

## On the same page: collaborative research assignment design with graduate teaching assistants

By: [Maggie Murphy](#)

Murphy, M. (2019), "On the same page: collaborative research assignment design with graduate teaching assistants", *Reference Services Review*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-04-2019-0027>

**\*\*\*© 2019 Emerald Publishing Limited. Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Emerald Publishing Limited. This version of the document is not the version of record. \*\*\***

### **Abstract:**

**Purpose:** This paper aims to explore how collaborative research assignment design consultations between instruction librarians and new graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) have the potential to improve the design of research assignments for first-year writing courses.

**Design/methodology/approach:** The author conducted a small number of questionnaires and structured interviews with first-time GTAs who serve as first-year composition instructors to explore their conceptions about teaching researched writing. Thematic analysis of the results of these qualitative instruments led to the design of a new framework for working with incoming cohorts of GTAs at her institution prior to the start of each fall semester.

**Findings:** New GTAs often emphasize strict source type parameters in research assignment design and expect their students to engage in expert research behaviors. Emphasizing the assignment design expertise of instruction librarians during new GTA orientation may lead to more assignment design consultations with first-time college writing instructors. Collaborative assignment design consultations between librarians and GTAs can improve the alignment of research assignment parameters with their shared goals for students' research and writing skills and habits of mind, including seeing research and writing as iterative and inquiry-based processes.

**Research limitations/implications:** While not every instruction librarian works with GTAs, working with instructors to collaboratively design research assignments that shift focus away from using specific search tools and locating particular types of sources opens possibilities for what librarians are able to achieve in one-shot instruction sessions, in terms of both lesson content and pedagogical strategies used.

**Originality/value:** The existing literature on first-year writing addressing faculty and librarian assignment design collaborations, and research assignments more generally, does not often explicitly examine the experiences of librarians who primarily work with GTAs. This paper adds to this literature by highlighting specific obstacles and unique opportunities in librarian–GTA teaching partnerships in first-year writing courses.

**Keywords:** Information literacy | Library instruction | Collaboration | Instructional design | Assignments | Graduate teaching assistants

**Article:**

**\*\*\*Note: Full text of article below**

1  
2  
3 **On the same page:**  
4

5 **Collaborative research assignment design with graduate teaching assistants**  
6

7 Maggie Murphy, UNC Greensboro

8  
9 mmurphy@uncg.edu  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 **Abstract**  
15

16 Purpose  
17

18 – This paper aims to explore how collaborative research assignment design consultations  
19 between instruction librarians and new graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) have the potential to  
20 improve the design of research assignments for first-year writing courses.  
21  
22

23 Design/methodology/approach  
24

25 – The author conducted a small number of questionnaires and structured interviews with  
26 first-time graduate teaching assistants who serve as first-year composition instructors in order to  
27 explore their conceptions about teaching researched writing. Thematic analysis of the results of  
28 these qualitative instruments led to the design of a new framework for working with incoming  
29 cohorts of graduate teaching assistants at her institution prior to the start of each fall semester.  
30  
31

32 Findings  
33

34 – New graduate teaching assistants often emphasize strict source type parameters in research  
35 assignment design and expect their students to engage in expert research behaviors.  
36  
37

38 Emphasizing the assignment design expertise of instruction librarians during new graduate  
39 teaching assistant orientation may lead to more assignment design consultations with first-time  
40 college writing instructors. Collaborative assignment design consultations between librarians and  
41 GTAs can improve the alignment of research assignment parameters with their shared goals for  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 students' research and writing skills and habits of mind, including seeing research and writing as  
4  
5 iterative and inquiry-based processes.

#### 6 7 Research limitations/implications

8  
9 – While not every instruction librarian works with graduate teaching assistants, working with  
10  
11 instructors to collaboratively design research assignments that shift focus away from using  
12  
13 specific search tools and locating particular types of sources opens possibilities for what  
14  
15 librarians are able to achieve in one-shot instruction sessions, in terms of both lesson content and  
16  
17 pedagogical strategies used.

#### 18 19 Originality/value

20  
21 – The existing literature on first-year writing addressing faculty and librarian assignment design  
22  
23 collaborations, and research assignments more generally, does not often explicitly examine the  
24  
25 experiences of librarians who primarily work with graduate teaching assistants. This paper adds  
26  
27 to this literature by highlighting specific obstacles and unique opportunities in librarian-GTA  
28  
29 teaching partnerships in first-year writing courses.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 37 **Introduction**

38  
39 First-year writing courses are a common feature of general education curricula at many  
40  
41 two-year and four-year colleges and universities. There is great variability in how first-year writing  
42  
43 courses are structured at different institutions: they may be structured as standalone introductory  
44  
45 composition courses, as a sequence of composition courses, or as thematic or disciplinary  
46  
47 first-year seminars with a writing-intensive focus (National Census of Writing, 2015). However,  
48  
49 according to the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2014), first-year writing courses  
50  
51 should aim to accomplish key shared outcomes, regardless of format. These shared outcomes  
52  
53 include helping new college students build rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking and reading  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 skills, the ability to engage in iterative composing processes, and awareness of conventions for  
4  
5 language, style, discipline, and genre.  
6

7           While these outcomes can be achieved in any number of ways, first-year writing courses  
8  
9 often include assignments that require students to delve into research and writing from outside  
10  
11 sources. In fact, first-year writing programs (and their instructors) “frequently bear the  
12  
13 responsibility for teaching basic research writing to first-year students” (Artman et al., 2010, p. 96)  
14  
15 in the general education curriculum. This is why library instruction for first-year writing courses is  
16  
17 a feature of almost every academic library’s instruction program. For example, 97% of academic  
18  
19 libraries that responded to a national survey on libraries in the first-year experience indicated that  
20  
21 they offer library instruction for first-year students; first-year seminars/writing courses were by far  
22  
23 the most common disciplines for first-year library instruction among those respondents (Library  
24  
25 Journal and Credo Reference, 2017).  
26  
27  
28

29           Despite the frequency with which research writing is included in first-year writing courses,  
30  
31 the efficacy of assigning research papers in these courses has been a topic discussed in the  
32  
33 composition studies literature for decades (Brent, 2013). While in theory, research papers help  
34  
35 students learn how to engage in the iterative processes of inquiry, critical analysis, synthesis, and  
36  
37 scholarly discourse, in practice the experience is often very different. When Schwegler and  
38  
39 Shamoan (1982) asked students why faculty assign research papers in an early study on this  
40  
41 issue, students’ answers indicated that they saw research papers as an exercise in learning about  
42  
43 unfamiliar topics, using library resources, gathering information, and writing papers that are  
44  
45 ultimately informative and factual, rather than argumentative or analytical. To students, research  
46  
47 is “close-ended, informative, skills-oriented” (p. 820). Howard and Jamieson (2014) echo these  
48  
49 findings more than thirty years later, writing, “students and instructors hold different ideals for the  
50  
51 research paper, and pedagogy may not resonate with instructors’ goals for the assignment” (p.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 235). Thus, there is a clear disconnect between the intended aims and actual outcomes of  
4  
5 research paper assignments in first-year writing: what faculty want students to learn in the  
6  
7 process of writing a research paper is not being achieved by the way the assignment itself is  
8  
9 designed or taught.  
10

11  
12 In a seminal work on the influence of faculty perceptions of academic research on  
13  
14 undergraduate research assignment design, Leckie (1996) argues that this disconnect largely has  
15  
16 to do with a number of interrelated assumptions faculty make about undergraduates' ability to  
17  
18 engage in research like an expert scholar would. These assumptions end up being implicitly  
19  
20 "embedded in the design and wording of the assignment" itself (p. 203) in the form of  
21  
22 requirements for topics, sources, and page length, rather than explicitly communicated to  
23  
24 students. Howard and Jamieson (2014) characterize these assignment requirements, from the  
25  
26 view of students, as "seemingly arbitrary demands" to be obeyed, such as "Your paper must  
27  
28 include references to at least two books'; 'You may not cite websites'; 'You may not cite  
29  
30 *Wikipedia*'; 'all of your sources must be scholarly'; and so forth" (p. 237). Research assignments  
31  
32 ultimately expect students to find, evaluate, read, comprehend, and synthesize lengthy, complex  
33  
34 sources without necessitating that they first understand how and why scholarship is produced  
35  
36 and disseminated in the first place.  
37  
38

39  
40 Library instruction in this context rarely helps in any meaningful way, because it is often  
41  
42 delivered in the form of one-shot sessions in which librarians are directed by writing instructors to  
43  
44 demonstrate how to find and cite sources. Reflecting on their experiences on working with  
45  
46 instruction librarians as first-year composition instructors, Jacobs and Jacobs (2009) write: "...our  
47  
48 course schedules and assignments revealed an assumption that a single 'dose' of library  
49  
50 instruction would teach students all they needed to know about research" (p. 74). This reveals a  
51  
52 common instructor perception about the role of librarians in first-year writing: if librarians show  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 students how to effectively search databases and format citations like experts do, the students  
4  
5 will be able to engage in researched writing as experts.  
6

7           Additionally, completed research papers rarely provide any evidence of student's  
8  
9 research and writing behaviors or habits of mind. According to Howard and Jamieson (2014),  
10  
11 students often satisfy written requirements for source integration by patchwriting from sources  
12  
13 they do not actually evaluate, read deeply, comprehend, or synthesize (p. 234). Yet the idea  
14  
15 persists that producing a paper that meets the assignment requirements means that students  
16  
17 must have gained "the requisite knowledge and skills through the very process of preparing a  
18  
19 piece of written coursework" (McGuinness, 2006). In other words, the actual design of research  
20  
21 paper projects often encourages students to meet the letter, but not the spirit, of what was  
22  
23 intended by the instructor when the paper was assigned.  
24  
25

26  
27           The problematic nature of research paper assignments, and the tension poorly designed  
28  
29 assignments create between instructors, students, and librarians, is not new territory in writing  
30  
31 studies or library and information science literature. However, most of these discussions focus on  
32  
33 the interplay between faculty-level instructors and librarians, and how they individually and  
34  
35 collectively grapple with the best ways to teach students to be ethical, critical, and creative  
36  
37 researchers. But, what about when first-year writing instructors are not faculty members, but  
38  
39 graduate students? And, what about when those graduate students have never taught research  
40  
41 writing before? What unique challenges do instruction librarians face working with GTAs who  
42  
43 assign research papers in first-year writing courses? Are there also unique opportunities?  
44  
45

46  
47           This case study considers how instruction librarians can collaborate with new graduate  
48  
49 teaching assistants who are first-time instructors of introductory first-year writing courses in order  
50  
51 to design assignments that meet their shared goals for students' researched writing. A qualitative  
52  
53 exploration of new graduate teaching assistants' perceptions about teaching researched writing  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 revealed beliefs that setting strict requirements on source parameters correlates with first-year  
4 writing students developing the research practices and dispositions graduate teaching assistants  
5 use as emerging experts. This prompted the author to rethink the way new graduate teaching  
6 assistants are introduced to her institution's library instruction program in order to encourage  
7 GTAs who are first-time writing instructors to schedule pre-semester assignment design  
8 consultations with instruction librarians.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

### 18 **Background**

19  
20           At UNC Greensboro, a new cohort of graduate teaching assistants for the college writing  
21 program, housed under the Department of English, starts each fall. These GTAs consist of new  
22 and continuing students in both the English PhD and Creative Writing MFA programs. Each new  
23 GTA is scheduled to teach a section of the introductory first-year writing course in both fall and  
24 spring semesters of their first academic year. The GTAs serve as instructors of record and have  
25 wide latitude to plan their course syllabi, including writing assignments, as long as the  
26 standardized course learning outcomes are met. This is significant to this case study in that there  
27 is no program requirement that students complete a research paper assignment in the  
28 introductory writing course.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40           The college writing program is administered by an English department faculty member  
41 who leads a week-long program orientation for new GTAs each August, before the start of the fall  
42 semester. The orientation consists of a number of peer- and faculty-led sessions on course and  
43 assignment design, pedagogy, assessment and grading, accessibility, classroom management,  
44 and more. Additionally, the GTAs take a graduate course, Teaching College Writing, during their  
45 first fall semester teaching, which serves as an introduction to the discipline of writing studies as  
46 well as a venue for developing a reflective pedagogical practice.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3           During the summer orientation session, new graduate teaching assistants also meet with  
4  
5 the instruction librarian who works with the college writing program for a half-hour session about  
6  
7 library instruction for the introductory first-year writing course. Traditionally, this session is  
8  
9 focused on logistical considerations: how the GTAs can request an instruction session for their  
10  
11 class, what information is needed from instructors to design an effective library instruction lesson  
12  
13 plan, and what some sample lesson plans for different research assignments might look like. The  
14  
15 orientation session prior to the fall 2017 semester, which was co-led by the information literacy  
16  
17 coordinator and the author, an instruction librarian who had been recently hired as the first-year  
18  
19 writing program liaison, also included a brief introduction to the *ACRL Framework for Information*  
20  
21 *Literacy* and other basic information literacy concepts that underpin library instruction as a  
22  
23 practice.  
24  
25

26  
27           The majority of library instruction for the introductory first-year writing course at UNC  
28  
29 Greensboro has historically been in the one-shot format. For example, between Fall 2015 and  
30  
31 Spring 2018, fewer than 13% of the 177 introductory first-year writing classes that received library  
32  
33 instruction came for more than one instruction session in a semester. None had more than two  
34  
35 sessions in a semester. While one-shot library instruction sessions have well-known pedagogical  
36  
37 limitations for teaching complex information literacy dispositions and practices in all disciplines  
38  
39 (Artman et al, 2010; Jacobs and Jacobs, 2009; Mery et al, 2012; Walker and Pearce, 2014), the  
40  
41 one-shot is still a prevalent and unfortunate format for instruction librarian work with first-year  
42  
43 writing classes in particular. As Artman et al. (2010) write from the perspective of writing studies  
44  
45 scholars and composition instructors:  
46  
47

48  
49           “...it is still common practice to either disregard the expertise our librarian colleagues may  
50  
51 lend to IL instruction, or, conversely, to ‘farm out’ lessons in information literacy to  
52  
53 one-shot library instruction sessions. These practices can, in turn, serve to reinforce the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 perception that the research process is separate from (and more facile than) the writing  
4 process, that teaching students effective research practices can be reduced to a single,  
5 skills-based class session, and that, ultimately, literacy in information is only useful or  
6 valuable if tied to that well-worn (and ill-formed) genre, the academic research paper” (p.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 96)

13  
14 Thus, while instruction librarians know that one-shots have a limited impact on first-year students’  
15 short-term ability to complete research projects *and* long-term growth as writers and researchers,  
16 the degree to which a librarian is embedded in a first-year writing course is determined by some  
17 combination of programmatic requirements and the extent to which an instruction librarian and  
18 writing instructor are able to negotiate a collaborative relationship.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 At UNC Greensboro, just as there is no programmatic requirement that the GTAs assign a  
26 research-based writing assignment in the introductory course in the first place, there is also no  
27 requirement that instructors of first-year writing courses incorporate library instruction into their  
28 schedules when they do assign research project. In fall 2017, just 64% of introductory course  
29 sections (or 45 sections) met with a librarian for an instruction session at all. A number of factors  
30 likely influence these numbers, including that first-year writing instructors may not be assigning  
31 research projects (and therefore see no use for library instruction), may feel confident in their own  
32 ability to teach students necessary information literacy concepts for researched writing, many not  
33 value the expertise or teaching skills of librarians, or may think they cannot or should not cede  
34 one or more class periods in the semester schedule to “research instruction.”  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Because the author came to UNC Greensboro from a community college setting, where  
48 the majority of first-year writing courses were taught by full-time faculty in the English department,  
49 working with graduate teaching assistants as the primary first-year writing instructors was a new  
50 experience. However, GTAs often teach first-year writing, especially at universities with large  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 enrollments that result in dozens of sections being offered concurrently in a semester. According  
4  
5 to the National Census of Writing (2015), about 32% of 410 four-year institutions (ranging from  
6  
7 small liberal arts colleges to large doctoral-granting institutions) reported that graduate teaching  
8  
9 assistants in English taught at least some percentage of the first-year composition courses  
10  
11 offered at their institution during the 2011-12 year. At about 16% of those institutions, graduate  
12  
13 teaching assistants in creative writing programs and other disciplines also served as instructors.  
14  
15

16 While graduate teaching assistants at UNC Greensboro are required by the institution's  
17  
18 accreditation agency to have "master's in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours  
19  
20 in the teaching discipline, direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching  
21  
22 discipline, regular in-service training, and planned and periodic evaluations" (SACSCOC, 2018: p.  
23  
24 1), there is no guarantee that they have taught before at any level before stepping in front of their  
25  
26 introductory first-year writing courses in their first fall semesters at GTAs. Additionally, while  
27  
28 accreditation agencies typically require that instructors of record have graduate degrees or have  
29  
30 accumulated a certain number of credits at the graduate level in the subject of instruction, many if  
31  
32 not most graduate students in English departments do not consider themselves to be scholars of  
33  
34 writing studies or rhetoric and composition. Rather, their focus of study is likely to be in a period  
35  
36 or style of literature or in literary theory—and in the academy, those concentrations are  
37  
38 considered distinct fields from college writing or composition (Downs and Wardle, 2007).  
39  
40  
41

42 Finally, while graduate teaching assistants are typically closer, in terms of professional  
43  
44 preparation and time passed, to the experience of being an undergraduate student than a full  
45  
46 faculty member would be, GTAs might also suffer from the "expert researcher" phenomenon that  
47  
48 Leckie (1996) writes about. When faculty design research assignments and teach research  
49  
50 methods to undergraduate students, they do so from a position where it is difficult to remember  
51  
52 the skills and habits of mind novice undergraduate researchers (and especially first-year  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 students) bring to the table. This often results in research assignments that unfairly expect  
4  
5 undergraduate students to engage in sophisticated, disciplinary-specific ways of thinking in order  
6  
7 to delve into the processes of inquiry and analysis required to complete the assignment as  
8  
9 written.  
10

11  
12         However, this phenomenon at least typically impacts novice researchers studying the  
13  
14 same discipline their faculty members were trained in. In the case of GTAs teaching introductory  
15  
16 first-year writing, the “expert researcher” issue is further exacerbated by having literary scholars  
17  
18 teach composition courses. Leckie (1996) writes, “The nature of the discipline will also have an  
19  
20 impact on the researcher’s own research process, including how she or he seeks and uses  
21  
22 information in the course of a research project” (p. 202). Research assignments appropriate for  
23  
24 introductory general education first-year writing course are unlikely to require the same students  
25  
26 to consider the same topics, engage in the same methods, or use the same tools as humanities  
27  
28 research and writing, which is the disciplinary framing many GTAs-as-expert-researchers likely  
29  
30 have (Downs and Wardle, 2007).  
31  
32

33  
34         Over the course of the fall semester, the author anecdotally observed many first-year  
35  
36 writing students at UNC Greensboro struggling with research assignments in library instruction  
37  
38 sessions and one-on-one research consultations in courses taught by new graduate teaching  
39  
40 assistants and wondered if it could be attributed to the unique confluence of factors resulting  
41  
42 from having new graduate teaching assistants teach researched writing in the context of first-year  
43  
44 writing. This led her to wonder: how did those GTAs feel about teaching “the research process”  
45  
46 to students? Were they satisfied with their students’ final products? Did they feel their students  
47  
48 were developing the critical and creative ways of thinking and practical skills necessary for  
49  
50 meaningfully engaging in iterative research and writing? While the new GTAs would certainly  
51  
52 learn from their own experiences each semester and likely adjust how they design and teach  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 research assignments in the future, each new fall would continue to bring a new cohort of  
4 first-time instructors. How could this entire experience be improved for new GTAs, first-year  
5 writing students, and instruction librarians the next go around?  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 **Questionnaires and interviews**

12  
13  
14 To get a better sense of how first-time graduate teaching assistants think about teaching  
15 researched writing within first-year composition courses, the author conducted a series of  
16 questionnaires and structured interviews during the 2017-18 academic year (similar to the  
17 approach used by Lantz, 2016, with graduate teaching assistants serving as instructors of  
18 first-year biology). Two anonymous questionnaires were developed and distributed at the end of  
19 the fall 2017 semester in order to compare the experiences of graduate teaching assistants at her  
20 own institution with experiences of GTAs more broadly; one questionnaire was intended for just  
21 first-semester GTAs at UNC Greensboro, and one was meant to be open to any first-time GTAs  
22 teaching first-year composition via a national listserv for writing program administrators (WPA-L).  
23 The questionnaires were designed in Qualtrics using branch logic to deliver open-ended,  
24 clarifying follow up questions depending on a respondent's answer to a yes or no question. The  
25 questionnaires included questions about new GTAs' practical experience with designing and  
26 assigning research assignments (e.g. "Did you spend more time than you had originally planned  
27 teaching students about research?") as well as their own goals and dispositions for teaching  
28 researched writing (e.g. "What should writing instructors, specifically, teach students about the  
29 research process?").  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 It should also be noted that both versions of the questionnaire were designed to screen  
50 out new graduate teaching assistants who had previously taught first-year writing in another  
51 setting, in order to capture responses from just first-time composition instructors. All of the new  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 graduate teaching assistants (n=11) in the 2017-18 cohort of the college writing program at UNC  
4 Greensboro were invited to participate in the institution-specific questionnaire via email. Of 7  
5  
6 respondents, 5 were eligible as first-time instructors of first-year writing to complete the full  
7  
8 questionnaire. The open questionnaire was sent to the WPA-L listserv in early December 2017,  
9  
10 with the intention that writing program administrators might advertise it to new graduate teaching  
11  
12 assistants at their institutions. Of 13 responses to the open questionnaire, 10 first-time instructors  
13  
14 of first-year writing were eligible to complete the full questionnaire. Across both versions, there  
15  
16 were 15 total respondents who completed the full questionnaire.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 At the end of the spring 2018 semester, the author invited the entire 2017-18 cohort of  
22  
23 new GTAs to participate in follow-up interviews. While 4 GTAs initially were interested in being  
24  
25 interviewed, the author was only able to successfully complete interviews with 2 GTAs before the  
26  
27 start of summer break due to scheduling concerns inherent to the end of a semester. The  
28  
29 interview participants were asked a series of 18 standardized questions, grouped under 4  
30  
31 categories: "information literacy," "pedagogy and assignment design," "first-year students," and  
32  
33 "librarian integration in first-year writing." The author recorded the interviews and used an online  
34  
35 automated transcription platform to process the recordings and clean up the transcripts.  
36  
37

38  
39 The full protocols for both questionnaires and the structured interviews were reviewed by  
40  
41 UNC Greensboro's Institutional Review Board; all received an IRB determination that they "[did]  
42  
43 not constitute human subjects research as defined under federal regulations [45 CFR 46.102 (d or  
44  
45 f)] and does not require IRB approval." Additionally, the questionnaires and list of interview  
46  
47 questions were not intended to be rigorous research instruments that would result in  
48  
49 generalizable findings, but rather a way to provide the author with a quick snapshot of graduate  
50  
51 teaching assistant dispositions.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Findings

The questionnaires and follow-up interviews indicate that graduate teaching assistants share many of the same perceptions about teaching researched writing that faculty-level instructors do. Each of the questionnaire respondents (n=15) assigned a research paper project in their fall 2017 introductory first-year writing course, regardless of whether it was required by their program. Additionally, the 2 interview participants, who were among those who completed the questionnaire anonymously, elaborated on their experiences with assigning research papers.

When asked about the role of teaching researched writing in introductory first-year writing courses, most instructors articulated learning goals that stressed evaluation, comprehension, and synthesis over the ability to locate sources. For example, in response to the question, “What should students know about research by the end of a first-year writing course?” one instructor answered:

*“Students should know how to evaluate sources for credibility, identify key concepts and arguments in academic writing, and be able to converse (both orally and in writing) about those ideas and their understanding and views regarding those ideas.”*

However, when they were asked about whether or not they set parameters for source use in their research paper assignments, the articulated assignment requirements for students emphasized the ability to identify a source’s format and integrate particular specific types of publications.

Consider these responses to the following questions.

“What types of sources could not be used in the research paper, and why?”

*“Popular, because they don’t present cogent and peer-reviewed arguments.”*

“What types of sources were required in the research paper, and why?”

*“Books from the library were required because the library is a valuable resource for on campus research.”*

1  
2  
3 New graduate teaching assistants likely think that by limiting students to particular types of  
4 sources, they are requiring students to engage in scholarly conversations and critical analysis as  
5 part of the research and writing processes. However, by limiting first-year writing students to  
6 specific source formats (not coincidentally the formats typically used by expert researchers in  
7 literary studies and other humanities disciplines), instructors are actually unintentionally  
8 circumventing opportunities for students to practice critical evaluation and select sources based  
9 on rhetorical contexts and information. Furthermore, the exclusive use of peer-reviewed sources  
10 and print books rarely makes sense for the types of researched writing students are being  
11 assigned in introductory composition classes, when students often have wide latitude to choose  
12 topics about current events and popular culture.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Finally, when asked about their understanding of the idea of “information literacy”  
26 instruction as it relates to first-year writing courses, several respondents’ answers mirrored the  
27 idea of that the role of librarians is to teach skills-based research instruction during a “library  
28 day.” For some respondents, information literacy itself is a discrete set of competencies involving  
29 finding and citing sources, rather than a framework practices and ways of thinking about  
30 information that demonstrate understanding of how information is created, disseminated,  
31 evaluated, and valued in society. In response to the question “What is your definition of  
32 information literacy in the context of teaching first-year students?”, one interview participant’s  
33 definition even involved the goal of having students use specific tools instead of engaging in  
34 open-ended inquiry.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 *“Learning and knowing how to use the particular databases that the library offers. The*  
48 *MLA International Bibliography, ProQuest, and JSTOR: those are the three main ones that*  
49 *I make my students use.”*  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Notably, the *MLA International Bibliography* is a subject database often used in literary studies  
4 and familiar to graduate students in English departments. However, it would rarely be an  
5 appropriate choice for a first-year writing student to use due to its level of difficulty and specificity  
6 compared to many multidisciplinary databases and tools like Google Scholar.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 All of the questionnaire respondents indicated that they were satisfied, overall, with their  
12 students' final research papers. However, despite their students' ability to produce satisfactory  
13 products, several respondents perceived that their students were not fully engaging in inquiry or  
14 evaluation during the research and writing processes. For example, when asked "What  
15 information literacy skills or habits of mind do your students still struggle with?", one participant  
16 answered:  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 *"I still see a lot of evidence of them just going to Google and using whatever pops up.*  
26 *Like kind of that plug and chug where, instead of going into it with a research question,*  
27 *even though we worked at getting them into a research question, they still wait until*  
28 *they've kind of written the paper to find sources. Or they only search for articles that*  
29 *reinforce their own ideas."*  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 These behaviors all mirror outcomes of mechanics-focused researched writing assignments that  
37 emphasize products instead of processes. As Critten and Seeber (2015) argue, assessing student  
38 research by evaluating the quantity and type of sources students use "tells you what a student  
39 obtained, but not how it was acquired, or if the student even wanted the product to begin with"  
40 (slide 12). Merely being able to produce a final paper that meets source requirements says very  
41 little about a student's dispositions towards research and writing, never mind whether they are  
42 able to engage in "reflective discovery of information," understand "how information is produced  
43 and valued," and use information to "create new knowledge" and "participate ethically in  
44 communities of learning"—all elements of information literacy as defined in the *ACRL Framework*.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 When asked “why did you assign a research paper this semester,” the range of  
4 responses from new graduate teaching assistants indicated a variety of beliefs about the role of  
5 research papers in first-year writing. For example, one questionnaire respondent answered:  
6  
7

8  
9 *“Because many of the students are unfamiliar with the actual process that not only goes*  
10 *into writing but researching as well, and I feel that it is important that my students get a*  
11 *chance to practice and engage with those skills that they will undoubtedly be using (at*  
12 *the very least) the rest of their undergraduate careers.”*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 However, another answered:  
19

20 *I felt like I had to. I think incorporating research is an important skill, but after this*  
21 *semester I am never doing a formal "research paper" again. Students don't need it as*  
22 *much as they need other skills that already require research incorporation.*  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 These responses both reflect a belief that teaching researched writing in first-year writing is  
28 valuable, but neither response actually gives a reason why the complex set of abilities required to  
29 engage in iterative research and writing processes must be taught through the assigning the  
30 genre of “the research paper.”  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Perhaps this is related to why 13 of the 15 respondents answered that they would change  
37 their approach to teaching researched writing in the subsequent semester, based on what they  
38 learned from their experience of assigning a research paper in their first semester. These  
39 changes ranged from “moving away from the traditional research paper format in favor of genres  
40 that students are more familiar with and more likely to need to work with in their professional  
41 futures” to “incorporating librarians and digital project consultants into the course in order to  
42 assign multimodal projects” to “re-emphasizing credibility” through informal activities leading up  
43 to a scaffolded research paper assignment. Significantly, these new graduate teaching assistants  
44 only arrived at these ideas for alternative ways to teach researched writing after experiencing  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 designing, assigning, and assessing a traditional research paper during their first semester  
4  
5 teaching introductory first-year writing.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **A New Approach**

11 From analyzing the experiences and perceptions of new graduate teaching assistants  
12 serving as first-time instructors of introductory first-year writing, it was clear to the author that she  
13 shared many learning goals for students with new GTAs at UNC Greensboro—yet, these new  
14 GTAs had initially fallen into the same trap that so many well-meaning faculty members had  
15 before them. They were designing research paper assignments that inadvertently constructed  
16 research as linear and skills-based while implicitly expecting first-year writing students to engage  
17 in researched writing using the methods and tools they use as emerging experts. As a result,  
18 their students were able to produce final products that nominally met the written requirements of  
19 the assignments without meeting the GTAs' goals for what students should learn about research:  
20 namely, how to engage in meaningful inquiry and reflection, synthesize complex ideas, and  
21 create new knowledge.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Yet, while the new GTAs from whom she gathered responses articulated the desire to  
37 engage in different approaches to teaching researched writing in the future, the author had  
38 limited agency as an instruction librarian within the structure of the college writing program at  
39 UNC Greensboro to pre-emptively improve the experiences of either new cohorts of graduate  
40 teaching assistants or their students in subsequent fall semesters. The 30-minute session the  
41 instruction librarians are allotted during the GTA orientation each August was hardly long enough  
42 to meaningfully impact new GTAs' perceptions about library instruction and the role of  
43 information literacy in first-year writing, particularly when the factors that result in poorly designed  
44 assignments (namely, the influence of the “expert researcher” mindset on research paper  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 assignment design and the expectation that a single one-shot session with a librarian will turn  
4  
5 students into expert researchers) are so pervasive even among experienced faculty. This raised  
6  
7 the question: without being able to change the structure of the orientation process for new GTAs,  
8  
9 and given that it was unlikely that new instructors would deviate from the one-shot precedent for  
10  
11 first-year writing courses, what was the most impactful change that could be made?  
12  
13  
14  
15

### 16 *Assignment design collaborations*

17  
18 In contemplating how to improve teaching researched writing in first-year composition  
19  
20 courses, scholars in writing studies and LIS have offered many possible solutions, such as greater  
21  
22 scaffolding of research assignments, deeper integration of librarians as teachers and course  
23  
24 designers in the first-year writing curriculum, the establishment of faculty-librarian communities of  
25  
26 practice around information literacy pedagogy, and supplemental online information literacy  
27  
28 instruction (Barratt et al, 2009; Gardner and White-Farnham, 2013; Howard and Jamieson, 2014;  
29  
30 Kissel et al, 2016; Leckie, 1996; McGuinness, 2006; Refaei et al., 2015). Yet, given the specifics of  
31  
32 the situation at UNC Greensboro, the author decided that the most meaningful way to improve  
33  
34 student learning outcomes for researched writing was to use the 30-minute session during GTA  
35  
36 orientation allotted to discuss library instruction to propose that new GTAs collaborate with  
37  
38 instruction librarians on the actual design of research-based assignments. This solution, while  
39  
40 rarely discussed as a standalone fix to the problems inherent with “the research paper” in  
41  
42 first-year writing, is supported by both writing studies and LIS literature.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 For example, writing from the perspective of a composition studies scholar, Brent (2014)  
48  
49 encourages writing instructors to collaborate with librarians on assignment design by pointing out  
50  
51 that librarians are well-attuned to the struggles and barriers students face when they are given  
52  
53 research paper assignments and are thus in a position to help improve them: “Since the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 librarians frequently are the ones to clean up our messes when we create ill-conceived research  
4 assignments, we would do well to listen more closely to what they are saying” (p. 43). McClure  
5  
6 (2009) takes this idea further, pointing out that both librarians and writing instructors have unique  
7  
8 perspectives on the writing and research processes as both teachers and practitioners. Thus, by  
9  
10 collaborating on research assignment design, librarian-instructor partners can “learn more about  
11  
12 their shared writing and researching goals, thus likely to improve both library and writing  
13  
14 instruction in the process” and “work together to design assignments in order to build in research  
15  
16 and analysis concepts at the points of need in them” (p. 71). Whitver (2017), reiterates this  
17  
18 sentiment in writing about librarian partnerships (including research assignment design  
19  
20 collaboration) with graduate teaching assistants during a teaching practicum, writing “if both  
21  
22 librarians and first-time teachers approach this collaboration with a willingness to learn from each  
23  
24 other and a commitment to working toward their shared goal, they can transform the information  
25  
26 literacy classroom into a dynamic learning environment that fosters the skills necessary for  
27  
28 engaged, researched writing” (pp. 175-176). In other words, research assignment collaborations  
29  
30 can be beneficial to both librarians and writing instructors, resulting in the exchange of expertise  
31  
32 and design of assignments that reflect their mutual goals for student learning.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 However, as Wishkoski et al. (2019) point out, collaborative assignment design is not the  
40  
41 norm in library instruction. Rather, “...consultation with a librarian happens only after course  
42  
43 assignments are written and syllabi set” ( p. 96), or worse, after the assignment has been  
44  
45 distributed (and, at that point, cannot really be changed without risking greater confusion to  
46  
47 students). This is because library instruction is often seen as an optional support service for  
48  
49 first-year writing instructors, who can involve librarians as little as they want to in the design of  
50  
51 their courses and assignments. To this end, Artman et al. (2010) argues that writing instructors  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 can only really benefit from the expertise of librarians in information literacy pedagogy and theory  
4  
5 by involving them much earlier:  
6

7           “...this collaboration must not be reserved until students are in the process of conducting  
8  
9           or beginning their research, but must be part of instructional planning envisioned by the  
10  
11           instructor or writing program administrator. If this sort of cooperation appears to improve  
12  
13           student writing (in terms of the final products produced through such partnerships), then  
14  
15           our efforts as compositionists and WPAs must focus on the collaborative processes that  
16  
17           facilitate productive interaction between library and writing instructors.” (p. 100)  
18  
19

20 Thus, while assignment design consultations between instruction librarians and GTAs are unlikely  
21  
22 to ever be required by the college writing program administration at UNC Greensboro, the author  
23  
24 also concluded that at least pointing out that collaborative research assignment design has  
25  
26 proponents among writing studies scholars might help legitimize the practice to new GTAs and  
27  
28 encourage further collaborations.  
29  
30

31           Finally, while one-shot library instruction sessions will always have limitations, assignment  
32  
33 design collaborations can open up more discussions about the inefficacy of skills-based  
34  
35 demonstration during library instruction. If instruction librarians are able to help first-year writing  
36  
37 instructors think through the negative impacts that strict source parameters have on the student  
38  
39 learning process in the context of researched writing and help them align the design of the  
40  
41 assignment with their goals for what students should learn about writing and research, other  
42  
43 forms of research projects that emphasize process over mechanics might emerge. When  
44  
45 students are not faced with arbitrary requirements for source use, writing instructors might be  
46  
47 encouraged to envision library instruction sessions that engage students in active learning  
48  
49 around aspects of research involving inquiry, analysis, and reflection.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Discussion and future directions

During the summer 2018 term, the author began to redesign the outline for the librarian-led session during the orientation for new GTAs. Instead of solely focusing on the logistics of scheduling library instruction, the session contextualized library instruction as part of a larger collaboration between writing instructors and librarians that begins with working together on assignment design. The session would also highlight some of the common pitfalls to traditional research paper assignments, including the relationship between source requirements and student dispositions towards research, in introductory first-year writing courses and introduce backward design (Wiggins and McTighe, 2005) as a helpful process for aligning goals for student learning with assignments and lesson plans.

<Insert murphy-fig1.tif>

Figure 1. Examples of slides from the revised library instruction introduction for new GTAs

Unfortunately, when the orientation schedule for the fall 2018 cohort of graduate teaching assistants was issued, the author discovered that she would be across the country participating in a multi-day professional development working during the entire 3-day orientation. This meant that she would be unable to fully implement plans for working with the new cohort in the 2018-19 year, because the new GTAs would not have an opportunity to meet their actual liaison librarian with whom they would collaborate on assignment design before the start of the fall semester. Instead, the information literacy coordinator at UNC Greensboro led a hybrid session that contained elements of both the old introduction to library instruction and the revised plan emphasizing assignment design collaborations in the author's absence.

While the author was unable to lead the session during the orientation for the new cohort of graduate teaching assistants in summer 2018, the hybrid session described above was not altogether unsuccessful in encouraging new GTAs to meet with the first-year writing instruction

1  
2  
3 librarian about research assignment design. Of the 9 new GTAs beginning as introductory  
4  
5 first-year writing instructors in fall 2018, 5 scheduled meetings with the author in August and early  
6  
7 September to begin the process of designing research assignments together. Additionally, while  
8  
9 the author did not explicitly hope that developing collaborative relationships with new GTAs  
10  
11 would impact the library instruction model at UNC Greensboro, more first-year writing instructors  
12  
13 scheduled two or more library instruction sessions in the fall 2018 semester than they had in the  
14  
15 previous six semesters; 20% of the 35 first-year writing classes that received library instruction  
16  
17 came to the library more than two or more sessions, as compared to an average of about 13%  
18  
19 between fall 2015 and spring 2017.  
20  
21  
22

23           One of the things the author emphasized during research assignment design sessions  
24  
25 with new graduate TAs was the practice of aligning source parameters to the instructor's actual  
26  
27 learning goals for their students, which typically included students being able to evaluate the  
28  
29 authority and trustworthiness of a source of information as well as choose useful and relevant  
30  
31 sources in the context of their actual research topics. As an outcome of these discussions, the  
32  
33 instructors moved away from requiring peer-reviewed journal articles or print books for  
34  
35 research-based writing assignments in their first-year writing courses. Instead, the wording of  
36  
37 their assignments stressed that students should seek a range of authoritative voices on their  
38  
39 topics, regardless of source type. For example, the source requirements section of one  
40  
41 persuasive video assignment, titled "What kinds of sources should I use?" was phrased,  
42  
43

44           "Credible sources do not need to consist of solely academic, peer-reviewed journal  
45  
46 articles. Credible sources do need to be written by someone with expertise in your  
47  
48 subject. This may be an academic professional/scholar, a journalist with extensive  
49  
50 experience covering and analyzing your topic area, or some other expert in the field."  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 In another example, a different instructor used the following language to describe source  
4 requirements for an argumentative research paper following a collaborative assignment design  
5 consultation with the author:  
6  
7

8  
9 “Your source needs to be someone (or some organization) with the authority to speak on  
10 the issue at hand. That means different things for different topics. If your topic is the  
11 Cuban Missile Crisis, a government source might be useful, if your topic is Chance the  
12 Rapper, you’re better off with a music critic. The library will help you to better define your  
13 searches and sources, but keep these things in mind: is the source biased? Authoritative?  
14 Current? If it is biased—can you present its ideas while still situating it/contextualizing it for  
15 your reader?”  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 As a result of these shifts in assignment parameter language, the author was also able to create  
26 library instruction lesson plans for the sections taught by the aforementioned graduate TAs that  
27 focused on more conceptual aspects of information literacy, rather than demonstrations of how to  
28 use scholarly article databases or the library book catalog. For example, to get students thinking  
29 about how and why information sources are created and shared in the first place before students  
30 are asked to seek them out through research, the author designed an activity for one library  
31 instruction session in which students were asked to work in groups to match different source  
32 formats (such as podcasts, Tweets, broadcast television news updates, YouTube videos, online  
33 magazine blog posts, and journal articles) to different statements about their creators and  
34 creation/dissemination processes (such as “can be published by anyone of any level of authority  
35 or expertise on a topic,” “can be instantly updated or edited after it was originally published to  
36 correct an error or add new information,” and “shares the results of original research, analysis, or  
37 theory by an academic subject specialist”). In another instruction session, students were asked to  
38 examine the first five results from a Google search for “backyard composting safety” and work in  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 groups to develop a list of criteria they use to evaluate different types of web sources, leading to  
4  
5 a class discussion about what questions a researcher should ask about authority, currency, bias,  
6  
7 and documentation in order to determine whether a source is trustworthy and relevant for their  
8  
9 information needs.  
10

11  
12 Finally, the author met with the information literacy coordinator and the college writing  
13  
14 program administrator in late fall 2018 to discuss possible future changes to the curriculum of the  
15  
16 introductory first-year writing course as part of a general education revision at UNC Greensboro.  
17  
18 One change the author advocated for was revising course outcomes, and instructor guidelines,  
19  
20 so that an alternative approach to teaching researched writing becomes part of the program  
21  
22 requirements for the introductory course. This approach has students practice reading,  
23  
24 comprehension, and synthesis when writing from complex sources before engaging in an actual  
25  
26 research project with a final product of an annotated bibliography (see Figure 2).  
27  
28

29  
30 <Insert murphy-fig2.tif here>

31  
32 Figure 2. Slide describing alternative research project approach

33  
34 The author also secured an invitation from the writing program administrator to serve as a guest  
35  
36 instructor for a class session of the graduate practicum course, which all new GTAs take, in the  
37  
38 upcoming fall 2019 semester. The session will be focused on shared concepts and language in  
39  
40 the *ACRL Framework for Information Literacy* and a similar framework used in the discipline of  
41  
42 writing studies, the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* in order to help graduate  
43  
44 teaching assistants explore the overlaps between writing and information literacy instruction.  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 50 **Conclusion**

51  
52 Working with GTAs on information literacy instruction can present librarians with  
53  
54 opportunities to develop effective collaborative teaching partnerships. Working with brand new  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 instructors at the outset of their instructional journeys may bypass some of the traditional  
4  
5 frustrations both librarians and instructors feel around assigning and assessing student research  
6  
7 projects. Of course, not every instruction librarian works with graduate teaching assistants.  
8  
9 However, many librarians will have the chance to work with new instructors who may be teaching  
10  
11 at the college level for the first time, which can result in similar opportunities to develop teaching  
12  
13 partnerships with new instructors right out of the gate.  
14  
15

16 One advantage of working with new graduate teaching assistants over new instructors in  
17  
18 general is that GTAs are often required to participate in pre-semester orientation programs  
19  
20 and/or teaching practica aimed at preparing these students for their instructional duties. Multi-day  
21  
22 orientations and semester- or year-long practica are often impactful venues for librarians to  
23  
24 emphasize how collaborative assignment design relationships can result in assignments that  
25  
26 emphasize shared librarian-instructor goals for student learning about research and writing as  
27  
28 inquiry-based iterative processes. For example, as Whitver (2017) writes, new graduate teaching  
29  
30 assistants as first-time college writing instructors “were more likely than other writing instructors  
31  
32 to involve librarians in assignment design, to strategically position library instruction sessions  
33  
34 within the greater context of their writing assignments and to take a greater role in engaging with  
35  
36 their students during library instruction sessions” (p. 173) as a result of participating in a  
37  
38 collaborative model with librarians during their formative teacher training.  
39  
40  
41

42 New faculty-level instructors may not be required by their institutions or departments to  
43  
44 participate in formal pedagogical training similar to what is required of graduate teaching  
45  
46 assistants before they begin teaching. However, librarians may be able to create opportunities to  
47  
48 reach new instructors in order to emphasize collaborative research assignment design before the  
49  
50 instructors assign research projects to students by working with teaching and learning centers or  
51  
52 instructional design units on campus. Because these departments are often tasked with providing  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 professional development on teaching and course/assignment design to faculty, they may be  
4  
5 able to more easily promote information sessions with librarians to new instructors.  
6

7           Additionally, regardless of whether librarians are working with new graduate teaching  
8  
9 assistants or new faculty-level instructors, there are a few common strategies they may want to  
10  
11 try in order to encourage instructor support for collaborative assignment design. First, librarians  
12  
13 can emphasize any shared language about information literacy dispositions and practices  
14  
15 between the *ACRL Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education* and the instructor's  
16  
17 own disciplinary frameworks. They can also discuss literature from both LIS and disciplinary  
18  
19 perspectives about successful librarian-instructor partnerships around research assignment  
20  
21 design and information literacy instruction related to an instructor's field. Lastly, instruction  
22  
23 librarians can ask graduate teaching assistants or other instructors with whom they have  
24  
25 successfully worked before to become involved in their outreach and collaboration with new  
26  
27 instructors, in order to provide potential opportunities for peer teaching and learning or  
28  
29 encourage a community of practice around information literacy at their institutions.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Artman, Margaret, Erica Frisicaro-Pawlowski, and Robert Monge. "Not Just One Shot: Extending the Dialogue about Information Literacy in Composition Classes." *Composition Studies* 38, no. 2 (2010): 93–109.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. "Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education," February 9, 2015. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.
- Barratt, Caroline Cason, Kristin Nielsen, Christy Desmet, and Ron Balthazor. "Collaboration Is Key: Librarians and Composition Instructors Analyze Student Research and Writing." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 9, no. 1 (January 8, 2009): 37–56. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.0.0038>.
- Brent, Douglass. "The Research Paper and Why We Should Still Care." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 37, no. 1 (2013): 33–53.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (Version 3.0)," July 2014. <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project. "Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing," January 2011. <http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf>.
- Critten, Jessica, and Kevin Seeber. "Process, Not Product: Teaching and Assessing the Critical Process of Information Literacy." Presented at the ACRL 2015 Conference, Portland, OR, March 27, 2015. <http://kevinseeber.com/ACRL2015.pdf>.
- Downs, Douglas, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication* 58, no. 4 (2007): 552–84.

- 1  
2  
3 Gardner, Carolyn Caffrey, Jamie White-Farnham, 2013. "She Has a Vocabulary I Just Don't  
4 Have': Faculty Culture and Information Literacy Collaboration." *Collaborative*  
5 *Librarianship* 5, no. 4 (2013): 235-242.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Howard, Rebecca Moore, and Sandra Jamieson. "Researched Writing." In *A Guide to*  
11 *Composition Pedagogies*, edited by Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper Taggart, Kurt Schick, and  
12 H. Brooke Hessler, 2nd ed., 232–47. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2014.  
13  
14  
15  
16 Jacobs, Heidi LM, and Dale Jacobs. "Transforming the One-Shot Library Session into  
17 Pedagogical Collaboration." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (September  
18 1, 2009): 72–82. <https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.49n1.72>.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Kissel, Francia, Melvin R. Winger, Scott R. Weeden, Patricia A. Wittberg, Randall S.  
24 Halverson, Meagan Lacy, and Rhonda K. Huisman. "Bridging the Gaps: Collaboration in  
25 a Faculty and Librarian Community of Practice on Information Literacy." In *Information*  
26 *Literacy: Research and Collaboration Across Disciplines*, edited by Barbara J. D'Angelo,  
27 Jamieson Sandra, Maid Barry, and Janice R. Walker: 117–37. WAC Clearinghouse and  
28 University Press of Colorado, 2015.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Lantz, Catherine. "Information Literacy in the Lab: Graduate Teaching Experiences in  
37 First-Year Biology." *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship* (Fall 2016).  
38 <https://doi.org/10.5062/f4vd6wfv>.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Leckie, Gloria J. "Desperately Seeking Citations: Uncovering Faculty Assumptions About the  
44 Undergraduate Research Process." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 3  
45 (1996): 201–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(96\)90059-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(96)90059-2).  
46  
47  
48  
49 Library Journal, and Credo Reference. "First Year Experience Survey: Information Literacy in  
50 Higher Education," 2017.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 [https://s3.amazonaws.com/WebVault/research/LJ\\_FirstYearExperienceSurvey\\_Mar2017.pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/WebVault/research/LJ_FirstYearExperienceSurvey_Mar2017.pdf).

4  
5  
6  
7  
8 McClure, Randall. "Examining the Presence of Advocacy and Commercial Websites in  
9  
10 Research Essays of First-Year Composition Students." *WPA: Writing Program*  
11  
12 *Administration - Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators* 32, no. 3  
13  
14 (Spring 2009): 49–74.

15  
16 McGuinness, Claire. "What Faculty Think—Exploring the Barriers to Information Literacy  
17  
18 Development in Undergraduate Education." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32,  
19  
20 no. 6 (November 2006): 573–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2006.06.002>.

21  
22  
23 Mery, Yvonne, Jill Newby, and Ke Peng. "Why One-Shot Information Literacy Sessions Are  
24  
25 Not the Future of Instruction: A Case for Online Credit Courses." *College & Research*  
26  
27 *Libraries* 73, no. 4 (July 2012): 366–77. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-271>.

28  
29  
30 National Census of Writing. "Four-Year Institution Survey," October 2015.  
31  
32 <https://writingcensus.swarthmore.edu/survey/4>

33  
34 Refaei, Brenda, Rita Kumar, and Stephen Harmon. "Working Collaboratively to Improve  
35  
36 Students' Application of Critical Thinking to Information Literacy Skills." *Writing &*  
37  
38 *Pedagogy* 7, no. 1 (January 2015): 117–137. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v7i1.17232>

39  
40  
41 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. "Faculty  
42  
43 Credentials," April 2018. <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/faculty%20credentials.pdf>.

44  
45 Walker, Kevin W., and Michael Pearce. "Student Engagement in One-Shot Library  
46  
47 Instruction." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 3–4 (May 2014): 281–90.  
48  
49 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.04.004>.

1  
2  
3 Whitver, Sara Maurice. "Using Information Literacy to Support Teaching Practicum Students."  
4

5 *Reference Services Review* 45, no. 2 (June 12, 2017): 166–78.

6  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-10-2016-0061>.

8  
9  
10 Wiggins, Grant, and Jay McTighe. *Understanding by Design*. ASCD, 2005.

11  
12 Wishkoski, Rachel, Lundstrom, Kacy, and Davis, Erin. "Faculty Teaching and

13  
14 Librarian-Facilitated Assignment Design." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 19, no. 1

15  
16 (2019): 95–126. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0006>.






Figure 1. Examples of slides from the revised library instruction introduction for new GTAs

279x171mm (300 x 300 DPI)

# Example of Alternate Assignment Approach

## The first step is to write from sources, without *finding* the sources.

- The librarian and course instructor collaborate on developing 4-6 sample topics for the class.
  - Each sample topic comes with a set of 6 sources in different formats.
- Librarian and course instructor teach students the BEAM method of source use. Students discuss creation process for different formats.
- Students write a paper on a sample topic, focusing on comprehension, synthesis, and integration, not locating sources.

## The actual final product is an annotated bibliography.

- After writing and receiving feedback on the first paper project, students receive instruction on locating and evaluating sources.
- Students develop their own research question, then find 4-6 sources that help them examine the question and understand the conversation.
- Students write an annotated bibliography in which they evaluate each source's authority and creation process, and articulate what role the source would play in a final paper.

Figure 2. Slide describing alternative research project approach

338x190mm (300 x 300 DPI)