

MORE THAN JUST A FIELDTRIP: FACULTY AND LIBRARIAN COLLABORATION IN THE FIRST- YEAR WRITING CLASSROOM

Caroline J. Smith and Ann Brown

According to Dennis Isbell, author of “Teaching Writing and Research as Inseparable: A Faculty-Librarian Teaching Team,” “the most important principle is that research and writing are part of a continuum and are inseparable” (53). Yet many college classes, which require a research component, frequently treat the library as a 50-minute fieldtrip rather than being fully integrated into the course. This often negates the idea of the recursive nature of writing and research—a more sophisticated approach to the synthesis of research within student papers that is the expectation of many college instructors. In such courses, isolated library sessions may not achieve the complexity desired by the faculty.

The fieldtrip approach to the library often holds true even in first-year composition courses, where students are often required to produce at least one intensive research project. Composition students may draft and redraft in response to writing assignments in their introductory courses, but they may visit the library only once in preparation for a research assignment, relying instead on Internet searches they conduct from the privacy of their residence halls. In these introductory courses, students often hear the mantra, “Writing is a process,” and they even diligently practice it, becoming converts by the end of the semester, yet this mantra is rarely repeated in relation to the *research process*—a true detriment to students’ abilities to develop their critical reading, researching, and writing skills, which prove invaluable over the course of their college careers.

In this paper, we are modeling an institutionalized, sustained faculty and librarian partnership at the first-year level. In preparing our paper, we found that composition journals have not revisited this partnership since the rise of the Internet while current librarian literature emphasizes the need for this sort of cooperation. The Internet has drastically changed how research is done on the most elemental level, with the majority of indexes and journals being accessed electronically. Our institution, The George Washington University, has a traditional undergraduate student base, consisting of almost entirely first-time students. In the fall of 2008, of the 2,461 first-year students, all but twelve were first-time and first-year students.¹ That leaves us with a population that is almost entirely within the Millennial or NetGen demographic.² While they know how to type words into a search box at Google, they still need to understand and learn research at the university level. Faculty, in turn, need to successfully integrate information literacy into research-intensive writing assignments. According to the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), information literacy is defined as “the set of skills needed to find, retrieve, analyze, and use information” (“Introduction to Information Literacy”). Our proposal here is for first-year composition and rhetoric faculty to more fully integrate library research, and librarians, into their courses, in order to critically engage students in higher levels of research.

As part of the University’s strategic plan to enhance academics, the University Writing Program (UWP) was created in 2003. First-year students are now required to take a themed introductory composition and rhetoric course known as University Writing 20 (UW20). UW20, a four-credit course, meets three times a week over sixteen weeks. There are two hour-and-fifteen-minute sessions a week and one fifty-minute session a week.

After completion of UW20, students are required to take two upper-level Writing in the Disciplines courses. These new literacy requirements replace two three-credit introductory English classes, which students were previously able to place out of with

Advanced Placement Testing. In the University Writing Program, there is a programmatic, concentrated effort to impart to students the valuable relationships among reading, writing, and research.

UW20 courses at George Washington are themed according to the faculty's individual area of interest.³ Our faculty comprises a diverse range of disciplinary backgrounds, and our courses reflect that diversity. Some UW20 courses, such as the Spring 2011 course "African American Rhetorics—Black Speech in Public Space," implicitly focus on writing and rhetoric while other courses may primarily focus on a specific disciplinary topic such as film theory, graphic novels, or global warming. Some faculty take advantage of the resources in the Washington, D.C. area such as the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, which one faculty member integrated into a course entitled "Legacies of the Holocaust." Other faculty have designed service-learning courses where they partner with D.C. agencies such as Miriam's Kitchen and Men Can Stop Rape. While courses may differ in thematic focus, each course stresses the teaching of critical reading, writing, and research skills needed for successful academic writing.⁴ As UWP faculty, we do not want to privilege one skill over the other; rather, we want to convey the interconnectedness of all three skills.

From the inception of the program, the collaboration between professors and librarians intended to explore "the intersection between writing and research" (Nutefall and Ryder 307). These partnerships are mandated by UWP, supported by the University, and valued by those involved. As Michele Hanson notes in "The Library as Laboratory for Interdisciplinary Studies," "Composition students are engaging in critical thinking about their own writing, their classmates' writing, and the assigned readings; the library gives them the opportunity to pursue those subjects that they are interested in and to evaluate and synthesize what they find there" (223). Through our individual partnership, we have developed a series of student-centered sessions, which promote dynamic, active learning. In this article, we will discuss our approach to integrating library research in general and provide a co-designed

library assignment, the E-Poster, which serves as a touchstone assignment.

Review of the Literature

In his 2003 article, “Writing Information Literacy: Contributions to a Concept,” Rolf Norgaard, a faculty member in the Program for Writing and Rhetoric at the University of Colorado at Boulder, writes about the frequent disassociation of research instruction from the writing process. While Norgaard acknowledges that “writing theory and pedagogy can and should have a constitutive influence on our conception of information literacy,” very often the two are seen as separate entities (124). Norgaard argues:

If libraries continue to evoke, for writing teachers and their students, images of the quick field trip, the scavenger hunt, the generic stand alone tutorial, or the dreary research paper, the fault remains, in large part, rhetoric and composition’s failure to adequately theorize the role of libraries and information literacy in its own rhetorical self-understanding and pedagogical practices. (124)

Norgaard’s article serves, then, as a call to action; he encourages a more thoughtful and extensive interaction between research and writing, librarians and composition faculty.

Since the 1990s, library publications such as *Reference and User Services Quarterly*, in which Norgaard’s article appears, have been calling for greater appreciation of the role of librarians in the college classroom and a more substantive approach to teaching research, especially in writing courses.⁵ After the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) developed and published the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* in 2000, there was a renewed interest in research instruction and the role that librarians might play in the classroom.⁶ Most notably, Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, a Reference Librarian/Assistant Professor at the College of Staten Island, City University of New

York, published two articles considering the role that information literacy was now playing in the college curriculum development and the shifts in thinking that would need to be made regarding the academic library and academic librarians (“Information” 2003, 2004). Like Norgaard’s article, Owusu-Ansah’s work reads like a call to action; in the first place, he asks for the debate regarding defining information literacy to end in favor of implementing its practice, and in the second, he proposes “a comprehensive approach to information literacy instruction . . . suggest[ing] a programmatic solution that ensures that every undergraduate is provided with information literacy instruction before graduation” (3).

While Norgaard and Owusu-Ansah provide powerful arguments for greater integration of library instruction into the college curriculum, they do not provide practical suggestions for more fully incorporating that instruction into the college classroom. In fact, while library scholarship has dealt more extensively with this issue, there are still very few articles that discuss a more sustained partnership between academic librarians and university faculty.⁷ The few articles that do address this kind of collaboration often do so on a very limited basis, relegating their discussion to a single library session or fieldtrip.⁸

While composition and library literature has acknowledged the need for a greater collaboration between composition faculty and librarians to improve student production, the composition literature, more specifically, has not reassessed this need since the rise of the Internet.⁹ Only a handful of articles in the composition field discuss the potential for increased collaboration between faculty and librarians. And, while some articles, like Norgaard’s, suggest that composition and rhetoric faculty more fully integrate library instruction into their courses, many of these articles are published within library literature, reaching an audience outside the targeted field.

Perhaps the most substantial discussions of faculty/librarian collaboration offered are Dan Terkla and Steve McKinzie’s “The Revolution is Being Televised: Pedagogy and Information

Retrieval in the Liberal Arts College,” and Isbell and Broaddus’ “Teaching Writing and Research as Inseparable: A Faculty-Librarian Teaching Team.” Terkla and McKinzie discuss the partnerships established at Dickinson College between librarians, deemed “Liaisons” by Terkla and McKinzie, and faculty in a variety of departments and programs. Yet, while “The faculty/Liaison relationship introduces a collaborative dimension to the research process,” Terkla and McKinzie assert the limited role of these Liaisons as “retrieval experts” (13). When discussing their faculty/Liaison model, they indicate that the Liaison’s interaction with students begins in the sixth week of classes—about two months into the semester (14). Isbell’s partnership with Dorothy Broaddus, then an assistant professor of English at Arizona State University West, presents readers with a much more intensive model for partnership; Isbell and Broaddus worked together extensively in creating and then implementing an American Studies course. Their partnership serves as an excellent model, yet their work is tailored to upper-level courses. We would argue that a sustained partnership, such as Isbell and Broaddus’, can also be successfully applied to first-year writing-intensive courses. The University-supported partnership that exists in the UWP has enabled faculty and librarians to explore together assignments and library sessions that will emphasize to students the recursive nature of writing and research.

Faculty and Librarian Perspectives and History

Prior to coming to The George Washington University, both of us had worked at other universities that had classroom/library interaction, yet neither of us had experienced a sustained partnership between faculty and librarians. From 1998-2005, Caroline was a graduate teaching assistant for the English Department at the University of Delaware. This department was well-supported by the library; instructors could request library instruction for first-year writing classes. These sessions were often held in computer classrooms located in the basement of Memorial Hall—the English department’s home base. At Delaware, Caroline

never ran the risk of having her students see their library instruction sessions as fieldtrips since they merely walked to the basement of Memorial Hall from a classroom located on the upper-level. The physical distance, though, between the computer classroom and the actual library reinforced the idea that these sessions occurred in isolation from the rest of the classroom work. As an instructor, Caroline tried to time library sessions appropriately, often scheduling them in advance of a due date for a research essay. Yet, this timing was not enough to impart to the students the connections between what they were doing in this satellite session and the writing that they were doing for the course. The physical separation also encouraged students to conduct all their research online—sometimes using the databases that the librarian would introduce but, more often than not, merely doing a quick Internet search for articles.

Ann has over a decade of professional library experience. Library science education is a mix of practical training and theory, but even now, pedagogy and instruction is not a general education requirement. Most librarians, like most faculty, learn pedagogy and teaching on the job. During her first job at the University of Illinois at Chicago, while bumbling through her first instruction sessions, Ann realized that she actually enjoyed teaching. Until that moment, she had never entertained the idea of being an instructor. Ann's next job started in 2000, just as the ACRL Information Literacy Standards were approved. Initially, they were not readily adopted or adapted at Utah State University, where she was a Business Librarian, doing a mixture of instruction and collection development. Due to the high number of classes and students for both Ann and the faculty she worked with, it was often expedient to have traditional demo-based library sessions. However, it was the graduate students teaching the mandatory first-year English classes who were willing to try new avenues and experiment within the regular 50-minute fieldtrip to the library.

For success in the composition classroom, interest in pedagogy needs to be systematically supported. Within the UWP, we hold numerous faculty development workshops, including a summer

retreat and semester workshops; the librarians have been an integral part of both the annual summer workshop and semester workshops, which have focused on such topics as teaching research and citation pedagogy. The faculty and librarians' ideas often cross-pollinate in these workshops. One such discussion group involved ten faculty/librarian partners sharing their collaborative research/writing assignments, which allowed for others to ask questions and even consider adaptation/adoption of said assignments. Likewise, The George Washington University Gelman Library's Education and Instruction Group (EIG) is fertile ground for exploration and experimentation. Efforts to remain on the cutting edge and EIG's emphasis on creativity led to exploring a Massively Multiplayer Online Role Playing Game for critical thinking. In an effort to educate ourselves, we conducted numerous internal workshops on pedagogy, including a workshop for D.C. Metropolitan Area librarians. In January 2009, George Washington, with the help of George Mason University, hosted a local writing conference, "Praxis, Pedagogy, People: Writing Studies in the D.C. Metropolitan Area," which served as an excellent forum for discussing pedagogical philosophies and exchanging ideas for classroom activities. Many of the presentations by George Washington writing faculty and librarians focused on these sustained partnerships.

Faculty and Librarian Collaboration: A Case Study

Planning and Preparation

Our approach to course design meets the first-year students where they are, valuing the skills, knowledge and ability they bring with them. We have created a series of assignments that model behavior, build upon each other, and utilize the Millennial behaviors of group work and comfort with technology to create a seamless learning environment.¹⁰ Prior to the start of the semester, we meet to discuss our semester goals for research. We reflect on what was successful, or not successful, about our work

together the previous semester, and we also look specifically at the successes (or failures) of the students' final research projects, a 12-15 page argumentative paper on the topics of their choice. This project is self-directed; the student develops his/her own topic in conjunction with the course theme and extensively researches that topic. The paper goes through two drafts and two rounds of peer review before being submitted for final evaluation. In the past, these meetings have been incredibly helpful in order to see what skills may need to be reinforced in the upcoming semester. From there, we discuss the timing of our library sessions and schedule at least three face-to-face sessions to occur in the library throughout the semester. We are also sure to include Ann's contact information at the top of the course syllabus as well as her contact information and photograph on Blackboard.

Making Research Visible in the Classroom

In the class sessions leading up to our first library session, Caroline strives to teach her students the interconnectedness of reading, writing, and research. For their first writing assignment, students are asked to do a close reading of an article that we have discussed in class, analyzing the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of the piece. Though students do not include any outside research in their first assignment, they are being asked to consider in class discussion the quality of research included in the pieces, and they may choose to focus on analyzing the (in)effectiveness of that research in their essays. When teaching a UW20 course themed around women's autobiographies, students read Chapter 8, "Growing Trust," from Barbara Kingsolver's *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle* (2007). This chapter includes statistics gathered from outside sources along with Kingsolver's own personal assertions. We discuss, as a class, the fact that Kingsolver does not include parenthetical citations or footnotes for her outside sources, only a bibliography at the close of her text, and we debate about what effect her use of sources might have on the reader. We talk, too, about how our own research papers might look different from Kingsolver's memoir, noting how genre can help a writer

determine appropriate and inappropriate ways to incorporate research. Even before we enter the library, students are beginning to think critically about how writers carefully consider the role that research plays in the texts that they write.

Research Instruction Sessions

As collaborators, we carefully link our in-class library sessions to the upcoming writing assignments. While we acknowledge that many students will do much of their research online, we also feel that it is important to introduce them to the library as a physical space, which is why we chose to have our library sessions in the Gelman Library's computer classrooms. The George Washington University is also committed to students using the space of the library and its resources; the library is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. On a practical level, meeting in the library's computer room helps the students to see these sessions not as busy work but as a necessary component to successfully completing a graded paper; often, students leave these sessions having found relevant and scholarly research to incorporate into the papers that they are writing. On a pedagogical level, though, we see this strategy again reinforcing for students the recursive nature of writing and research. Prior to our first library session of the semester, which usually occurs in Week 3 or 4 of the course, we ask that students complete a library pre-assignment, which Ann has developed. For the women's autobiography course, students are asked to visit The National Portrait Gallery and look at a series of self-portraits and portraits of famous women; they then pick one work to focus on. For the pre-assignment, students are asked to research their selected work, looking at the artists themselves or the themes of their works, using Google, Wikipedia, the library catalog, and *Academic Search Premier*. They are then asked to critically evaluate the usefulness of these results. The final question asks the students to reflect upon the similarities and differences among the results of their four searches.

Then, in the face-to-face library session, Ann asks them to elaborate on their findings and research experiences. This session

accomplishes several course goals in an hour-and-fifteen-minute session. First, it helps make transparent to students their natural search process—first Google then Wikipedia—and it shows them how the searching skills they already possess can be applied to the library resources. Instead of demonizing their research process, we explore it with them, pushing them to critically evaluate the tools that they are already using while simultaneously demonstrating the more precise alternatives from the library.¹¹ This session also enables Ann to help students navigate Gelman Library resources such as the catalog and the databases, without having to spend valuable class time demonstrating each step.

As students approach a new library and new research expectations, they often make missteps on the road to success, and this assignment allows them to do so with low risk. It also helps us to begin to teach students the sometimes very foreign concept of thinking critically about a paper topic and their contribution to the scholarly conversation already occurring about that topic. Often, a student is very literal when he or she starts searching and will become frustrated because he or she could not find information specific to a work such as the *Self-Portrait* by Alice Neel in either the catalog or *Academic Search Premier*. We take this opportunity to discuss the concept of applying a research lens, noting that if it was difficult to find information about the individual portrait, one might look up information about aging or body image to inform a reading of Neel's work. Finally, this session prepares them for a number of upcoming writing assignments, including the E-Poster project and their second writing assignment of the semester, a research-based compare/contrast paper.

The E-Poster: A Touchstone Assignment

Our second session of the semester occurs a week after the first session and focuses on the E-Poster, an electronic version of a poster session.¹² The E-Poster was adapted from an assignment that we developed for a six-week, online UW20 course held over the summer. In the face-to-face classroom, this assignment asks students to work in groups of three to explore a subject-specific

database and to construct an E-Poster (a 5-7 slide PowerPoint presentation) which serves as an advertisement and quick help-guide for their classmates, highlighting the focus of the database, articulating tricks and tips for using it, and indicating how one could use this database in connection with our course theme.

At the close of our first library session, Ann introduces the concept of the E-Poster. The students have been assigned working groups or pods in groups of three within the classroom. The student groups are responsible for exploring one of five databases. In Fall 2009, we selected *MLA International Bibliography*, *Lexis-Nexis*, *Sociological Abstracts*, *PsycInfo*, and *Contemporary Women's Issues*; these database selections differ as the theme of the course changes. As part of the introduction, we note our grading standards for the assignment and point to sample student E-Posters from former classes on Blackboard, our University's online course management system; as this is Ann's area of expertise, we grade the E-Posters together. These presentations are meant to stand alone and will not be presented in class. Rather, they will be reviewed by the students prior to our next library session in preparation for class discussion.

Since, during this first session, Ann has modeled Boolean searches and truncation in *Academic Search Premier*, students already have some familiarity with database searching that applies across platforms. Our assignment asks students to critically evaluate how a discipline-specific database can be used to explore a painting from the National Portrait Gallery pre-assignment and its related issues or content. Students are also asked to demonstrate the mechanics of the assigned database, including the exploration of subject-specific thesauri and the vocabulary specific to their assigned databases. We also ask that their E-Poster answer the following questions:

- What is the topic of this database?
- What sources seem to be in this database?
- How might you use this database for this class?

- What tricks or tools would you use to maximize your searches in this database to find better or more sources?
- How would you find the full text and the hard copy of a source from this database?

We encourage students to take screenshots of their searches and results and include these in their poster to help their classmates see more clearly how to conduct a search—an aspect of the assignment that appeals to more visual learners.

In our follow-up library session, which occurs a week later, Ann asks the student groups to compile a list of the databases' similarities and differences in relation to the database that they were assigned. She then leads a discussion, asking students to report back on what they found. Students often have trouble grasping the unique focus of each database; while they understand that *MLA International Bibliography* is a literary database, they will often conduct searches that do not effectively illustrate that focus. This library session enables us to discuss why typing “Rosa Parks” into *MLA* may not produce the best results, whereas extrapolating from the topic and searching for literary representations of African-American women in the 1950s would work better. Taking that discussion further, Ann will take one such example and ask students to formulate relevant and related database searches. Again, this activity prompts students to think more critically, and strategically, about how they searched and where they chose to search. The skills they begin to develop in this session, too, are ones that they will continue to develop when researching their second writing assignment of the semester and their final research project.

In preparation for the second writing assignment of the semester, the research-intensive, compare/contrast paper, students lead class discussion on outside readings that connect with a “primary” text that we have assigned them to read for class. The students are assigned either a contextual presentation, which puts the “primary” text in context, or a textual presentation,

which concentrates on the textual elements of the “primary” text. To find these readings, students must consult the databases which Ann has introduced; if their “primary” text is a selection from Anne Moody’s *Coming of Age in Mississippi*, they might go to *Sociological Abstracts* to find a scholarly article about women’s activist movements during the 1960s. Or, if they are assigned a textual presentation, they can consult *MLA* for sources. They then can draw on these resources as they write their compare/contrast paper.

Likewise, these E-Posters come into play in a number of ways as they prepare for their third writing assignment of the semester, the research project. First, we reference these posters when students begin developing a research paper topic. Each student is required to post his/her topic to Blackboard. Their classmates are then asked to go in and respond to those posts, suggesting a research lens they might use to explore their topic as well as a database that might be appropriate for the work that they are doing, and to include a citation to an article or book that they have found for their partners. Very often, students will review the E-Posters as a way of reminding themselves which database would be appropriate for a topic on literature and which would be appropriate for a sociologically based topic.

Most obviously, students utilize these databases to find information for their research papers. Our third and final library session is a structured open lab, in which the students are given time in class to do research and consult with either of us. These databases come into play during this session as students talk with each other and with us about which databases would best suit their research needs. Students are then asked to individually construct a second E-Poster that will serve as a tentative visual outline for their final research paper.

Online Integration

Not only will students interact with Ann during the three library sessions of the semester, but Ann also enters the classroom space in other ways as well. The Blackboard site becomes an

additional space for Ann to interact with students. Organized around the four major writing assignments, the site includes links to information about those assignments as well as links to the library homepage. Here, Ann enters into discussions taking place on the discussion boards; she comments on students' individual blogs; and she posts announcements. After students post their initial research paper topics to their Writing Journal on Blackboard, both Caroline and Ann will provide feedback on the topics. Ann suggests resources that might benefit the student, outside the scope of the E-Posters, as he/she begins researching. Throughout the semester, students become more and more familiar with Ann and often email or instant message her with questions about their research topics. Additionally, they may schedule individual research sessions with her prior to the completion of the project. Allowing Ann this additional presence outside of our classroom proper increases her visibility and ability to help the students, and it emphasizes the important role that research plays at the college level.

Conclusion

Integration of the writing classroom and the library, of writing skills *and* researching skills, can and does have its challenges, but when it does work, it works exceptionally well. Student responses to our course design have confirmed this assertion. Often, in their classroom evaluations at the close of the semester, students speak favorably about the instruction they received from Ann. One student, in the Fall 2009, wrote, "My research skills have definitely improved a lot. Usually, I would restrict myself to Google only, but now I know of so many databases available that I can actually provide reliable and resourceful information." Likewise, a student in the Fall 2010 wrote, "I learned a lot about researching. I have already used the techniques in other classes. Now, I seldom use Google. Instead, I opt for more academic search engines because now I know how to use them."

While these comments do not capture the recursive nature of writing and research, in our final class period of the semester,

students reflect on these connections more explicitly. At the start of the semester, Caroline has them complete a “writing time capsule.” Each student brings to class a paper he/she has written in the past; they write a reflection letter about that paper; and they complete a survey that Caroline and Ann developed together which asks them questions about their past reading, researching, and writing experiences. These time capsules are returned at the close of the semester, and students are asked to write another reflection letter about what they submitted. We take the last day of class to discuss these observations. At the close of the semester, students are much more aware of the fact that quality papers for this course are a result of a process. One student in Fall 2010 wrote,

I have learned that my writing process was good, but it was very high school. I learned that it is okay to research while you’re writing and it is okay to completely rework a paper. I always thought that you had to know exactly what you are writing about before you wrote it, but I’ve learned that it isn’t always the case. In the future, I won’t be so afraid to rewrite paragraphs or eliminate them.

In this class period, students become more thoughtful about the connections between writing and researching. One question on the survey asks, “What does the phrase ‘the recursive nature of writing and research’ mean to you?” At the start of the semester, most students leave that question blank, but by the end of the term, like the student above, they are better able to explain the interconnectedness.

When writing and research are emphasized as interrelated skills, no longer are there breaks in the learning process for a library “fieldtrip.” Rather, the writing classroom and the library sessions intersect to provide students with one sustained learning environment where students can not only learn valuable skills but also begin to think more critically about how writing and research work to support each other. In our classroom, we strive to stress

that “research and writing are part of a continuum” (Isbell and Broaddus 53), and over the course of the semester, students begin to see more clearly how these “excursions” will directly contribute to their continued success at the college level.

Notes

¹These statistics were compiled from The George Washington University’s Office of Institutional Research and Planning’s webpages:

<http://www.gwu.edu/~ire/undergraduate_admissions.htm> and
<<http://www.gwu.edu/~ire/fa.htm>>.

²While we recognize that not every institution of higher education will have an identical student population, there are some commonalities among some populations. In 2009, the Pew Internet and American Life Project charted Internet usage by generation. Their statistics reveal that generations prior to the Millennials are—on average—still fairly Internet savvy. For more information, see <http://pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2009/PIP_Generations_2009.pdf>.

³For a full list of first-year writing courses, see the University Writing Program’s webpage: <<http://www.gwu.edu/~uwp/fyw/uw20-courses.html>>.

⁴For the course template, which articulates the common goals of the program, see <<http://www.gwu.edu/~uwp/fyw/uw20-template.html>>.

⁵See, for example: Jean Sheridan’s “What Bibliographic Instruction Librarians Can Learn from Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Instructors” (*Writing Across the Curriculum and the Academic Library*. Ed. Jean Sheridan. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1995: 113-19) and Amy M. Kautzman’s “Teaching Critical Thinking: The Alliance of Composition Studies and Research Instruction” (*Reference Services Review* 24.3 (1996): 61-65).

⁶For a copy of the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education developed by the ACRL, see <<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency.cfm>>.

⁷See, for example: Mary M. Huston and Willie Parson’s “A Model of Librarianship for Combining Learning and Teaching” (*Research Strategies* 3.2 (1985): 75-80) and Ann Grafstein’s “A Discipline-Based Approach to Information Literacy” (*The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 28.4 (2002): 197-204).

⁸See, for example: Sonia Bodi's "Collaborating With Faculty in Teaching Critical Thinking: The Role of Librarians" (*Research Strategies* 10.2 (1992): 69-76); Amy Kautzman's "Teaching Critical Thinking: The Alliance of Composition Studies and Research Instruction" (*Reference Services Review* Fall 1996: 61-65); Mark Emmons and Wanda Martin's "Engaging Conversation: Evaluating the Contribution of Library Instruction to the Quality of Student Research" (*College and Research Libraries* November 2002: 545-560); and Rebecca S. Albitz's "The What and Who of Information Literacy and Critical Thinking in Higher Education" (*Libraries and the Academy* 7.1 (2007): 97-109).

⁹In his article, "Reinventing WAC (Again): The First-Year Seminar and Academic Literacy" for *College, Composition, and Communication*, Doug Brent argues that first-year seminars can be a site of introduction to valuable skills such as critical reading, researching, and writing—skills necessary for upper-level Writing-Across-the-Curriculum courses. Many of his ideas can also be applied to first-year writing courses.

¹⁰In the summer of 2006, we created and taught, along with reference and instruction librarian Tina Plottel, an online version of our face-to-face UW20 course. In an online environment, modeling behavior becomes essential to a successful "classroom" experience. Modeling behavior is also a component of Universal Design for Instruction, which supports students' multi-modal learning styles.

¹¹For instance, many students have been told prior to entering George Washington that they should not consult Wikipedia for assignments. We discuss with them the reasons why their previous instructors might have been wary of this resource, but we also discuss ways in which Wikipedia might be a useful—perhaps for acquiring background information or to develop a list of search terms. We consistently encourage them to think critically about not only the information they are acquiring but also the resources from which they are acquiring that information.

¹²The term E-Poster and some of the parameters for the assignment were adapted from the Poster Session submission guidelines for the 2006 American Library Association's Annual Meeting.

Works Cited

- Albitz, Rebecca S. "The What and Who of Information Literacy and Critical Thinking in Higher Education." *Libraries and the Academy* 7.1 (2007): 97-109. Print.
- Bodi, Sonia. "Collaborating With Faculty in Teaching Critical Thinking: The Role of Librarians." *Research Strategies* 10.2 (1992): 69-76. Print.

- Brent, Doug. "Reinventing WAC (Again): The First-Year Seminar and Academic Literacy." *College, Composition, and Communication* 57.2 (2005): 253-276. Print.
- Emmons, Mark, and Wanda Martin. "Engaging Conversation: Evaluating the Contribution of Library Instruction to the Quality of Student Research." *College and Research Libraries* November 2002: 545-560. Print.
- "First-Time, First-Year (Freshman) Admission." *Office of Institutional Research and Planning*. The George Washington University, n.d. Web. 3 February 2010.
- Gavin, Christy. "Guiding Students Along the Information Highway: Librarians Collaborating with Composition Instructors." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 13.1-2 (1994): 225-235. Print.
- "University Writing Program: The GW Experience." *The George Washington University*. The George Washington University, n.d. Web. 26 March 2011.
- Grafstein, Ann. "A Discipline-Based Approach to Information Literacy." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 28.4 (2002): 197-204. Print.
- Hanson, Michele. "The Library as Laboratory for Interdisciplinary Studies." *Teaching English at the Two-Year College*, October 1993: 222-228. Print.
- Huston, Mary M., and Willie Parson. "A Model of Librarianship for Combining Learning and Teaching." *Research Strategies* 3.2 (1985): 75-80. Print.
- "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." *Association of College and Research Libraries*. American Library Association, n.d. Web. 3 February 2010.
- "Introduction to Information Literacy." *Association of College and Research Libraries*. American Library Association, n.d. Web. 3 February 2010.
- Isbell, Dennis, and Dorothy Broaddus. "Teaching Writing and Research as Inseparable: A Faculty-Librarian Teaching Team." *Reference Services Review*, Winter 1995: 51-62. Print.
- Jones, Sydney. "Pew Internet Project Data Memo." *Pew Internet and American Life Project*. 28 January 2009. Web. 26 March 2011.
- Kautzman, Amy M. "Teaching Critical Thinking: The Alliance of Composition Studies and Research Instruction." *Reference Services Review* 24.3 (1996): 61-65. Print.
- Norgaard, Rolf. "Writing Information Literacy: Contributions to a Concept." *Reference and User Services Quarterly* 43.2 (2003): 124-30. Print.
- Nutefall, Jennifer, and Phyllis Ryder. "Teaching Research Rhetorically." *Academic Exchange Quarterly* 9.4 (2005): 307-311. Print.
- Owusu-Ansah, Edward K. "Information Literacy and the Academic Library: A Critical Look at the Controversies Surrounding It." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 29.4 (2003): 219-230. Print.

- . "Information Literacy and Higher Education: Placing the Academic Library in the Center of a Comprehensive Solution." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 30.1 (2004) 3-16. Print.
- Sheridan, Jean. "What Bibliographic Instruction Librarians Can Learn from Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Instructors." *Writing Across the Curriculum and the Academic Library*. Ed. Jean Sheridan. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1995: 113-19. Print.
- Terkla, Dan, and Steve McKinzie. "The Revolution Is Being Televised: Pedagogy and Information Retrieval in the Liberal Arts College." *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 4.2 (1997): 9-20. Print.
- "Undergraduate Freshmen Admission (Fall 1994-Fall 2007)." *Office of Institutional Research and Planning*. The George Washington University, n.d. Web. 3 February 2010.