7, this collection).

RN: I would have hoped that the old ghost of the research paper would have by now faded away, for it has been under such intense criticism in Rhetoric and Writing Studies. Yet the old ghost continues to haunt us, and with it outmoded notions of IL.

CS: The same sentiments have been echoed in librarianship as well, perhaps most compellingly by Fister (2013). She spoke at the 2013 LOEX conference, making several "outrageous claims," one of which was to abandon the research

paper in first-year experiences. Fister identifies many ways that the research paper is not suited to first-year students, because they are novices to academic communication norms and because the assignment de-emphasizes research as an intellectual and knowledge-building act. When we couple the research paper with one shot library seminars, where the focus is information retrieval, it is no wonder that students fail to comprehend sources as rhetorical acts or to see their own information interactions as rhetorical choices (Fister, 2013).

RN: If the ghost of the traditional research paper endures, what I saw ten years ago as the new specter of plagiarism has grown even larger. Of course, we wish to instill a sense of academic values in our students, and with it the ethical obligation and practical ability to document sources according to codified rules of citation. Yet this goal has privileged procedure in much the same way as has information gathering. Students are fearful of breaking the rules to the point that they cut and paste citations into a paper without comprehending the pragmatics inherent in these academic practices. There is ample evidence provided by the Stanford Writing Project, the Citation Project, and Project Information Literacy that students do struggle with understanding citation and plagiarism fully (Lunsford, 2008, Jamieson et al., n.d.; Project Information Literacy, n.d.). Students patchwrite rather than summarize sources, and quote sentences with little awareness of their rhetorical role in the original sources (Jamieson & Howard, 2013). Students are taught about plagiarism with fear tactics, threatening punishment for infringement. Students hear this warning. They do not hear that citation is a means to support claims, track scholarly discourse, and create allegiances with other writers. If students obsess with "covering their behinds" so as not to get caught by Turnitin.com, they will not appreciate how real authors use citations and why (Jamieson, Chapter 6, this collection).

CS: And the most pernicious aspect of this narrow focus on plagiarism is the way it disenfranchises student writers. Students construct citations because "knowledge belongs to other people," so they must follow the rules (Fister, 2013). When writing and IL become divorced from knowledge making, we've lost far more than the battle against plagiarism.

RN: Plagiarism-detection software loomed large ten years ago, and is still with us. What looms large now, ten years later, is the specter of automated or machine grading of student writing. News reports now happily claim that this or that software can lighten the burden of teachers as they respond to student writing—neglecting all the while the crucial distinction between grading or scoring and responding. As Common Core State Standards sweep into high school classrooms, so too do heavily marketed software products that purport to evaluate the writing that is meant to meet those standards. Although the Rhetoric and Writing Studies community has responded to

these developments with cogent arguments in both scholarly venues and the public press, the more specific impact of this new technology on IL has yet to be fully discussed (Strauss, 2013). Even as we endorse a more nuanced, context-sensitive approach to IL, if machines are grading the writing that is meant to foster and showcase those capacities, our efforts will not be valued, and may even be undermined.

CS: And to note but another barrier, a significant failure of the coupling between the research paper and the one-shot library session is an intense privileging of academic enactments of IL. First, as already noted, this is an environment foreign to first-year students and one which requires a great deal of acculturation in order for students to authentically engage. Second, it ignores the expertise and experiences that students have in other contexts and through other information interactions. Third, it does not support students' future needs in alternate contexts. At the core of IL is discerning what to learn, seeking patterns across information (people, text, places), generating knowledge, and acting in the world (Elmborg, 2003, p. 73). If we focus our efforts in IL on academic contexts, students may come to view its importance as relevant only in that context, rather than being transferable and broadly relevant. Take, for example, Project Information Literacy's "Passage Studies," which found employer dissatisfaction with recent graduates' IL in the workplace. Employers interviewed in this study value employees who are agile, collaborative, flexible, nimble, patient, persistent, and resourceful. However, recent graduates lacked sophisticated habits of analyzing information across sources, distinguishing important information from "noise," synthesizing information for problem solving, and finding patterns. This example captures only one alternate information landscape, the workplace, but there are many others that students will encounter after graduation in which a critical disposition towards information will be vital (Cyphert & Lyle, Chapter 3, this collection).

RN: As important as workplace contexts are, I also worry that our privileging of the academic context renders students underprepared for civic life and advocacy. Students deserve an approach to IL that will support broad engagement and collaboration in our communities, not just in classrooms with access to academic databases.

CS: Indeed. As we take into account civic, social, and workplace contexts, our potential strategies should ensure that the multiple actions inherent in IL— questioning, seeking, reading, thinking, and writing—are not presented as separate. These are in fact "non-consecutive acts," which are not neatly delimited or linear (Fister, 1993, para. 19). To support students through these messy activities, collaborations may help to scaffold and to slow down students' inquiry, allowing for time to reflect, pause, reverse or proceed. These are habits and

functions much more authentic to self-motivated acts of inquiry transferable across contexts and information landscapes.

All of this leads us back to your initial claim, some ten years ago, that we form intellectual partnerships.

RN: Yes, the metaphor—and real act—of conversation is central to ensuring progress and surmounting barriers. Our students best appreciate the relevance of IL when they read information environments as invitations to converse, and when we prepare them to enter those conversations fully aware of their obligations and opportunities. But to do so, we ourselves must enter into a more robust and sustained conversation with each other.

COMMON GROUND GOING FORWARD

CS: We started our conversation by looking back ten years. We noted in your two articles a call that, if appreciated, went largely unheeded. And we've observed more than a few obstacles along the path to intellectual partnerships, engaged classroom teaching, and a more nuanced sense of IL.

RN: But our conversation has also demonstrated that there has been considerable progress as well. We have a better sense of the challenges as well as the rewards of an IL actively shaped by collaboration between our two fields.

RN and CS: And, now speaking in one voice, we've also arrived at several desiderata that can inform our efforts going forward:

Community
- Share our educational identities, and our hopes with one another.
- Formulate integrated guiding documents that lead to shared understanding.
- Establish locations for shared conversation and collaboration, in formal literature, organizations, and institutions.

Change
- Reflect on our strategies through feedback from one another and students.
- Experiment and revise so as to resist fossilized approaches.
- Attend to student-centered approaches which call on contexts outside of our academic ones.

Context
- Embrace the rich environments in which students use technology and information.
- Look beyond college to dynamic, life-long relevance and application.
- Emphasize knowledge making in collaborative and interactive information environments.

If there were to be a presiding deity for our article it would Janus, the Roman god of transitions, thresholds, and new beginnings. Janus is usually depicted as having two faces, one that looks to the past, and one that looks forward into the future. We have likewise looked back ten years to a pair of articles that had a formative influence, if not on IL practices then at least on IL discussions. And from our current position we have also looked forward. IL is itself similarly positioned at a threshold moment. The promise of the next decade is bright indeed if collaboration and conversation drive our efforts, as they have in these pages.

REFERENCES

Accardi, M. T., Drabinski, E. & Kumbier, A. (2010). *Critical library instruction: Theories and methods*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, LLC.

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency.

ACRL. (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework.

ACRL, Instruction Section, Professional Education Committee. (2013). *Library instruction courses. ACRL Instruction Section, Professional Education Wiki.* Retrieved from http://wikis.ala.org/acrl/index.php/IS/Library_Instruction_Courses.

American Association of School Libraries. (2007). *Standards for the 21st-century learner.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/aasl/standards-guidelines/learning-standards.

Artman, M., Frisicaro-Pawlowski, E. & Monge, R. (2010). Not just one shot: Extending the dialogues about information literacy in composition classes. *Composition Studies/Freshman English News, 38*(2), 93–110.

Australian and New Zealand Institute for Information. (2004). *Australian and New Zealand information literacy framework.* Retrieved from http://archive.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/InfoLiteracyFramework.pdf.

Blackwell-Starnes, K. (2016). Preliminary paths to information literacy: Introducing research in core courses. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines.* Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado.

Bousquet, M. (2008). *How the university works: Higher education and the low-wage nation.* New York: New York University Press.

Bousquet, M., Scott, T. & Parascondola, L. (2004). *Tenured bosses and disposable teachers: Writing instruction in the managed university.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bruch, C. & Wilkinson, C. W. (2012). Surveying terrain, clearing pathways. In C. Bruch (Ed.), *Transforming information literacy programs: Complex frontiers of self, library culture, and campus community* (pp. 3–44). Chicago: ACRL.

Carter, T. & Schmidt, G. (2013). Transforming students through two literacies: The integration of sustainability literacy into information literacy classes. Georgia Inter-

national Conference on Information Literacy. Retrieved from http://digitalcom mons.georgiasouthern.edu/cil-2012-2/6.

CCCC. (2013). 2013 CCCC convention program. Conference on College Composition and Communication. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/cccc/review /2013program.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2008). WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes .html.

Council of Writing Program Administrators & National Writing Project. (2011). *Framework for success in postsecondary writing.* Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org /framework.

Cyphert, D. & Lyle, S. P. (2016). Employer expectations of information literacy: Identifying the skills gap. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines.* Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado.

D'Angelo, B. J. & Maid, B. M. (2004). Moving beyond definitions: Implementing information literacy across the curriculum. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 30*(3), 212–217. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2004.02.002.

Davidson, J. R. & Crateau, C. A. (1998). Intersections: Teaching research through a rhetorical lens. *Research Strategies, 16*(4), 245–257. doi:10.1016/S0734-3310(99) 00013-0.

Derakhshan, M. & Singh, D. (2011). Integration of information literacy into the curriculum: A meta-synthesis. *Library Review, 60*(3), 218–229. doi:10.1108/0024253 1111117272.

Dew, D., Belzowski, N., Mileham, T. & Bull, J. (2013). Panel: Going vertical together: An interdisciplinary infusion of information literacy with research writing in the disciplines. Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cil-2012-2/23.

Elmborg, J. (2012). Critical information literacy: Definitions and challenges. In C. W. Wilkinson & C. Bruch (Eds.), *Transforming information literacy programs : Intersecting frontiers of self, library culture, and campus community.* Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Elmborg, J. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 32*(2), 192–199. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2005 .12.004.

Elmborg, J. (2003). Information literacy and writing across the curriculum: Sharing the vision. *Reference Services Review, 31(*1), 68–80. doi:10.1108/00907320310 460933.

Fister, B. (1993). Teaching the rhetorical dimensions of research. Retrieved October 9, 2012, from http://homepages.gac.edu/%7Efister/rs.html.

Fister, B. (1995). Connected communities: Encouraging dialogue between composition and bibliographic instruction. In J. Sheridan (Ed.), *Writing across the curriculum and the academic library: Implications for bibliographic instruction* (pp. 33–51). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Fister, B. (2013). Decode academy. Presented at the LOEX, Nashville, TN. Retrieved from http://homepages.gac.edu/~fister/loex13.pdf.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

Gola, C. & Creelman, K. (2013). Building a culture of IL assessment: Establishing buy-in for programmatic change. Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cil-2012-2/13.

Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA). (2013). *GWLA student learning outcomes task force.* Retrieved from http://www.gwla.org/Committees/slo.

Gregory, A. S. & McCall, B. L. (2016). Building critical researchers and writers incrementally: Vital partnerships between faculty and librarians. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines.* Chapter 18. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado.

Gruber, A. M., Knefel, M. A. & Waelchli, P. (2008). Modeling scholarly inquiry: One article at a time. *College & Undergraduate Libraries, 15*(1–2), 99–125. doi:10.1080/10691310802177085.

Harris, B. R. (2013). Subversive infusions: Strategies for the integration of information literacy across the curriculum. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 39*(2), 175–180. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2012.10.003.

Head, A. J., Van Hoeck, M., Eschler, J. & Fullerton, S. (2013). What information competencies matter in today's workplace? *Library and Information Research, 37*(114), 74–104.

Holliday, W. & Fagerheim, B. A. (2006). Integrating information literacy with a sequenced English composition curriculum. *portal: Libraries and the Academy, 6*(2), 169–184.

Howard, R. M., Serviss, T. & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing & Pedagogy, 2*(2), 177–192.

Iannuzzi, P. (2013). Info Lit 2.0 or Deja Vu? *Communications in Information Literacy*, 1–17.

Jamieson, S. (2016). What the Citation Project tells us about information literacy in college composition. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines.* Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado.

Jamieson, S., Howard, R. M. & Serviss, T. (n.d.). *The Citation Project: Preventing plagiarism, teaching writing.* Retrieved from http://site.citationproject.net/.

Jamieson, S. & Howard, R. M. (2013). Explorations of what NextGen students do in the undergraduate writing classroom. In R. McClure & J. P. Purdy (Eds.), *The new digital scholar: Exploring and enriching the research and writing practices of NextGen students* (pp. 109–127). Medford, NJ: ASIST.

Jacobs, H. L. & Jacobs, D. (2009). Transforming the one-shot session into pedagogical collaboration. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 49*(1), 72–82. doi:10.5860/rusq.49n1.72.

Jacobs, H. L. M. (2008). Information literacy and reflective pedagogical praxis. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 34*(3), 256–262. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2008.03.009.

Jacobson, T. & Gibson, C. (2013). A prospectus for revision. ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education Task Force. Retrieved from http://connect.ala.org/files/Doc%205.0a%20Info%20Lit%20Standards%20Prospectus%20for%20Revision.pdf.

Kissel, F., Wininger, M. R., Weeden, S. R., Wittberg, P. A., Halverson, R. S., Lacy, M. & Huisman, R. (2016). Information literacy community of practice. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines.* Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado

Lloyd, A. (2006). Information literacy landscapes: An emerging picture. *Journal of Documentation, 62*(5), 570–583. doi:10.1108/00220410610688723.

Luke, A. & Kapitzke, C. (1999). Literacies and libraries: Archives and cybraries. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 7*(3), 467–491. doi:10.1080/14681369900200066.

Lunsford, A. A. (2008). *Stanford study of writing.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Retrieved from https://ssw.stanford.edu/about

Maid, B. & D'Angelo, B. J. (2016). Threshold concepts: Integrating and applying information literacy and writing instruction. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines.* Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado

McClure, R. (2009). Examining the presence of advocacy and commercial websites in research essays of first-year composition students. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 32*(3). Retrieved from http://muwriting.wdfiles.com/local--files/annotated-readings/mcClure.pdf.

McClure, H. & Toth, C. (2013). Panel: Bridging the gap: Collaborative teaching of an emerging genre to empower students with information literacy skills. Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cil-2012-2/19.

Meulemans, Y. N. & Carr, A. (2013). Not at your service: Building genuine faculty-librarian partnerships. *Reference Services Review*, *41*(1), 80–90. doi:10.1108/00907321311300893.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2000). *Developing research and communication skills: Guidelines for information literacy in the curriculum.* Retrieved from http://www.msche.org/publications/devskill050208135642.pdf.

International Federation of Library Associations and Universities. (2005). *Alexandria Proclamation on Information Literacy and Lifelong Learning.* Retrieved from http://archive.ifla.org/III/wsis/BeaconInfSoc.html.

Norgaard, R. (2003). Writing information literacy contributions to a concept. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 43*(2), 124–130.

Norgaard, R. (2004). Writing information literacy in the classroom: Pedagogical enactments and considerations. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 43*, 220–226.

O'Connor, L., Bowles-Terry, M., Davis, E. & Holliday, W. (2010). "Writing information literacy" revisited. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 49*(3), 225–230.

Owusu-Ansah, E. K. (2005). Debating definitions of information literacy: Enough is enough! *Library Review, 54*(6), 366–374.

Palmquist, M. & Doe, S. (Eds.). (2011). Special Issue. *College English, 73*(4).

Phelps, S. F. & Campbell, N. (2012). Commitment and trust in librarian–faculty relationships: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 38*(1), 13–19. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2011.11.003.

Project Information Literacy. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://projectinfolit.org.

Purdue University Libraries. (2014). W. Wayne Booker. *Purdue University Libraries W. Wayne Booker Chair in Information Literacy.* Retrieved from https://www.lib.purdue .edu/infolit/bookerChair

Saunders, L. (2012). Faculty perspectives on information literacy as a student learning outcome. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 38*(4), 226–236. doi:10.1016/j.acalib .2012.06.001.

Schell, E. E., Stock, P. L. & National Council of Teachers of English. (2001). *Moving a mountain: Transforming the role of contingent faculty in composition studies and higher education.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Scheidt, D. L., Carpenter, W., Fitzgerald, R., Kozma, C., Middleton, H. & Shields, K.. (2016). Writing information literacy in first year composition: A collaboration among faculty and librarians. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines.* Chapter 10. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado

SCONUL Working Group on Information Literacy. (2011). *SCONUL Seven pillars of information literacy: Core model.* Retrieved from http://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/de fault/files/documents/coremodel.pdf.

Seamans, N. H. (2012). Information literacy reality check. In C. Bruch & C. W. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Transforming information literacy programs: Complex frontiers of self, library culture, and campus community* (pp. 221–241). Chicago: ACRL.

Simmons, M. H. (2005). Librarians as disciplinary discourse mediators: Using genre theory to move toward critical information literacy. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 5*(3), 297–311. doi:10.1353/pla.2005.0041.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2012). *Principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement.* Retrieved from http://sac scoc.org/pdf/2012principlesof acreditation.pdf.

Strauss, V. (2013, May 4). Grading writing: The art and science—and why computers can't do it. *The Answer Sheet, Washington Post* [Blog]. Retrieved from http://www. washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/05/02/grading-writing-the-art -and-science-and-why-computers-cant-do-it/.

Todorinova, L. (2010). *Writing center and library collaboration: A telephone survey of academic libraries* (Masters). University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/ltodorinova/1.

Veach, G. (2012). At the intersection: Librarianship, writing studies, and sources as topoi. *Journal of Literacy and Technology, 13*(1), 102.

Weiner, S. A. (2012). Institutionalizing information literacy. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 38*(5), 287–293. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2012.05.004.