



*Article*

**Rethinking Roles:  
Librarians and Faculty Collaborate to Develop Students' Information Literacy**

Dianne VanderPol  
Emily A. B. Swanson  
Westminster College

**Abstract**

Librarians at Westminster College developed and implemented a yearlong faculty and staff professional development experience using ACRL's "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education" as a framework. Traditionally, fostering student mastery of selected standards is perceived as the librarians' job while other standards are thought to fall primarily under the purview of the teaching faculty. In particular, librarians are hesitant to address some of the more complex learning outcomes in standards three and four, such as the students' ability to synthesize and use information to develop new knowledge. These information literacy components fall into a no man's land between the generally accepted roles for librarians and teaching faculty. This article describes the experience of librarians at Westminster College leading a faculty and staff Learning Community that addressed these information literacy elements. We share our observations and insights along with the readings and activities that made up the syllabus for the Learning Community.

Librarians can best develop higher order information literacy skills in students by partnering with faculty. Too often librarians suggest that it is the role of the college or university's teaching faculty to help students become critical readers, adept at synthesizing information sources, and capable of recognizing interrelationships among concepts--outcomes included in standards three and four of ACRL's "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education". Librarians cite concerns about overstepping boundaries between librarian and faculty work and note that our teaching faculty colleagues have classroom opportunities that we lack, such as the ability to grade students' work. At the same time, teaching faculty may consign all information literacy instruction to librarians, making assumptions about the students' preparedness, and suggesting that their expertise is in a subject discipline and not in teaching writing and research basics. Student development of some of the most complex and interesting information literacy skills can therefore fall through the cracks. This article describes the experience of librarians and faculty at Westminster College<sup>1</sup> leading and participating in a year-long professional development experience that prompted us to re-think our roles in fostering information literacy.

In the summer of 2011, the administration of Westminster College released a call for proposals for Learning Communities. The intent was to bring together groups of interested faculty and staff to spend a year learning about a particular topic and applying new knowledge to practice. Librarians at Giovale Library proposed an Information Literacy Learning Community, which was one of the eight Learning Communities funded. Learning Community members were awarded a stipend for participating. To recruit members for the Information Literacy Learning Community, librarians sent out a short email asking faculty and staff if they were satisfied with their students' research abilities and inviting them to

---

<sup>1</sup> Westminster College is a private, comprehensive college located in Salt Lake City, offering more than 70 undergraduate majors and 11 graduate programs to a population of just over three thousand students. The campus is served by Giovale Library, which employs 6 librarians, 4 full time staff members, and 13 student employees.

## **Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education**

### **Standard One**

The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.

### **Standard Two**

The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

### **Standard Three**

The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.

### **Standard Four**

The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

### **Standard Five**

The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

Source:  
<http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>

participate in the Learning Community. The announcement went on to say that through a series of monthly meetings, participants in the Information Literacy Learning Community would rework assignments to add information literacy components and thereby improve students' research skills. Interested faculty and staff replied to the librarians. Nearly two dozen staff and faculty members indicated an interest but approximately half were unable to participate at the time due to overloaded schedules. Additionally, a few faculty opted out after the first meeting due to insurmountable scheduling conflicts. In the end, the Learning Community was composed of seven members and two librarian leaders. The librarians created the content, led discussions, and scheduled guest speakers, when relevant, to address the group. Half way through the academic year, the library hired a new instruction librarian, and she became a participant in later meetings. In addition to librarians, membership consisted of two education professors, two English professors, a history professor, a public health professor, the Director of Undergraduate Research, and a staff member from the Career Resource Center. The Learning Community met once a month, September through March, for two hours each session.

The topics of the meetings were based on the five ACRL standards, with sessions devoted to each standard. The librarians felt the ACRL standards held untapped potential. Each session was meant to introduce participants to the richness of the standard, generate conversation, and provide ideas for practical application in a course. The end goal was for each participant to add information literacy to an assignment or course. At the end of the academic year, all of the Learning Communities presented at a campus-wide event.

### **Initial Assumptions and Session One**

Prior to meeting with the Learning Community members, librarians sketched out a structure for the Learning Community, with each session devoted to an ACRL standard. For most of the standards, we found inspiration and ideas both in our own experiences and in the literature in the field. However, there was little in the literature that addressed librarians taking on ACRL's information literacy standard four, "the information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose." Our own experiences mirrored our findings in the literature; we had neglected our role in helping students to develop their abilities to use information to accomplish a specific purpose. A post on Wayne Bivens-Tatum's blog (2011) dealing with all the standards and how they related to a librarian's job seemed to capture a common sentiment:

Standard Four also goes beyond the level of student involvement that most librarians have. Accomplishing a specific purpose can be interpreted many ways, but the specific purpose of most students I see is writing a research essay of some kind. I help them find sources, discuss the different kinds of sources there are and what they could do for an essay, but I don't work with them in the way that instructors would, and I'm

usually not in a position to know if they've accomplished their task well.  
(para. 5)

Many commenters agreed with Bivens-Tatum that standard four was the professor's responsibility. Librarians wrote of their lack of comfort or ability in addressing the standard. Initially, the Westminster librarians agreed with Bivens-Tatum and the commenters. We took the approach that standard four is the faculty's responsibility and faculty may, in fact, be offended if librarians tried to take on the development of those student skills. In our original plans for the Learning Community, standards three and four would be addressed briefly, combined in one session, and we would cede the responsibility for much of the higher order thinking skills of these standards to the faculty, sticking to the tried and true roles of librarians.

These assumptions were challenged at the first meeting of our Learning Community. Prior to that meeting, we asked each participant to read the *Inside Higher Ed* article "What Students Don't Know" (Kolowich, 2011), and at the meeting we asked participants to share with the group the biggest stumbling blocks and issues of their students. Many of the faculty members said that their students struggled most with the intersections of research and writing, which is related to standards three and four. Participants talked about a desire to know how students used sources. They wanted ideas on how to encourage students to really engage with the sources and interact with authors' ideas. And, to our surprise, they looked to librarians for help with precisely those issues we'd seen as primarily their domain. After our first meeting, we redesigned our original plan to focus on elements of the standards that had been somewhat neglected by many of our library colleagues. We realized that all the standards needed to be fully addressed and that we needed to expand our roles as librarians. Furthermore, faculty members were asking us to articulate and expand our traditional roles in order to help them address major issues in students' engagement with and use of information.

## **Session Two**

*Standard One: The information literate student determines the nature and extent of information needed*

Approaching the session on standard one, we knew we needed to support and encourage faculty interest in any of the standard's outcomes, but after our first group meeting, we realized that we had to think about our roles broadly, looking carefully at outcomes that perhaps we had neglected in the past, particularly those that ask students to demonstrate complex critical thinking skills. For example, one outcome is that the information literate student recognizes that existing information can be combined with original thought, experimentation, and analysis to produce new information. The role of existing information at the students' disposal or the impact of prior knowledge in their determination of their information need was new and interesting territory. We developed the following goals for the session on standard one:

1. Providing faculty the opportunity to see the ACRL Standards as a customizable tool for setting expectations and conducting assessments.
2. Discussing strategies for helping students select topics with which they might become deeply engaged and which make use of their prior knowledge and experiences.
3. Reviewing means for illustrating the breadth and depth of the information landscape for students prone to taking a limited view of their options.

Prior to the session, librarians presented faculty with a table listing the performance indicators and outcomes for standard one. We invited them to take a close look at the discrete knowledge sets, abilities, and skills students must develop to determine the nature and extent of their information needs. The table included blank spaces for faculty to note discipline-specific outcomes and also included some sample outcomes specific to anthropology and sociology for inspiration. The session on standard one began with a review of these tables and discussion of the rich evaluative language available to faculty in the ACRL standards.

Next, librarians asked faculty about student success with the first performance indicator, “the information literate student defines and articulates the need for information.”<sup>2</sup> In particular, we asked about their students’ success with topic selection. The group identified a disconnection between student prior knowledge and topic selection, and noted a correlation between engagement with the topic and success with the research. Too often, the faculty reported, students cast about for a topic that seemed to be something they should care about, rather than finding a way to relate the course material to something they actually already did care about. We discussed mechanisms to help students bring their prior experiences and interests to bear on topic selection. The librarians were able to bring unique perspectives to bear on the problem and provided links to concept mapping products and highlighted library resources such as Pop Culture Universe, a popular culture reference database produced by ABC-Clío, in which potential research topics are discussed in broad context essays. The essays make connections to related topics and help inspire students to see their interests reflected in fields of academic inquiry. One faculty member shared a tool she has adapted from the *Norton Field Guide to Writing* (Bullock, 2009) in which students generate an inventory of their prior experience with an eye to finding personally engaging topics to research throughout the semester. For example, a student might, on the inventory, identify herself as a twin and as a dog lover. Then, in her psychology class, she might elect to explore attachment issues between twins for one paper and the use of therapy animals in another based on her prior knowledge and experiences.

The second performance indicator, “the information literate student identifies a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information,” was the focus of the remainder of the session. Faculty had previously noted that many of their students did not have a full grasp of the information environment and that they relied nearly exclusively on popular Web content. The librarians provided several learning tools to showcase

---

<sup>2</sup> All performance indicators quoted in this article were retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency#stan>

popular and scholarly sources and to help students differentiate between primary and secondary sources. For example, we showed Eli Pariser's (2011) TED talk on filter bubbles as a lead in for a model conversation about how technology and our traditional habits conspire to present us with a skewed information diet. Using a major search engine, Pariser describes a search environment in which our location, our search history, and a number of other variables may influence our search results. He paints a picture of a kind of technological censorship as an unintended consequence of the personalization of search results.

### **Session Three**

*Standard Two: The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.*

The librarians chose a hands-on activity to introduce standard two. We were in our element conducting faculty development around this standard. The "access" standard has traditionally been the purview of librarians, with faculty acknowledging our expertise and contribution. The goals of the hands-on exercise were:

1. To highlight the complexities inherent in accessing needed information.
2. To articulate strategies used by expert researchers to accomplish this effectively and efficiently.

Faculty were asked to name a few of the best databases and resources for research in their discipline. Librarians listed the databases named by the faculty in a Word document that was projected on a screen at the front of the room throughout the activity. Next, librarians solicited potential paper topics from each faculty participant. We asked for topics that would be good choices for an undergraduate research paper. Faculty members selected a topic to research from among those provided by their peers. We asked them to select a topic in a discipline as far removed from their own as possible. A historian chose chaos theory in career counseling and an English professor explored issues surrounding wilderness designations of sites with evidence of historic human use. Participants were given 15 minutes to search. Librarians observed and interviewed faculty about the strategies they employed while searching for resources in an area outside of their expertise. Strategies included searching for background information using Google and/or Wikipedia, identifying important researchers in the field through a database search in order to seek out the blogs and web pages of those researchers, consulting with librarians for advice on a good database, modifying the assigned topic to fit the information found and prior knowledge, and using bibliographies to find more information.

The exercise was a powerful illustration of the experience of students who regularly try to employ research strategies in an area in which they are not an expert. The librarians asked the faculty questions about how they made judgment calls and selected one source over another. Faculty realized they use a series of cues, such as author affiliation or journal and publisher name recognition, some of which transferred well into

an unfamiliar discipline, but many of which did not serve them as well outside of their area of expertise. The majority of the faculty did not begin with library databases despite the fact that the librarians had, with their help, generated a list of suggested databases that was projected at the front of the room during the exercise. Most of the faculty used Google and Wikipedia at some point in their search. Some faculty found themselves employing prior knowledge in ways that furthered their search; for example, the faculty member looking into wilderness designations knew that the federal government made the designations and so she did some exploring within government regulations and codes. Other faculty found that their prior knowledge led them off track; a career counselor conducting research on Native American literature experienced serious “topic drift” into history resources on the Trail of Tears based on his comfort level with the scholarly discourses in history and literature. They realized that parts of their approach were very similar to that of their students and also saw points at which their approaches typically diverged. As a group, we were able to isolate some of the behaviors of advanced researchers that we’d like to model for and develop in our students.

Librarians also presented a specific example of an assignment that addressed standard two. We invited a psychology professor not affiliated with the Learning Community to present an assignment she used with success in her 300 level classes. Librarians felt that faculty would appreciate hearing from a teaching colleague about her experience. The assignment asks students to first find a popular article or website that has advice for parents on some aspect of child development. Students typically use simple searches on Google to find this source. Next, students must find scholarly work that directly supports or contradicts the information in their popular source. In this search for very specific information, students demonstrate their ability to access needed information. The students must also discuss the information presented in both sources and analyze the differences. The assignment does a nice job of targeting skills covered in standard two.

## **Session Four**

*Standard Three: The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.*

For the standard three session, it was important to the librarians to focus on the critical thinking information literate students must do in order to evaluate information for relevance and appropriateness. Too often, we felt, this standard is addressed, both by librarians and teaching faculty, using checklists and surface cues such as website domain or author affiliation to designate a source as inherently “good” or “poor”. The goals for this session included:

1. Recognizing that in order for students to effectively evaluate information sources, they must first be able to synthesize, analyze and understand the sources they have discovered.

2. Exploring classroom techniques designed to identify bottlenecks to student understanding.

We invited Dr. Wendy Holliday, Coordinator of Instruction at Utah State University, to facilitate this session. We decided to ask the faculty to read Project Information Literacy's interview with *The Citation Project* researchers (Project Information Literacy, 2011). The librarians selected this reading as a way of introducing the research that shows that students struggle to paraphrase or synthesize the main ideas from their sources and instead engage in rampant "patch-writing", or selecting discrete individual thoughts, quotes and citations to string together. Several of the performance indicators and outcomes for standard three highlight the need for students to summarize and synthesize, to recognize interrelationships among concepts, to compare, and to look for contradictions as a means of evaluating the appropriateness of a source. The skills students develop to master standard three sets the stage for their success in using their discovered information to create new knowledge, the work of standard four. During the Learning Community session on standard three, we discussed the findings of *The Citation Project's* researchers. Our participants' corroborated the results of *The Citation Project*, stating that Westminster students' writing is fraught with examples of patch-writing.

Dr. Holliday shared part of a TED talk delivered by Salman Khan (2011) about the value of flipping the classroom, asking students to listen to a taped lecture or to do other more traditional classroom activities independently prior to the class meeting and to do "homework" in the class session. She discussed what this might look like when the learning goal is information literacy and in particular, when the goal is the critical evaluation of information. Starting with the premise that in order to evaluate a source, a student must understand that source, Dr. Holliday suggested that students spend class time reading a source. She suggested that rather than spending class time demonstrating the use of a database, librarians and faculty could make use of tutorials to have the students search for an appropriate source as homework prior to the session. Flipping the classroom by asking the students to sit and read and then to verbally summarize the content of the source helps faculty and librarians to see clearly how students understand texts.

We also discussed an annotated bibliography assignment, which can help master elements of standard three. While annotated bibliographies have long been a staple of well-developed research assignments, asking students to use specific evaluative criteria to craft their annotations can be a powerful tool to build a framework for the kind of engagement with sources that faculty seek. Challenging students to take their annotations beyond simple summaries emphasizes the critical thinking skills in standard three.

## Session Five

*Standard Four: The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.*

Learning Community participants voiced concern over their students' ineffective writing. They were also frustrated by the students' inability to integrate source materials with their own thoughts. Therefore, the majority of the session was focused on performance indicator one, "the information literate student applies new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance." The librarians believed working with Dr. Christopher LeCluyse, Associate Professor of English and Director of Westminster's Writing Center, was a natural fit for the session on standard four. Prior to the session, we met with Dr. LeCluyse to define our goals for the session:

1. Provide members with adoptable exercises to use with students.
2. Illustrate the connection between research and good writing.
3. Present alternate models for feedback and reflection.

Unfortunately, a common complaint on campus is that students are not learning to write in the introductory English course. LeCluyse often counters this notion by saying that good writing is not something that is taught in one semester. Good writing takes years and is specific to the discipline. In many ways, librarians also fight this idea—that research is not taught in a one-shot session, but is a process. Moreover, good writing often depends on good research and quality sources.

The session focused on summary and paraphrasing, which would help prevent students' tendencies to resort to patch writing. LeCluyse led the group through a series of exercises that he uses with his students. He provided everyone with a set of artifacts: two different article excerpts and one data set that all addressed the same topic. He asked each person to select one artifact and write a short sentence that summarized the artifact. Then, working in groups of three, he asked each group to combine their sentences into a paragraph. This exercise required participants to synthesize and summarize different types of information; furthermore, it could be used with many different subject areas. LeCluyse also showed the Learning Community a synthesis matrix, a graphic organizer that helps students organize their sources around main ideas, created by the Writing and Speaking Tutorials Service at North Carolina State University (2006).

Although most of the meeting was about performance indicator one, some time was spent on the second performance indicator, "the information literate student revises the development process for the product or performance." Librarians led a discussion on revision, and participants reported frustration with the revision process. One participant said that students often revise, but often remove the "good parts" or they only fix what you specifically tell them needs to be fixed. Participants concluded that students may not be familiar with the revision process and need to be taught that skill.

To address the third goal for the session, Westminster history professor Dr. Gary Marquardt attended the meeting and discussed a method for providing feedback on research papers. He found that many of his students would flip through a paper he'd commented on, making small corrections but not addressing larger structural or evidentiary issues that he'd painstakingly identified and discussed in his full response to the paper. He tried, without success, to get students to meet with him to discuss their papers. Then he began experimenting with providing verbal feedback. He records his comments, usually on his phone, as he reads through a paper, highlighting whole paragraphs that have problems or areas where the argument is weak. The recordings usually last two to six minutes. Combining this verbal feedback with in-class workshops resulted in student improvement revising papers.

## Session Six

*Standard Five: The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.*

ACRL standard five often is thought of as the “citation standard”. Learning Community participants were interested in discussing citations. However, librarians, still thinking expansively about potential roles, sought to expose them to the real breadth of the standard. The goals of the meeting were:

1. Discuss the pros and cons of citation systems in a digital age.
2. Go beyond citations and present the ethical, social, and economic implications of the information.
3. Present a source for locating open access materials.

The first thirty minutes of our meeting was devoted to discussing citations, and the final sixty minutes devoted to the “ethical, legal and socio-economic issues” of standard five, performance indicator one. Prior to the meeting, participants read an article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* titled “Citation Obsession? Get Over It” (Schick, 2011). In this article, Kurt Schick advocates for a less stringent citation style for undergraduates, arguing that more of the students’ time should be spent on writing and information literacy skills rather than the minutia of citation format. During the meeting, we discussed Schick’s ideas, and participants voiced their experiences with teaching and grading citations. The main concern with not requiring a citation style was that students would then have difficulty reading and understanding citations.

After discussing citations, the group turned to the history of copyright and fair use. We intended to show Eric Faden’s video “A Fair(y) Use Tale” (2007). However, due to technical issues, we were not able to at that time. We described the video as a potential illustrative tool and shared the link so that participants could view it after the session. Next, the group discussed Shepard Fairey’s Barack Obama Hope poster which was used widely during Obama’s first election campaign and resulted in a court case (Senda, 2010). Discussion centered on whether or not Fairey’s use of the Associated

Press photo to create the poster was transformative, adding new meaning to the original (Stim, 2010). We also discussed if the photograph originally taken by Mannie Garcia, could be considered art. This activity illustrated the complexities of performance indicator 5.1: “The information literate student understands many of the ethical, legal, and socio-economic issues surrounding information and information technology.”

This discussion transitioned to how students can access images and videos that are available for free use. Librarians presented and demonstrated Creative Commons Search (<http://search.creativecommons.org/>). As student portfolios are becoming more frequently required on campus, Creative Commons Search is an excellent choice for students to get images for their projects and portfolios.

## **Faculty Response**

Campus administration required participants in the Faculty/Staff Learning Communities to set goals and/or develop a product as a result of our year of work. The Information Literacy Learning Community’s goal was that participants would design or redesign course elements to help foster information literacy

Faculty and staff from the Information Literacy Learning Community and from other professional development programs showcased their instructional design work at a college-wide end of year event attended by their peers. Our group chose to run a hands-on session modeled, in part, on the exercise we conducted in session three on standard two, and also, on an in-class assignment one of the faculty had redesigned following the Learning Community’s sessions on standards two and three. The group wanted to model the technique of flipping the classroom to assess the skills and knowledge needed for successful research. We designed a session in which attendees were asked to quickly research the public health topic Lyme disease in preparation for a media interview. Most attendees had only a lay persons’ knowledge of Lyme disease and no expertise in the field of public health. Attendees found themselves experiencing the search process much in the way that their students do. After the attendees attempted to research Lyme disease, Learning Community members led a discussion about the research process as experienced by experts and novices in a field.

After the exercise, group members shared other techniques and ideas from the Learning Community and described how they incorporated them into assignments. Session attendees received a booklet describing every participant’s course design/redesign. Some of the highlights included:

An education professor added the full set of ACRL standards to her introduction (a PowerPoint presentation and handout that form the basis of the first few class meetings) to a two-semester graduate thesis class. She engaged her students in a conversation about the breadth and depth of the information literacy they’d be called upon to demonstrate in writing the thesis. She wanted to give them the language to discuss the discrete elements of the process from the outset.

A history professor designed an evidence exercise for students in his upper division undergraduate course to interact with primary sources. His exercise uses modeling to walk students through discovery steps. He helps them to learn how to question an initial source and to develop an understanding of the variety of sources available to them.

An English and an ESL professor employed several new course modules with her class of non-native speakers. She used a version of a synthesis matrix introduced in the session on standard four to help students develop their summarization and evaluation skills. She noted that learning to summarize was an especially important step for these students and helped them to wean themselves from direct quotes or copy and pasting activities.

In addition to the materials the faculty and staff in the Learning Community developed for use in their classrooms and work situations, the Learning Community participants also broadened their ideas about how librarians could contribute to student development. Our College faculty, and in particular the group that self-selected to participate in the Information Literacy Learning Community, have always valued the work of librarians, but the Learning Community opened new doors for richer and deeper collaborations. The librarians demonstrated a host of underutilized talents as coordinators of a valuable faculty development program. Participants saw that we are thoughtful about pedagogical approaches and that we provide unique perspectives on the research process. Librarians benefited from an interdepartmental lens and broad access to a wide variety of assignments and novice researchers attempting to complete them.

In a survey conducted after the Learning Community concluded its work, faculty responded to questions about the value of experience with comments such as:

- “I really enjoyed this group. I feel the IL [information literacy] was a missing piece in my classes. The discussions were set up well and the topics fit my needs.”
- “It was a wonderful experience – [the librarians] carefully selected topics that they anticipated would be interesting to us (and were!) and were always well-prepared.”
- “They [the librarians] have a much broader range of knowledge and expertise than I previously thought.”

## **Next Steps**

The success of this first Learning Community spurred the proposal of a second year-long faculty and staff development module. The second learning community was led by a librarian and the Writing Center Director and focused on the intersections of research and writing in the disciplines. Excellent writing ability, like excellent research ability, is learned in cumulative stages. It is best addressed within the disciplines and by faculty

who may be skilled at the act but may desire assistance in teaching writing or research. One of the “graduates” of the first year Learning Community participated in the second year Learning Community. He felt he had more work to do with course and assignment design to promote information literacy. Westminster’s librarians continue to develop a core group of faculty on campus willing to collaborate to develop student’s information literacy. Furthermore, faculty participants have worked closely with librarians both during the Learning Community and afterward.

Librarians also came away from the Learning Community energized and re-focused on their own teaching. They have been practicing techniques discussed in the Learning Community, such as flipping the classroom, in their own sessions and in sessions worked on with faculty. For example, in an education course taught by a Learning Community participant and a librarian, students were asked to find and read an article relevant to their research prior to a session in the library. They then spent the class time talking about the information in those articles and doing verbal summaries, synthesis, and evaluations for relevance. The librarian worked with the students to demonstrate how they might use one source to find similar sources or sources that fill the gaps in their knowledge that the discussion and verbal summary had helped them identify. Another librarian is embedded in an ESL course taught by a Learning Community participant and the two are collaborating on a presentation on the topic of teaching information literacy to international students for a national conference of ESL instructors. On our small campus, these one-on-one relationships are one of the most effective mechanisms for outreach and program development.

## **Conclusions**

The ACRL standards provide rich fodder for faculty development work. Some have criticized the standards for being too skills based (Elmborg, 2006; Pawley, 2003). However, the standards served us well as a succinctly packaged artifact to begin a deeper conversation about information and research: the very conversation that critics such as Elmborg and Pawley push librarians to have.

The future of information literacy will be multi-faceted. Faculty see students struggle to produce well-researched and well-reasoned papers and projects, so they respond positively to the standards as a roadmap for student improvement, and are willing to share responsibility to develop students’ information literacy. We’ve seen instances where the shared responsibilities are divided up along the lines of the standards: librarians cover standard two and parts of three, maybe some of standard five, but standard one, parts of three, and four belong solely to the teaching faculty. Our experience in looking at course and assignment design suggests that every standard is best tackled by both librarians and teaching faculty. It is unreasonable to think that one librarian can teach every outcome in the ACRL standards. A reasonable goal, and a goal that librarians should strive for, is to work with faculty members to assure that these outcomes are being taught effectively throughout a student’s career.

## References

- Bivens-Tatum, W. (2011, March 16) A bit on information literacy [Web log post]. Retrieved from [http://blogs.princeton.edu/librarian/2011/03/a\\_bit\\_on\\_information\\_literacy/](http://blogs.princeton.edu/librarian/2011/03/a_bit_on_information_literacy/)
- Bullock, R. (2009). A guide to writing arguments: Choosing a topic. *The Norton Field Guide to Writing*. W. W. Norton & Company. 99-100.
- Elmborg, J. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(2), 192-199.
- Faden, E. (2007). A Fair(y) use tale. [Video file]. Retrieved from: <http://cyberlaw.stanford.edu/blog/2007/03/fairy-use-tale>
- Khan, S. (2011). Salman Khan: Let's use video to reinvent education [Video file]. Retrieved from [http://www.ted.com/talks/salman\\_khan\\_let\\_s\\_use\\_video\\_to\\_reinvent\\_education.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/salman_khan_let_s_use_video_to_reinvent_education.html)
- Kolowich, S. (2011). What students don't know. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from [http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/08/22/erial\\_study\\_of\\_student\\_research\\_habits\\_at\\_illinois\\_university\\_libraries\\_reveals\\_alarmingly\\_poor\\_information\\_literacy\\_and\\_skills](http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/08/22/erial_study_of_student_research_habits_at_illinois_university_libraries_reveals_alarmingly_poor_information_literacy_and_skills)
- Pariser, E. (2011). Eli Pariser: Beware online "filter bubbles" [Video file]. Retrieved from [http://www.ted.com/talks/eli\\_pariser\\_beware\\_online\\_filter\\_bubbles.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/eli_pariser_beware_online_filter_bubbles.html)
- Pawley, C. (2003). Information literacy: A contradictory coupling. *Library Quarterly*, 73 (4), 422-452.
- Project Information Literacy (2011). Sandra Jamieson and Rebecca Moore Howard: Unraveling the citation trail. *Smart Talks*, (8). Retrieved from <http://projectinfolit.org/st/howard-jamieson.asp>
- Schick, K. (October 30, 2011). Citation obsession? Get over it. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Citation-Obsession-Get-Over/129575/>
- Senda, H. (2010). Hope or nope – Is “Obama Hope” protected by idea/expression, fair use doctrine, & First Amendment?. *Chicago-Kent Journal of Intellectual Property*, 10, 65.
- Stim, R. (2010). Measuring fair use: The four factors. Retrieved from <http://fairuse.stanford.edu/overview/fair-use/four-factors/>

Writing and Speaking Tutorials Service at North Carolina State University. (2006).  
Writing literature reviews and using a Synthesis matrix. Retrieved from:  
[http://tutorial.ncsu.edu/sites/tutorial.ncsu.edu/files/synthesis%20matrix\\_CC.pdf](http://tutorial.ncsu.edu/sites/tutorial.ncsu.edu/files/synthesis%20matrix_CC.pdf)

Diane VanderPol is the Director of the Giovale Library at Westminster College.

Emily A. B. Swanson is a Reference & Instruction Librarian at the Giovale Library,  
Westminster College.

©2013, D. VanderPol and E. A. B. Swanson. *Journal of Library Innovation* is an open access journal. Authors retain the copyright to their work under the terms of the following Creative Commons license: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 (United States) <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/us/>