INFORMATION LITERACY AND WRITING STUDIES IN CONVERSATION: REENVISIONING LIBRARY-WRITING PROGRAM CONNECTIONS

Andrea Baer

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements

While this book project has been a largely intellectual endeavor, it is also a personal one. It can be traced back to my earlier experiences in teaching college writing and literature while, in a previous incarnation, completing a doctoral degree in comparative literature. At the time I had no idea that it would ultimately lead me to libraries and to looking at the connections between the work of librarians and writing instructors. I think it was a happy accident. My interactions in both composition and library classrooms have greatly informed my work as a teacher, a librarian, and a scholar, and I am excited to see the work of compositionists and instruction librarians increasingly intersecting and opening up new possibilities for teaching and learning. My work as a librarian has also shaped my perspectives on undergraduate education and curriculum (recurring topics of this book), particularly since much of my library work has largely centered on building library instructional programming and partnerships that facilitate information literacy integration across the disciplines. Relatedly, the ideas from this book have been enriched by the interactions I have been honored to have with librarian colleagues in professional development workshops centered on teaching and learning, and in collaborating with faculty.

This book is most obviously about the powerful connections between teaching writing and information literacy. But just as importantly, it is also about connections between individuals and professional communities, and about how those connections can be nurtured and sustained. The

foundations for such relationships are mutual listening and dialogue, and this book would not have been possible without such conversations. Though I appear as the sole author of this book and speak primarily from my own perspective, it is the result of many conversations and of the work and ideas of many.

I would like to give particular thanks to the compositionists and librarians who agreed to be interviewed about their collaborative experiences, which are the focal point of Chapter 4: Michelle Albertson, Dan DeSanto, Teresa Grettano, Susanmarie Harrington, Wendy Hayden, Stephanie Margolin, Caroline Sinkinson, and Donna Witek. Their openness and generosity has enabled a much fuller exploration in this book of the many possibilities for meaningful and creative library-writing program partnerships. Their thoughtful feedback during the writing of Chapter 4 has furthermore deepened the thinking that went into all of this book's chapters. Many thanks also to Bob Schroeder, who in sharing his own interviewing experiences for his book *Critical Journeys: How 14 Librarians Came to Embrace Critical Practice*, helped me to develop my approach to this publication's Chapter 4.[1]

I am also incredibly fortunate for the supportive colleagues and friends who provided their honest and thoughtful feedback and perspectives during my writing process: in particular Maria Accardi, Heidi L.M. Jacobs, and Catherine Minter. Their fresh perspectives have made this a much clearer and more thoughtful work, at the same time that their encouragement has helped me to push through moments of feeling stuck and of questioning whether I had anything new that was worth saying and being heard. My parents and friends have similarly offered their continual support, including listening when I talked through ideas that weren't yet crystallized. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Indiana University Libraries and my colleagues there for their support during the majority of my writing process, as well as the University of West Georgia Ingram Library and colleagues during the final stages of

---

1. Robert Schroeder, *Critical Journeys: How 14 Librarians Came to Embrace Critical Practice* (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2014).

this book project. This book would not have been possible without their financial and moral support. I am furthermore grateful to everyone at Library Juice Press, in particular Rory Litwin and Alison Lewis, who have managed the copyediting, production, distribution, and marketing of this book, and have done so in a way that makes this work accessible.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2003 and 2004, rhetorician Rolf Norgaard wrote of "writing information literacy" in a two-part editorial published in the library professional journal *Reference and User Services Quarterly*.[1] A pedagogy for "writing information literacy," Norgaard argued, would situate research and information use within specific rhetorical and writing contexts. To cultivate such an approach, Norgaard called for building fuller partnerships among librarians and writing instructors.

The phrase "writing information literacy" was intended to convey the intertwined acts of writing, research, and information use.[2] Librarians' and writing instructors' pedagogies, when conceived of through this integrative lens, would enable information literacy education to function "as a means for asking better and better questions and for

---

1. Rolf Norgaard, "Writing Information Literacy: Contributions to a Concept," *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (Winter 2003): 124–30; Rolf Norgaard, "Writing Information Literacy in the Classroom: Pedagogical Enactments and Implications," *Reference User Services Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (2004): 220–26.

2. "Information literacy" has been defined most often as the ability to "recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information" (American Library Association, "Presidential Committee on Information Literacy: Final Report," January 10, 1989, http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/presidential.). Though the library profession has probably been the most vocal advocate of "information literacy" education and though the term has often been viewed to connote simply instruction about library resources, the concept of information literacy encompasses much more, including the use of information for a wide range of purposes and contexts, and awareness of the social, cultural, and ethical dimensions of information creation, access, and use.

finding ever more persuasive lines of reasoning, and not just as a way to cite factoids and ready answers."[3] For Norgaard, "writing information literacy" would lead "to a more situated, process-oriented, and relevant literacy," as both professions worked together for pedagogical reform that would extend beyond these two fields.[4] Such an approach would contrast the artificial separation of writing and library research that has characterized much of both librarians' and compositionists' instruction.

Norgaard, of course, was not the first to draw attention to the need for greater collaboration among writing instructors and librarians, though he was probably the first individual from the field of composition and rhetoric to do so to a sizable audience. It remains nonetheless notable that he was writing in a library journal that compositionists were unlikely to read. The connections between writing and source-based research have been evident to many college writing instructors and librarians—though perhaps in varying ways—since the early developments of both writing and library instruction. (In fact, as early as 1952 an argument similar to Norgaard's was made by Haskell M. Block and Sidney Mattis in their *College English* article "The Research Paper: A Co-Operative Approach).[5] The intersections between writing and library instruction have been reflected in collaborations among individuals in our professions over the decades, as well as in the growing body of literature on integrated approaches to teaching writing and information literacy.[6]

---

3. Norgaard, "Writing Information Literacy in the Classroom," 222.

4. Ibid., 225.

5. Haskell M. Block and Sidney Mattis, "The Research Paper: A Co-Operative Approach," *College English* 13, no. 4 (1952): 212–15.

6. A number of librarians have given particular attention to the development of collaborations between librarians and writing instructors over time. See for example: M. Mounce, "Academic Librarian and English Composition Instructor Collaboration: A Selective Annotated Bibliography 1998-2007," *Reference Services Review* 37, no. 1 (2009): 44–53, doi:10.1108/00907320910934986; Grace L. Veach, "Tracing Boundaries, Effacing Boundaries: Information Literacy as an Academic Discipline" (Dissertation, University of Southern Florida, 2012), http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent. cgi?article=5609&context=etd; Gail S. Corso, Sandra Weiss, and Tiffany McGregor, "Information Literacy: A Story of Collaboration and Cooperation between the Writing Program Coordinator and Colleagues 2003-2010" (National Conference of the Council of Writing Program Administrators, Philadelphia, PA, 2010).

The form and depth of such library-writing program alliances have varied considerably, ranging from the single librarian visit to fully re-envisioned courses that involve collaborative curricular development and co-teaching. Library-writing program partnerships, moreover, have extended beyond traditional classroom settings and are now also evident in alternative learning spaces such as writing centers and media labs.

Such collaborations illustrate that both writing and information seeking and use (information literacy) share powerful connections: both are central to posing and exploring problems and questions and to seeking informed and creative approaches to answering them. Writing and information literacy instruction invite students to analyze information sources, to reflect on varying perspectives on issues, and ultimately to contribute their own ideas about the questions they explore. Thus, at the heart of writing and information seeking and use are inquiry and critical thinking, which many college educators across disciplines view to be at the center of learning. The analytical and generative thinking that writing and information practices require–and the ways that these recursive processes repeatedly intersect–reflect the rich potential for teaching them as creative and interrelated acts of meaning making. Many in the fields of writing and library and information studies would likely agree with the educational reformer John Dewey's statement that "[o]nly by wrestling with the conditions of the problem at first hand, seeking and finding his own way out, does [the student] think."[7] As John Bean, a leader of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement, states when reflecting on Dewey's statement, "Part of the difficulty of teaching critical thinking, therefore, is awakening students to the existence of problems all around them."[8]

This awakening to and engagement in real-world problems is ideally what writing and information literacy instruction both center on. Scholarship on inquiry-based learning and critical pedagogy, much of which informs our (compositionists' and librarians') pedagogical practices

---

7. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1916), 188.

8. John C. Bean, *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*, 2nd ed, The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011), 3.

and much of which has been developed by individuals in our fields, has provided fertile ground for growth in our individual and collaborative teaching, as well as for curricular initiatives that extend beyond our two fields. Though writing instructors and librarians may often approach inquiry from different angles (for example, information literacy instruction tends to focus heavily on locating sources, while writing classrooms generally give more attention to textual analysis and construction of an argument that is supported by evidence from sources), we generally share the view that problem-posing and inquiry are key to meaningful and engaged learning. The varying approaches we have to encouraging critical inquiry have great potential to function in complementary and enriching ways, as is explored throughout this book.

Common Disjunctures

The value of partnerships between English composition programs and libraries may seem obvious to many, given the importance in academic writing and in many writing classes of supporting one's ideas with sources and developing and articulating questions that are informed by source-based research. Both writing and source-based research are highly recursive processes that ideally begin with curiosity about a problem or question, which an individual then explores through an iterative process of information gathering, analysis, reflection, and ultimately communication about the relationship between one's own ideas and those presented by others. But despite these intersections, there is still a strong tendency for writing and library instruction to be taught in relative separation, with the latter frequently being viewed as a course "add-on." Similarly, conversations about writing and information literacy pedagogy have tended to exist in professional silos.[9]

---

9. See for example: Veach, "Tracing Boundaries, Effacing Boundaries: Information Literacy as an Academic Discipline"; Celia Rabinowitz, "Working in a Vacuum: A Study of the Literature of Student Research and Writing," *Research Strategies* 17, no. 4 (January 4, 2000): 337–46, doi:10.1016/S0734-3310(01)00052-0; Norgaard, "Writing Information Literacy in the Classroom"; Melissa Bowles-Terry, Erin Davis, and Wendy Holliday, "'Writing Information Literacy Revisited: Application of Theory to Practice in the Classroom," *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (2010): 225–30.

The one-off model of library instruction that is still the norm in many respects reinforces this. The tradition of the stand-alone library session implies that a short introduction to library resources should prepare students for a fairly straightforward task called academic research. Most library instruction for writing courses still uses this model, helping to keep intact a perception of information literacy as being simply about search mechanics. Norgaard's description in 2003 of writing instructor-librarian relationships still appears relevant today:

> On virtually every college campus librarians and writing teachers can point to each other as classroom colleagues and curricular compatriots. Yet the conversation is often limited to this level—and thus dismissed as a matter of local lore and personal friendship. Our collegial relations tend not to be sustained by a broader, theoretically informed conversation between writing and information literacy as disciplines and fields of endeavor.[10]

The reasons for this tendency toward separate dialogues are, of course, complex and multiple. They include differences in the historical developments of our fields, the professional training and education that prepares us for our work, the disciplinary discourses that inform much of that work, the structure of our workdays and our professional responsibilities, and the cultures and structural conditions of our institutions. Differences in librarians' and compositionists' everyday work environments and responsibilities are particularly significant, as these circumstances inevitably affect the nature of our interactions with students and other educators, as well as our common and differing perspectives on how students engage in seeking and using sources.

A number of librarians and compositionists have explored how views of information literacy and research instruction may generally differ between librarians and compositionists. Librarian Sheril Hook describes frequently differing perspectives of librarians and writing instructors (including those in writing centers) as follows:

---

10. Norgaard, "Writing Information Literacy: Contributions to a Concept," 124–125.

Currently, writing professionals tend to assume that the research process is subordinate to the writing process and thus have not given enough attention to understanding the research process itself and teaching it to students. Teaching librarians have tended to under-estimate or ignore the necessity to understand the writing process well enough to success-fully integrate the research process with the formal teaching or tutorial of writing. And perhaps they also have tended to think of the writing process as subsequent to the research process.[11]

Hook argues for further dialogue and collaboration between librarians and writing professionals at the same time that she asserts a need for recognizing and appreciating distinctions between writing and research and between the work of librarians and writing educators.

Arguing along similar lines, librarian and library administrator Craig Gibson has noted the frequent disconnects between the teaching of writing and library instruction, which exist despite the vital connections between them. A major source of this problem, Gibson believes, lies in the view of library research as primarily a matter of search mechan-ics. He notes that writing instructors may sometimes view the use of library resources as more straightforward than the process actually is.

Writing teachers sometimes assume that learning to use the library is only a matter of hands-on practice, emphasizing narrow procedural skills […]. Although hands-on work with tools is essential for students to gain confidence with information systems, an overemphasis on this particular kind of skill, removed from a larger rhetorical or critical-thinking con-text, shortchanges real learning of the type many librarians have been espousing in recent years.[12]

---

11. Sheril Hook, "Teaching Librarians and Writing Center Professionals in Collaboration: Complementary Practices," in *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Libraries in Collaboration*, ed. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook, Publications in Librarianship: No. 58 (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2005), 21.

12. Craig Gibson, "Research Skills across the Curriculum: Connections with Writing-Across-the-Curriculum," in *Writing-Across-the-Curriculum and the Aca-demic Library: A Guide for Librarians, Instructors, and Writing Program Directors*, ed. Jean (ed.) Sheridan, Thomas G., Jr. (fwd.) Kirk, and Elaine P. (afterword) Maimon, xix, 240 pp. vols. (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1995), 55–69.

Gibson's observation would seem in keeping with that of compositionist James Purdy, who asserts that in many writing courses

> Research is typically addressed in a separate unit, positioned at the end of the course or sequence of courses. […] Students are instructed to march through linear processes that compartmentalize research and writing: formulate a thesis, find (ideally print) sources to support that thesis, write a paper.[13]

The perception of library instruction as merely mechanical is reflected in the most common approach to library instruction: the "one-shot" library session. Because the one-shot is so limited in time, but is often the only time in which students are expected to learn "how to use the library" and how to do source-based research, these class sessions most often focus on the bare essentials of locating sources, leaving little time for considering the rhetorical purposes and contexts of research. Though librarians have increasingly been using individual library sessions to focus on other aspects of information literacy, such as source evaluation and integration of sources into one's writing, taking such an approach can be challenging when course instructors place a higher priority on librarians' teaching search mechanics.

One-shot sessions often imply that locating and using sources are distinct activities and that one can understand the essentials of academic research outside of a rhetorical framework. Although many librarians and writing instructors will agree that this strategy is not ideal, it has remained the most common practice for decades. (Among the top reasons given for this are time constraints and the difficulty of building meaningful teaching partnerships.)

At the same time that information literacy instruction continues most often to take the form of stand-alone class sessions, both librarians and compositionists know from their own writing and research experiences that these processes are closely interlinked. The library database search, often approached in library sessions as a matter of procedure, if done

---

13. James P. Purdy, "The Changing Space of Research: Web 2.0 and the Integration of Research and Writing Environments," *Computers and Composition* 27, no. 1 (2010): 48.

well actually requires complex analytical skills, such as identifying themes and patterns in research on a given topic and formulating and refining research questions with an awareness of the existing discourse. Such critical thinking ideally occurs throughout every step of the research process, including during the selection of a research tools, identification of effective search terms, evaluation of search results, initial selection of sources, and integration and analysis of sources.

But the same factors that contribute to an artificial separation between the teaching of writing and of information literacy, and to limited understandings of one another's professions and pedagogies, also point to ways that librarians and compositionists' expertise and pedagogies can function in complementary ways, with both parties learning from one another's unique experiences and expertise. Increased dialogue about our pedagogical work can help librarians and compositionists recognize the common experiences and challenges of our professions that can be sources of solidarity, helping us to generate creative responses to the pedagogical challenges of "writing information literacy."

Thus far I have discussed the common conception of "library instruction as procedural" as a significant obstacle to building meaningful library-writing program partnerships. Interestingly, this same barrier also reflects a shared experience and frustration of librarians and compositionists. Compositionists have similarly struggled with conceptions of writing as a mechanical and simple skill (that is, as an activity reduced to grammatical and syntax errors that are easily corrected and mastered). In reality, of course, composition and information literacy both involve complex abilities that are highly contextual and that develop over extensive periods of time.

Converging Conversations

The interconnectedness of writing and research, as well as the similar experiences and challenges that compositionists and librarians have faced in conveying to other educators the complexity and significance of writing and information literacy education, present natural openings

for meaningful partnerships across our professions. This is evident in many recent and current collaborations between individuals in both fields, as well as in a notable amount of scholarly literature on information literacy and English composition. The potential for collaboration seems especially great now, as library instruction programs are increasingly placing a strong emphasis on the rhetorical dimensions of research, and as library instruction becomes more deeply informed by pedagogical and process-oriented theories that align with many writing pedagogies. The progressively more complex role that technology plays in how people digest, share, and create information further suggests the importance of teaching writing and information literacy as interconnected processes and as integral parts of college curricula. Not only are Norgaard's comments in 2003 that "writing information literacy" enables "a more situated, process-oriented, and relevant literacy" still relevant today, but they have also taken on new resonance as the range of contexts and environments in which students compose and in which they engage with a wide range of information sources and formats have expanded.[14]

Moreover, with the growing attention in higher education to active and constructivist pedagogical approaches to learning, the opportunities for librarians and compositionists to join in their curricular efforts to support writing and information literacy education across the disciplines appear particularly significant now. There is clearly much that can be done in this area. Despite the significant progress both of our fields have made in communicating how writing and information literacy are central to higher-order thinking and the communication of complex ideas, librarians still struggle with the common misperception that information literacy and "library skills" can be boiled down to point-and-click skills, and writing instructors still grapple with the view of freshmen composition as a remedial course. And despite the powerful connections between writing and information practices, library and writing instruction tend to be presented largely in separation from one another.

---

14. Norgaard, "Writing Information Literacy in the Classroom," 225.

Although the reasons that potentially rich partnerships often do not form are complex, and although there are no easy solutions to strengthening our connections, dialogue across our professions has begun to expand at what appears an unprecedented pace, particularly as librarians become more vocal about the need for information literacy to be an integral part of college education, and as librarians expand their engagement with learning theories and conceptual frameworks for information literacy. This shift is evident in numerous conversations among academic teaching librarians and writing instructors about instruction, including those about the intersections between the recently adopted ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* and the WPA *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, both of which take a holistic and inquiry-based approach to teaching writing and information literacy as abilities that are relevant in a wide range of rhetorical situations, and in both analog and digital environments.[15] The increasing conversations between our fields are further evident in a significant number of recent conference presentations, professional events, and calls for publication submissions concerning writing-information literacy connections.

This book is intended to help widen and deepen those conversations, as librarians and compositionists develop better understandings of the intersections between our work, as well as the barriers that sometimes stand between partnership. While the literature on the relationships between writing and information literacy and on library-writing partnerships continues to grow, this scholarship still remains limited and tends to focus most often on specific case studies. There have been few extensive explorations of the relationship between librarians' and compositionists' teaching, and still fewer that carefully consider the work of librarians and writing instructors not only in relation to research on student learning, but also in light of sociohistorical and structural contexts of library and

---

15. Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project, *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, 2011, http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf; Association of College and Research Libraries, *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, 2015, http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework.

writing instruction. This book seeks to do both. It does so with the view that through learning more about one another's pedagogical work and perspectives, compositionists and instruction librarians can deepen our understandings of both fields and, by extension, of pedagogical practices. With fuller understandings of our professions and of our educational roles, we can ultimately expand such teaching partnerships beyond our two professions, as we approach writing and information literacy education as shared responsibilities of all educators. Given the larger goals and the scope of this book, I do not provide a comprehensive discussion of the many collaborations that have occurred between individuals in these two professions, nor do I suggest a single strategy for approaching library-writing program partnerships. Working from the view that any collaboration depends greatly on context, I discuss concepts and general approaches that can help to inform library and writing instructors' individual and shared teaching, rather than suggesting a particular approach for all partnerships. Chapter 4's discussion of four specific librarian-compositionist collaborations also offers concrete examples of various shapes that partnerships might take. In the closing chapter I offer several general recommendations for strengthening connections between our professions.

Chapters Overview

This introductory Chapter 1 has offered an overview of the interconnections between writing and information literacy, the disconnects that often prevent fuller dialogue, and the evolving role of writing-library teaching collaborations. These will remain the broader themes that structure this book, as I look more closely at the possibilities for and obstacles to collaboration from several angles.

Chapter 2, "Students as Writers and Researchers: Empirical Studies and Pedagogical Implications," provides a fuller view of what we know about how students engage with writing, information seeking, and information use, and how this can inform compositionists' and librarians' teaching practices. This scholarship, conducted primarily by

compositionists and librarians, reflects how critical inquiry and knowledge creation are at the heart of both composing and information practices. Relatedly, these studies illustrate the highly contextual and social nature of writing and information practices and the long-term and gradual nature of writing and information literacy development. In providing fuller understandings of how students engage with and sometimes struggle with writing and information practices, such research suggests ways that compositionists and librarians can further support students in approaching writing and information use as personally meaningful processes with larger communicative and social functions. Chapter 2 further considers the importance of learning transfer for writing and information literacy education. Studies on transfer (the ability to apply knowledge and skills developed in one situation to a different context) provide insight into how writing and information practices can be taught as context-dependent activities, including through giving explicit attention to conceptual understandings of writing and information, dispositions related to writing and information processes, and metacognitive thinking.

The pedagogical implications of the empirical studies discussed in Chapter 2 are further explored in Chapter 3, specifically through the lens of two professional documents that have been particularly influential for many compositionists and librarians: the WPA *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* and the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*.[16] This section explores intersecting themes of these frameworks, such as their representations of inquiry and knowledge creation as social and situated activities, and how these commonalities can serve as catalysts for expanding dialogue between our professions. The frameworks' pedagogical implications are also explored and related to what we know about students' writing and information literacy development. More specifically, I consider how the WPA and ACRL frameworks' stress on critical habits of mind and conceptual understandings related

---

16. Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project, WPA *Framework*; Association of College and Research Libraries, *Framework*.

to composing and information practices suggest strategies for teaching for transfer.

Chapter 4, "Composition-Library Collaborations: Notes from the Fields," shifts the focus from a more conceptual discussion of writing and information literacy pedagogy to four specific examples of close partnerships between compositionists and librarians. This section is primarily informed by my interviews with compositionists and librarians involved in extensive collaborations that are founded on an understanding of writing and information literacy as intertwined. The interviewees' creative approaches to "writing information literacy" illustrate the rich potential of joining efforts. Their collaborative experiences offer insight into common qualities of meaningful partnerships and into the conditions that help to cultivate and sustain them. At the same time the difficulties interviewees have experienced in expanding their collective efforts point to barriers that deserve further attention. These challenges frequently mirror structural and institutional barriers that prevent fuller cross-professional dialogue.

The interviewees' experiences and perspectives reflect constructive responses to many of these structural barriers (responses that include growing community through open dialogue; sharing experiences, perspectives, and instructional approaches; and examining factors and conditions that often prevent fuller conversations). Addressing such concerns, however, ultimately requires the engagement of a much larger number of individuals in our professions. In Chapter 5, "Expanding the Potential for Collaborations: Intersections between the Interpersonal and the Sociostructural," I look more closely at factors that often stand in the way of partnerships and ways we might address those challenges. Here I begin with reflection on the shared origins of writing and information literacy in literacy education and the ways that this history has influenced compositionists' and librarians' instructional and institutional roles in similar and distinct ways. With a larger view of the structural contexts in which compositionists and librarians work and how they have been influenced by a longer history, I then revisit the possibilities for library-writing partnerships and common barriers to

them. Reviewing sociological and psychological research on librarian-faculty relations, I reflect on institutional structures and conditions that often support or prevent the development of partnerships. I also consider how this scholarship might help inform our shared efforts to advocate for writing and information literacy education as the shared responsibility of all educators.

In the final chapter, "Looking Back, Looking Forward," I reflect on the themes and issues explored throughout the text and suggest considerations for, and general approaches to, strengthening the connections between writing and information literacy education, including through continued support and development of compositionist-librarian collaborations. Expanding and deepening these relationships is a long-term project that we might approach with the same openness, curiosity, and persistence that we hope students will bring to their development as writers, researchers, and critical thinkers.