"Hanging Together": Collaboration Between Information Literacy and Writing Programs Based on the ACRL Standards and the WPA Outcomes

Donna Mazziotti and Teresa Grettano

The initial aim of this project was to find common ground between the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education[1] (hereafter "ACRL Standards") developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries and the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition[2] (hereafter "WPA Outcomes") adopted by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) in order to foster collaboration between information literacy and first-year writing programs. The presenters hypothesized they would identify clear examples of overlap between the goals articulated in the two documents, and through this pairing would make suggestions as to how academic librarians and writing instructors could collaborate to meet these mutual goals. What the presenters found, though, was so much more.

Part I: Context
At First Glance, or How "They" Became "We"
The presenters entered their collaboration in Fall 2009, when Teresa began teaching at The University of Scranton and applied for an Information Literacy Stipend[3] through the Weinberg Memorial Library where Donna is a reference librarian and serves as the liaison to the Department of English & Theatre. Teresa wanted to develop a course on rhetoric and social media,

and, being in Rhetoric and Composition, she figured everything she did as a professor was information literacy already; she might as well earn some extra money while developing this course. Before applying for the stipend, Teresa had no idea librarians had a formalized set of standards toward which they worked. After working through the application process with Donna, though, Teresa began to understand the intricacy and thoroughness of the ACRL Standards. Once the stipend application was approved and she and Donna met to plan the course, many of the goals expressed in the ACRL Standards reminded Teresa of the teaching she did in first-year writing and the goals set forth by her own field's WPA Outcomes. The presenters looked at both documents and they thought, "Wow! Our disciplines share many of the same goals." The opportunity to work together to meet these goals crystallized, and a partnership began. At this point in their collaboration, "they" became "we."

We realized (accidentally, as often happens with good collaboration) the governing documents of our fields are closely aligned. We agreed it would be productive to compare the two documents and (with all our ambition and naiveté) planned to draft an article about this comparison in a single afternoon later that year. Almost two academic years later, we now can say

Donna Mazziotti is a Librarian at Weinberg Memorial Library, The University of Scranton, e-mail: donna.mazziotti@scranton.edu; Teresa Grettano is an English Professor in the Department of English & Theatre at The University of Scranton, e-mail: grettanot2@scranton.edu

with certainty that the two academic disciplines do share similar goals and can complement each other through collaboration. This certainty though, and our faith in our initial hypothesis, was hard coming and nothing like we thought it would be at that initial afternoon meeting. We grappled with the language in each document, reflected on the thought processes and histories of our fields, came apart, drew back together, and ultimately landed in a more in-depth understanding of what collaboration between academic librarians and writing instructors entails.

At Second Look, or How We Think Differently

About halfway through our collaboration and exploration of the documents, we found that our fields think and work differently. Teresa was surprised by this realization, since, as you remember, she entered this collaboration *because* she thought everything she did was "information literacy" anyway. How could we possibly think differently if we're all doing the same thing? We do. We think differently about research and instruction, and that became evident in the language of our documents. This realization nearly broke the project.

We came to this realization when Donna approached Teresa with Wayne Bivens-Tatum's *Academic Librarian* blog post analysis of the *portal* article, "The Timing of the Research Question: First-Year Writing Faculty and Instruction Librarians' Differing Perspectives," by Jennifer E. Nutefall and Phyllis Mentzell Ryder.[4] The article claims that difficulties in collaboration between librarians and writing instructors could be caused by differences in the disciplines' understanding of the research process. Donna found herself identifying with the blogger's analysis of the article, particularly the line, "Librarians want early, clearly formulated research questions, preferably with good keywords, because it's at that point that librarians can be most useful, or at least when many librarians feel most useful."[5] When Donna read that line aloud, Teresa chuckled because immediately she imagined all the work it took to get her students to articulate good research questions. As Donna continued, though, Teresa also found herself identifying with the blogger's analysis of the article, particularly when he explains, "Whereas librarians often enough get students with at least some focus, writing instructors usually begin with the chaos that is most student writing in the early stages of a first-year writing class.

It's the function of the writing instructor to teach students to form this chaos, to shape it, discipline it, focus it, and just when the students have mastered one skill, it's time for the writing instructor to push them further into the unknown with the research essay assignment. A writing class is always in some stage of managed chaos, and the writing instructor is always helping students find their way."[6] Chaos. Managed Chaos. That sounded accurate, and exciting, to Teresa. Formulated. Clearly formulated. That's when Donna felt most comfortable. We were in trouble.

This exchange prompted us to explain to each other, in detail, how we interact with students and their research. We felt it necessary to do so *even after* a year of collaborating *and even after* Donna had taught information literacy sessions for Teresa's writing classes. Teresa showed Donna the assignments she works through with students in first-year writing, documents Donna had already seen but that now took on new meaning in the context of this research. Teresa explained that at least a quarter of the first-year course focused on inquiry—the process through which students learn *by researching* what it is they want to write about. She admitted these assignments were meant to shift students' thinking about research, moving from "I want to make X argument and I need to find support for my opinion" to "I really need to learn about this issue before I can formulate an opinion responsibly and intellectually." Through these assignments, students were meant to understand research as inquiry.

In response, Donna noted how challenging "research as inquiry" makes the librarians' job as it is typically performed in the instruction setting. The reasons for this, Donna explained, have everything to do with the pressures of the "one-shot" library instruction session and the day-to-day reality of what happens at the reference desk. Donna gently reminded Teresa of how little time librarians have with students when asked to deliver library instruction—often it is as little as fifty minutes, and without the benefit of follow-up with the students. Added to the pressure are the specific expectations that the course professor has for the session, often worded along the lines of "For this assignment the students will need to find good, relevant scholarly research articles on their topics. They will also need to be able to accurately format a bibliography in correct APA format. Please show them how to do these things." Donna went on to describe how instruction at the reference desk shares the same orientation toward

successful execution of the final product. The librarian's role is to provide the steps students can follow to arrive at their intended goal. And this of course implies they *have* an intended goal they aim to meet. For better or worse, Donna more often than not taught research as method.

It is important to point out this disconnect in our understandings of what research is and how it is taught within our respective disciplines before we offer an analysis of the documents. Once we characterized this difference in our ways of thinking about research, we realized these differing approaches, these thought processes, are not only reflected in the documents but also in how they were created—both of which influence the work we do with students, together and separately.

"Product vs. Process": A Brief History of Rhetoric and Composition Pedagogy

By examining our documents with this new understanding in mind, we found differing ways of thinking reflected in the documents through which each discipline works through a research task. The ACRL Standards are more linear; the WPA Outcomes more recursive. Clear vs. chaotic. It was true!

In order to explain how Rhetoric and Composition learned to embrace the chaos, Teresa outlined for Donna (who was fascinated by it all) the "product vs. process vs. post-process" debates in her field. Rhetoric and Composition as an academic discipline in the modern university is fairly young.[7] For the most part, the discipline grew out of the influx of "unprepared" students in the 1950s and 1960s as a result of the GI Bill[8] and flourished through the Back to Basics literacy crisis of the Nixon Administration.[9] This is not to say that Rhetoric or Composition wasn't taught before this time. The origins of Rhetoric instruction can be traced back to ancient Greece, and Composition has been taught in American universities since the late nineteenth century. But as an academic discipline with professionals being trained through formal graduate programs, Rhetoric and Composition is only about sixty years old.

Throughout the history of the discipline, best practices for teaching writing have evolved. For many reasons—one being that the purpose of writing instruction in the 1950s and 1960s was somewhat remedial, to bring those students not traditionally admitted to university-level education up-to-speed with

their prep-school trained peers—this early historical period taught writing through what is now known as the "current-traditional pedagogy" of "teaching writing as a product." Teaching writing as a product meant mostly teaching grammar and form; its object was the mechanics of writing. This paradigm focused on the written text, not the writer. It treated both the writer and writing in modernistic terms—positioning the writer as an autonomous, rational, and unitary being and writing as a linear, isolated act.[10] This makes sense in that most writing instructors at the time were formally trained in Literature, not Rhetoric and Composition, and treated student documents much in the same way they treated literature, as finished works to be analyzed.

By the early 1970s, though, this approach was meeting resistance by some in the field. Donald Murray's 1972 article, "Teach Writing as a Process, Not Product," shifted the paradigm and ushered in the "process pedagogy" movement in Rhetoric and Composition.[11] Process pedagogy focused instruction on the writer and the ways writers compose—how they invent or generate ideas, how they organize, how they draft and revise. Approaches during this time varied from cognitive-behavioralist (examining how the brain functioned and observing seasoned writers) to expressivist (promoting personal writing and the writer's finding his or her own worldview through writing), to name just two.

By the early 1990s, another paradigm shift occurred when the "social turn" in the university at large made its way into Rhetoric and Composition and fostered "post-process pedagogy." As John Clifford and Elizabeth Ervin so aptly conclude, process was no longer the point of writing instruction—it was *beside* the point.[12] "Post-process pedagogy" situates the goals of writing instruction in understanding knowledge as socially constructed, writing as a social activity with social consequences, and literacy as an ideological domain; it teaches the construction of knowledge as a process and focuses on the role language plays in that construction. It is a distinctly postmodern approach—one that sees reality as socially constructed, subjectivity as shifting and fragmented, language as epistemic, and all of this as historically situated.

The work of James Berlin traces the shifts in epistemologies throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in writing instruction in the United States.[13] Despite criticism of his historical choices and meth-

odology, Berlin's description of the history of the field makes a significant contribution in the way it insists on the relationship among ideology, writing, and pedagogy. Berlin explains that changing definitions of knowledge, reality, and self have influenced the shifts in approaches to teaching writing. He places his theories of rhetoric into three epistemological categories: objective, subjective, and transactional. An objective rhetoric (chiefly employed by product-based pedagogies) places reality in the external world, and knowledge is the material object of experience; therefore, language works as a tool to transcribe and transfer knowledge. A subjective rhetoric (chiefly employed by process pedagogies) places reality within the individual, and language is the means by which individuals come to find their own personal knowledge. Transactional rhetoric (chiefly employed by post-process pedagogies) places reality in the interaction of the elements in the traditional rhetorical situation; subject, object, audience, and language work together to create knowledge.[14] Berlin's work shows that for most of the twentieth century, writing instructors taught within a modernist framework of reality, subjectivity, and knowledge.

We offer this brief history of the paradigms of writing instruction so that you understand the thought processes of those you may collaborate with and the orientation of the document that governs much of what is taught in first-year writing. We want you to be aware of how those in your writing program may think about research. Donna was not aware that the ACRL Standards were as product-oriented as they are until this collaboration. When Teresa pointed out to her the amount of time, work and exploration students should have behind them *before* they "begin" the research process as it is outlined in the ACRL Standards, Donna's way of seeing both the document and research itself shifted. It also brought to light just how non-linear the research process as expressed in the WPA Outcomes is in comparison. The work with Teresa on the two documents allowed Donna both to understand the logic of the writing program and examine the logic of her own information literacy program—an understanding and examination which she now can bring to the collaboration as a whole.

We also offer this brief history as much as a setting of context as we do a warning. Rhetoric and Composition as a discipline has had difficulty making these shifts though its own paradigms, and there

are programs in the United States that currently teach through product-based and/or process and/or post-process pedagogies. Paradigms shift in disciplinary literature and in the minds and practices of those faculty who continually develop professionally, but often change is slow to enter the programmatic and classroom levels. And, ideally, the best practices of a previous paradigm are incorporated into the new one during a shift. The point is, the writing faculty and/or program you encounter on your campus could teach writing through any of these lenses, and possibly combinations of all three.

A second warning: Because our fields speak differently about research and writing, and because of Rhetoric and Composition's difficult past, Rhetoric and Composition faculty may be sensitive to the language librarians use to discuss conducting research and instructing students. This is not to say that librarians need to appropriate the discourse of Rhetoric and Composition, or that Information Literacy as a discipline should revise its approach to research. What this means for those of us wanting to collaborate is that we need to be cautious of how our colleagues in the other discipline may react to our language and be prepared to explain that while we approach research from different perspectives, we still have a lot in common.

Finally, things will change rapidly in the near future. With the explosion of communication technology, with a generation of students conditioned by standardized testing and short-answer tweeting, we are bound to witness shifts in student needs, attitudes, and behaviors toward writing and research. Both disciplines continually are revising our approaches to research. The understanding we gained through this research and we hope you gain through this presentation will need to be developed and adapted as our disciplines progress through the twenty-first century.

Coming to Terms with Terms

Amidst the cloud of opposing concept-pairings that made up our meetings during this period in our collaboration—"product vs. process," "method or inquiry," "linear but recursive"—the language in the ACRL Standards and the WPA Outcomes took on new orientations for Donna and Teresa. In particular, the verbs employed by each document differed from those in the other in significant ways that could now be characterized by the differing thought processes in the disciplines. On the one hand, the verbs in the

ACRL Standards denote concrete acts performed by students—behaviors that demonstrate their proficiency in practicing information literacy. In contrast, the verbs in the WPA Outcomes denote processes students work through in order to bring them to an understanding of what it entails to make meaning through writing and research.

We will present our analysis of the verbs in each document later in this presentation, but the perspective that developed through this analysis is important to explain. Teresa initially positioned the ACRL Standards as *objectives* and the WPA Outcomes as *goals* in order to grasp the way the documents function in relation to instruction. That simplification of the documents led us to realize that the terms *goals* and *objectives* are nowhere to be found in either document.[15] How was that possible? We realized the hierarchical level in the ACRL Standards that Teresa was referring to as *objectives* (the lowest in the hierarchy) actually is called "Outcomes" in the language of the document itself—the same term used in the *title* of the WPA Outcomes. A clarification of terms was necessary, but difficult to find.

An exercise in scanning educational theory for definitions of terms was meant to clarify the meanings and functions behind the terms' usage in our documents, but instead this research only confused matters further. It seems these terms are conflated or interchanged regularly in educational theory. The most consistent definitions we could find follow.

In the educational theory, it seems there has been a shift in terms. Educators used to speak in terms of *goals* (the more general or theoretical concepts) and *objectives* (the more specific and practical actions). Kathleen Graves explains, "Goals are a way of putting into words the main purposes and intended outcomes of your course. If we use the analogy of a journey, the destination is the goal; the journey is the course. The objectives are the different points you pass through on the journey to the destination."[16] Now, it seems, a shift in terminology has occurred and *goals* have come to be called *standards* and *objectives* have become *outcomes*. Linda B. Nilson changed her terms between editions of her *Teaching At Its Best*.[17] What were called *objectives* in her 2003 second edition are termed *outcomes* in her 2010 third edition. In 2010, Nilson explained, "A learning outcome is a statement of exactly what your students should be able to do after completing your course or at specified points during the

course," alluding to the more specific tasks or abilities.[18] We were comfortable with our understanding of goals/standards and objectives/outcomes, that the first were more general and the second more specific, until we attempted to apply these definitions to our documents.

This explanation, wherein *standards* are what *goals* used to be and *outcomes* are the former *objectives*, complicates matters even further when applying these definitions to our documents, both of which were published in their current forms in 2000. The ACRL Standards seem to highlight concrete objectives, whereas the WPA Outcomes seem to highlight conceptual goals. We looked to the introductions of the documents for explanations. This introductory information in the ACRL Standards explains, "In the following competencies, there are five standards and twenty-two performance indicators. The standards focus upon the needs of students in higher education at all levels. The standards also list a range of outcomes for assessing student progress toward information literacy. These outcomes serve as guidelines for faculty, librarians, and others in developing local methods for measuring student learning in the context of an institution's unique mission."[19] "Outcomes," it seems, refers to *learning outcomes* for the ACRL; they can be measured and assessed; they are concrete; and they are narrower than "standards." But the terms are defined differently in the WPA Outcomes, which states, "This document intentionally defines only 'outcomes,' or types of results, and not 'standards,' or precise levels of achievement. The setting of standards should be left to specific institutions or specific groups of institutions."[20] So, for the WPA, "outcomes" are *goals* or the more general/conceptual frame, and *objectives* are "standards" or the more specific/practical skills within the frame. Placing all these differing definitions side-by-side made it seem to us that decisions about these phrases were arbitrary; instructors and organizations used the terms as they wanted, as long as internally the hierarchy was evident and their use consistent. We were frustrated, and we were confused.

At Third Reading, or Foundational Visions

Our frustration came from the lack of a common vocabulary with which to communicate. Our confusion arose because our instincts about our shared goals now seemed wrong. We faced the reality that librarians understand research as method whereas writing

instructors teach research as inquiry. The orientation of Teresa's instruction excelled with process; Donna's tended toward product. And all of these differences could be read right in our respective disciplines' documents, plain as day. Did this mean the project was over? That the work we were doing would cease to make any sense? Had we painted ourselves into a corner?

The answers to these questions, we soon learned, were No, No and (surprisingly) Yes. Our project was far from over, and though our work seemed more confusing than ever, our paralysis in the face of a whirlwind of terms ultimately functioned as a help and not a hindrance. At this point, Donna was reading through the two documents, side-by-side, combing the language for any meaning we may have missed, when she took a break and let her vision of the documents go out of focus. In that moment, she stopped trying to make the documents do what she thought we needed them to— i.e., align in a straightforward, easy-to-trace manner. Instead, she let the shape inherent to each document emerge: the ACRL Standards revealed itself as a tiered structure with intricate detail offered at the third level of hierarchy within the document (internally referred to as the "Outcomes" level), and the WPA Outcomes jumped off of the linear page and reconfigured into a spherical, non-ordered web where each outcome is connected to every other outcome. Suddenly the conceptual points of overlap, where one structure touched the other in shared meaning, began to appear. The shapes were in motion though—no longer cemented side-by-side—and how the contents of the documents interacted now seemed less like a regimented march and more like a fluid dance. We really had painted ourselves into a corner by attempting to compartmentalize concepts that needed to breathe in order to reveal their meaning. And it was at this moment that the deepest level of analysis of these documents could finally occur—the level of their shared foundation, built upon their shared meaning.

Part Two: Analysis
Methodology
When we began to plan the structure of this paper and its presentation, and considered how best to present the evidence from the two documents in our respective fields, it seemed logical for us to begin with the language of the ACRL Standards since we would be addressing an audience of librarians and thus it would be the document most familiar to them. However, because the ACRL Standards are so detailed and the WPA Outcomes are so theoretical, it made better sense to identify the shorter, more compact WPA statement first. This method also allows the librarian to interpret the ACRL Standards we are so familiar with through a new lens.

Findings
Structure and scope. One of the deeper similarities that emerged was a parallel structure that at first is easy to miss—and, as we recounted above, we did miss it when we first began analyzing the documents together. But when we allowed our vision of the documents to relax, we noticed that both documents are organized into five groups. In the ACRL Standards these groups are called Standard One, Standard Two, Standard Three, Standard Four, and Standard Five. In the WPA Outcomes these groups do not have a uniform name, but are organized topically into five groupings of bulleted "outcomes" (as the document names them) that focus on specific theoretical areas and include Rhetorical Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; Processes; Knowledge of Conventions; and Composing in Electronic Environments.

We then analyzed the content of the groups at the mechanical level of what kinds of verbs the individual statements in each document employ. When we did this, we were surprised to find that within the hierarchical scheme of the documents, the bulleted statements in the WPA Outcomes are of equal weight and scope to the Performance Indicators in the ACRL Standards (second level in the hierarchy), and *not* to the level of the "Outcome" (third level in the hierarchy). This highlights the importance of defining terms, especially as they are utilized within the documents themselves, and developing a common vocabulary for both documents before proceeding with the work of comparing how the documents are similar and different; see our discussion above in which we address this point. As our analysis of how verbs are used continued, it became clear that the number of bulleted statements in the WPA Outcomes mirrored the number of Performance Indicators in the ACRL Standards: for any given heading there are 3-7 such statements under that heading.[21] In this scheme, the headings are the first level in the hierarchy, and the statements immediately beneath them are the second.

Where the documents differ is in the presence of a third level in the hierarchy. The ACRL Standards have this level, and it uses the term "Outcomes" to identify it. The WPA Outcomes, on the other hand, does not include this level purposefully, as explained earlier in our discussion of the introductory information in both documents. So, in the ACRL Standards, each Performance Indicator has a list of Outcomes that are used to determine whether that Performance Indicator has been met; whereas, in the WPA Outcomes, the bulleted statements that comprise the document do not include this third level of hierarchy. The primary benefit of including the third level of hierarchy is having the ability to observe concretely or measure whether or not students have achieved proficiency of the skill in question, as Teresa pointed out to Donna when she lamented the absence of measurable student behaviors and activities in the WPA Outcomes. However, the disadvantage of including this third level of hierarchy is that instructors who put the document into practice could be limited in how they measure student performance, which could discourage creativity and innovation in classroom practices and cause the document to become quickly outdated; for this reason, Donna found the absence of the third level of hierarchy in the WPA Outcomes refreshing and liberating. At that moment, we found ourselves preferring the structure of the *others'* document to that of our own—a sure sign we each were learning to think like the other!

One other important difference between the ACRL Standards and the WPA Outcomes is in their respective scopes, a difference that is evident in the full titles of the two documents. The WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition identifies goals to be met by the end of the student's *first* undergraduate year of study. In contrast, the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education articulate the knowledge and skills students should have by the end of their college- or university-level education—a length of time that will vary depending on the student's program of study. In this respect, librarians "have more time" than writing instructors to put their document into practice successfully. This difference in scope has implications in both documents and accounts for the fact that the goals articulated in the WPA Outcomes are less finite and more open-ended than those articulated in the ACRL Standards.

Primary points of overlap. In the WPA Outcomes, there are two statements that describe the en-

tire work of librarians in a nutshell—a surprising and encouraging discovery for Teresa and Donna! The first of these statements falls in the Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing grouping and reads that by the end of first-year composition, students should "understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources" (hereafter "WPA Outcome II.2").[22] An academic librarian reading that statement can recognize in it all the major components of the research process. For this reason it is the strongest jumping-off point for conversation between librarians and writing instructors. Furthermore, those familiar with the ACRL Standards will be able to identify many conceptual points of overlap between the entire ACRL document and this single statement from the WPA Outcomes. The verbs *finding*, *evaluating*, *analyzing*, and *synthesizing* can each be used as a prism through which to interpret the statements found at the Performance Indicator level within the ACRL Standards.

We began by reading the ACRL Standards though the lens of the WPA Outcomes verb *finding*. Examples of similar verbs employed by the ACRL Standards at the Performance Indicator level include *acquiring*, *accessing*, *retrieves*, *extracts*, and *records*.[23] In each case, the object of the verb is *information*, which parallels *primary and secondary sources* in WPA Outcome II.2, and strengthens the argument that these statements from both documents accomplish the same goal. In addition to identifying synonymous verbs, we identified concepts in the ACRL Standards which are not necessarily verbs, but which invoke the act of *finding*, such as *search strategy* or *query*. There are three Performance Indicators in which these concepts can be found: "Constructs and implements effectively-designed search strategies," "Refines the search strategy if necessary," and "Determines whether the initial search query should be revised."[24] Thus we encountered a total of seven Performance Indicators in the ACRL Standards that are embedded within that single term *finding*, just *one* of the four tasks listed in WPA Outcome II.2.

For the task of *evaluating*, identifying synonymous verbs in the ACRL Standards was more difficult, and we found we needed to rely on the context in which verbs were used in order to match specific Performance Indicators with this task. We found, for instance, that the verb *identifies* has as its objects *types*

and *formats* of information, and built into the act of identifying types and formats is the act of evaluation.[25] Other examples of concepts tied to the task of *evaluating* include *criteria for evaluating* and *characteristics of the information*.[26] Of course, in the case of the verb *reevaluates* it was a clear match with the task of *evaluating*, since one cannot *re*evaluate something unless one has the skill to evaluate it in the first place.[27] And finally, we found that the statement, "Refines the search strategy if necessary," involves the task of *evaluating* the information that has already been found in order to determine whether the search strategy does in fact need to be refined.[28] By the end of our search within the ACRL Standards for the WPA Outcomes verb *evaluating*, we found a total of five different Performance Indicators related to this task.

Our work with the verb *analyzing* yielded interesting results. At the beginning of the analysis of this term, Donna noted to Teresa that the task of *analyzing* is rarely isolated from *evaluating* in information literacy instruction. The typical criteria taught by librarians for the evaluation of information are accuracy, authority, objectivity, currency and coverage, and they agreed that embedded in these criteria is both evaluative and analytical work.[29] Teresa clarified the term *analyzing* as it is used in writing instruction as a task which is applied to the information itself (i.e., the structure and content of the argument, the methodology and findings of the inquiry, etc.), while *evaluating* she said focused more on the credibility of the information source (i.e., the credentials of the author(s), the selection process of the publishing body, etc.). As soon as Teresa distinguished between examining the *content* of the information and the *source* of the information, the term *analyzing* took on a whole new layer of meaning for Donna, and the work of matching this task with Performance Indicators from the ACRL Standards could begin in earnest.

Since we realized that, for librarians, *analyzing* is most likely to occur in conjunction with *evaluating*, the logical place to look in the ACRL Standards for related Performance Indicators is Standard Three, the "*evaluating* standard."[30] When the student "summarizes the main ideas to be extracted from the information gathered," this is the first step in *analyzing* the content of an information source.[31] In the case of the Performance Indicator involving *criteria for evaluating*—a Performance Indicator we've already tied to *evaluating* in the above analysis—a closer look at

the complete statement will illustrate that this Performance Indicator involves *analyzing* according to our established definition: "The information literate student articulates and applies initial criteria for evaluating *both the information and its sources*" (emphasis added).[32] For a student to achieve this proficiency as stated, the student must evaluate both the content of the information as well as the source from which the information comes—the former task constituting *analysis* and the latter task constituting *evaluation*, according to the usages of these terms in the WPA Outcomes and the writing discipline.

It is no surprise the other Performance Indicators in the ACRL Standards that align with the task of *analyzing* are the same ones that we've already examined in our discussion of *evaluating*.[33] Other Performance Indicators that are unique to the task of *analyzing* are "Extracts, records, and manages the information and its sources," and "Determines whether the new knowledge has an impact on the individual's value system and takes steps to reconcile differences."[34] In the former, a student's ability to *manage* information and its sources requires that the student understand the content *of* those sources, if the student's organizational scheme is going to be meaningful in any way. In the latter, the student's ability to *reconcile* differences between new knowledge and prior knowledge requires that the student *understand* the content of the different information sources encountered. In both cases, it is the content itself that is being analyzed in order to achieve the stated proficiency. In total, we found seven different Performance Indicators related to the task of *analyzing* as understood in WPA Outcome II.2—far more than Donna expected to find considering that the words *analysis* and *analyzing* only appear once each in the ACRL Standards, and only on the third level of hierarchy in both instances.[35]

The final task listed in WPA Outcome II.2 is *synthesizing*, and this verb was relatively straightforward for us to understand together and apply to the ACRL Standards. Two Performance Indicators already discussed involve synthesis on the student's part, since the verbs *to compare* and *to reconcile differences* between old knowledge and new are both activities that require the critical thinking task of *synthesizing* information.[36] Another Performance Indicator found in that same standard—Standard Three, the "*evaluating* standard"—invokes synthesis directly: "Synthesizes main ideas to construct new concepts."[37] This tells us

that the task of *evaluating* for librarians will always involve the other key critical thinking tasks of *analyzing* and *synthesizing*, since in the case of the latter, three of the seven total Performance Indicators that make up Standard Three involve *synthesizing* information. Finally, the task of *synthesizing* is found in Standard Four as well, which is concerned with the concrete product of the research endeavor; the relevant Performance Indicator reads, "Applies new and prior knowledge to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance."[38] Whenever the language of *new and prior knowledge* is employed in the ACRL Standards, this is a clear indication that synthesis is a part of the proficiency being described. With this in mind, the total number of Performance Indicators aligned with the task of *synthesizing* information is four.

In addition to WPA Outcome II.2, one other outcome in the document summarizes the work of librarians but employs slightly different language to do so. WPA Outcome V.2 reads that by the end of first-year composition, students should "locate, evaluate, organize, and use research material collected from electronic sources, including scholarly library databases; other official databases (e.g., federal government databases); and informal electronic networks and internet sources."[39] If the content of this statement sounds familiar, it should, as the research tasks listed in verb-form here—*locate*, *evaluate*, *organize*, and *use*—are analogous to those used in WPA Outcome II.2—*finding*, *evaluating*, *analyzing*, and *synthesizing*—discussed in detail above.

Understanding WPA Outcome V.2 in the wider context of the entire document will shed some light on this slight variation in terms. This fifth grouping of outcomes, Composing in Electronic Environments, was amended to the document in July 2008 in order to address the unique concerns that arise when students utilize technology in their writing processes.[40] Taking this into consideration, the use of the verb *locate* in contrast to *find* makes sense, as the language surrounding electronic resources in the twenty-first century has evolved such that one *locates* information within the electronic resource (i.e., the Web, a database, or other electronic index); *find* is used in this context far less often. It is not surprising that the term *evaluate* has been retained, since the task of *evaluating* electronic resources—with all of the nuance we developed above—is that much more important in an environment where it is so easy to "publish" one's thoughts

and ideas than it is to do so in the print format. The technology-oriented WPA Outcome V.2 employs the verb *organize* instead of *analyze*, since an understanding of the content of information resources—electronic or otherwise—is a prerequisite for being able to organize those resources into any meaningful schema. Finally, the more practical verb *use* is preferred to the higher-level thinking task of *synthesize* when the action is applied to information in electronic environments. This is not to say that synthesis has no place when composing electronically; just like analysis, the content of information resources located within electronic environments cannot be *used* effectively to achieve a specific purpose in the student's writing unless that content first is *analyzed* and *synthesized*. The point here is that the presence of technology in the process of research and writing colors the verbs we use to describe our actions. Despite this nuance, the two WPA Outcomes—II.2 and V.2—are enough alike where an in-depth analysis the verbs in WPA Outcome V.2 in relation to the ACRL Standards is not necessary; the work on WPA Outcome II.2 described above is sufficient to show how the documents share goals on a foundational level, despite the differences in terms. These shared goals are meeting points where librarians and writing instructors can and should collaborate.

Part III. Conclusion

The points of overlap between the two documents are not limited to those we have analyzed here. In fact, we found many more in the other bullets of the WPA Outcomes by using the same method of verb comparison we used to unpack WPA Outcome II.2. The purpose of this presentation is to offer librarians a framework for collaboration with writing instructors, and we are confident that WPA Outcome II.2 (with its sister WPA Outcome V.2) provides enough concrete examples of conceptual overlap between the two disciplines to get the conversation started. We encourage you to consider these two documents in all of the different lights we've encountered throughout our collaborative partnership thus far. We hope our story has brought out the shared meaning in the ACRL Standards and the WPA Outcomes, and that despite the points of divergence this deeper meaning invigorates you to reach out to the writing program at your respective institutions.

Notes

1. Association of College and Research Libraries, *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 2000). http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/standards.pdf (accessed January 9, 2011).

2. Council of Writing Program Administrators, *WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition* (April 2000). http://wpacouncil.org/files/wpa-outcomes-statement.pdf (accessed January 9, 2011).

3. "Information Literacy Stipends" (The University of Scranton). http://matrix.scranton.edu/academics/wml/infolit/stipends/index.shtml (accessed January 9, 2011).

4. Wayne Bivens-Tatum, "Timing of the Research Question," *Academic Librarian: On Libraries, Rhetoric, Poetry, History, & Moral Philosophy*, November 30, 2010. https://blogs.princeton.edu/librarian/2010/11/timing_of_the_research_question.html (accessed January 9, 2011).

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. For more information about the history of Rhetoric and Composition as an academic discipline, see "A Brief History of Rhetoric and Composition," in *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing*, available at http://www.bedfordstmartins.com/bb/history.html (accessed January 9, 2011).

8. For more information on how the GI Bill affected writing instruction, see Thomas Masters' *Practicing Writing: The Postwar Discourse of Freshman English* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 2004).

9. For more information about the Back to Basics literacy crisis, see Ira Shor's *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration, 1969–1984* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

10. For an in-depth analysis of Rhetoric and Composition's conception of the "self," see Lester Faigley's *Fragments of Rationality: Postmodernity and the Subject of Composition* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992).

11. Murray's article has been anthologized in Victor Villanueva's *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader* (Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2003).

12. John Clifford and Elizabeth Ervin, "The Ethics of Process," in *Post-Process Theory: Beyond the Writing-Process Paradigm*, ed. Thomas Kent (Southern Illinois University Press, 1999), 184.

13. James A. Berlin, *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900–1985* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987).

14. Ibid., 139–65. This paraphrase of Berlin's epistemol-ogies will appear in "Negotiating the Culture of an Institution with National Outcomes" by Teresa Grettano, Rebecca Ingalls, and Tracy Ann Morse in *The WPA Outcomes Statement: A Decade Later*, eds. Nicholas Behm, Gregory Glau, Duane Roen, and Deborah Holdstein, forthcoming from Parlor Press.

15. We intentionally limited our in-depth analysis of the documents to the language found in the statements that define student behaviors in each, and omitted the introductory text in both documents. In the ACRL Standards, this part of the document begins on page eight, whereas it begins on page two of the WPA Outcomes. Unless noted otherwise, whenever we refer to the terms or language of the documents, we mean the language—in list-form—used to define student behaviors, and not the introductory prose that precedes the student behaviors sections of the documents.

16. Kathleen Graves, *Designing Language Courses: A Guide for Teachers* (Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2000), 75.

17. Linda B. Nilson, *Teaching At Its Best: A Research-based Resource for College Instructors*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003); 3rd ed. published in 2010.

18. Linda B. Nilson, *Teaching At Its Best: A Research-based Resource for College Instructors*, 3rd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010), 18.

19. ACRL Standards, 6.

20. WPA Outcomes, 1.

21. When specific student behaviors from the WPA Outcomes and ACRL Standards are cited in this presentation, the authors have developed a parallel numbering system in which the first level of hierarchy receives a Roman numeral (I.-V.) and the second level of hierarchy receives an Arabic numeral (1–7). Examples: In the WPA Outcomes, the first outcome listed in the first grouping is cited as "WPA Outcomes, I.1." In the ACRL Standards, the first Performance Indicator listed under Standard One is cited as "ACRL Standards, I.1." When text from the introductory pages of the documents is quoted, citations revert back to "Title, page number" as in 19n and 20n above.

22. WPA Outcomes, II.2.

23. ACRL Standards, I.3, II.1, II.3 and II.5.

24. ACRL Standards, II.2, II.4 and III.7.

25. ACRL Standards, I.2.

26. ACRL Standards, II.3 and II.4.

27. ACRL Standards, I.4.

28. ACRL Standards, II.4.

29. Jim Kapoun, "Teaching Undergrads WEB Evaluation: A Guide for Library Instruction," *College & Research Libraries News* 59, no. 7 (July/August 1998). http://www.

ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crlnews/1998/jul/teachingundergrads.cfm (accessed January 9, 2011).

30.   The full text of ACRL Standard Three, often referred to as the "evaluating standard" reads: "The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system" (ACRL Standards, III).

31.   ACRL Standards, III.1.

32.   ACRL Standards, III.2.

33.   See ACRL Standards, I.2, II.4 and III.4 as examples of Performance Indicators that straddle the tasks of *evaluating* and *analyzing* information and its sources.

34.   ACRL Standards, II.5 and III.5.

35.   ACRL Standards, I.1.f and III.2.b.

36.   ACRL Standards, III.4 and III.5.

37.   ACRL Standards, III.3.

38.   ACRL Standards, IV.1.

39.   WPA Outcomes, V.2.

40.   WPA Outcomes, 1.