

4-1-2017

Name It and Claim It: Cross-Campus Collaborations for Community-Based Learning

Beth Godbee

Marquette University, beth.godbee@marquette.edu

Elizabeth Andrejasich Gibes

Marquette University, elizabeth.gibes@marquette.edu

Published version. *Reflections: A Journal of Public Rhetoric, Civic Writing, and Service Learning*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Spring 2017): 69-95. [Publisher link](#). © New City Community Press 2017. Used with permission.

Name It and Claim It:

Cross-Campus Collaborations for Community-Based Learning

Beth Godbee, Ph.D.,
Marquette University
& Elizabeth
Andrejasich Gibes,
Marquette University

This article describes the value of cross-campus collaborations for community-based learning. We argue that community-based learning both provides unique opportunities for breaking academic silos and invites campus partnerships to make ambitious projects possible. To illustrate, we describe a course "Writing for Social Justice" that involved created videos for our local YWCA's Racial Justice Program. We begin by discussing the shared value of collaboration across writing studies and librarianship (our disciplinary orientations). We identify four forms of cross-campus collaboration, which engaged us in working with each other, with our community partner, and with other partners across campus. From there, we visualize a timeline, turning from the why of cross-campus collaborations to the how. Finally, we underscore the need to name and claim—to value and cultivate—cross-campus collaborations for community-based learning.

For those of us involved in public rhetoric, civic writing, and service learning, collaboration is what we do. Whether educators, community organizers, nonprofit leaders, writers, or activists, we recognize that *we need others*. We seek to build "bridges" (Peck,

Flower, and Higgins) and “networks” (Getto, Leon, and Getto-Rivait), and we act on shared responsibility to communities for many reasons, not the least of which being “because we live here” (Goldblatt). Despite valuing collaboration, our understanding of this essential ingredient of social justice work becomes limited when we conceive of it simply as a single, bi-directional partnership. Conversations about campus-community partnerships, for instance, have emphasized the inward/outward relationship of working between and across organizations (from school to community and, in reverse, from community to school). Such language has been incredibly important for helping educators recognize that we need to learn and receive, as much as teach and give. In other words, collaborations need reciprocity—an argument made by my community writing scholar-practitioners (e.g., Cushman; Flower; Mathieu; Parks and Goldblatt; Rousculp). While critically important, this language has also enabled educators to look outward, off campus, without doing important inward-looking reflection. Identifying and partnering with internal campus collaborators can strengthen and help sustain campus-community partnerships over time, while also changing the educational contexts that block collaborative engagement.

Toward painting a fuller picture of the many relationships that enable community-based learning, we highlight the need for a multitude of reciprocal collaborations, including and especially those within one’s home institution. That is, to support and sustain community-based learning, we (educators and activists) also need cross-campus collaborations, or those internal to K-university schools or other organizations. As Cheryl Hofstetter Duffy argues in “Tapping the Potential of Service-Learning,” faculty—and we’d broaden this to include all educators—“should look for ways to recognize and utilize the contributions of all parties involved, members of the community *as well as members of the academy*” (11, emphasis added). Truly, cross-campus collaborations (or those with members of the academy) are needed for more intentional, robust, engaged, and lasting infrastructure for community-based learning. Cross-campus collaborations provide relational networks, teaching tools, funding, and other support. Such infrastructure is especially important for justice-oriented teaching, scholarship, and activism, as the more people and programs involved, the more institutional investment stands behind what is too-often discounted as an

individual's personal work. Further, such infrastructure provides the connections, resources, and commitments that can make community-based learning truly capacity-building and sustained practice, for as Myles Horton reminds us of any community organizing or justice-based work, we're in it for "the long haul."

To make this argument, we describe the role of cross-campus collaborations in offering a community-based learning course titled "Writing for Social Justice" in partnership with the YWCA Southeast Wisconsin. This course was (and will continue to be) offered as an upper-division, special topics course in Writing-Intensive English at Marquette University (Milwaukee, Wisconsin). In addition to studying central concepts of (in)equity, (in)justice, agency, power, and rights, this course provided students with opportunities to practice and enact "writing for social justice," with special attention to racial justice. Specifically, we partnered with the YWCA's Racial Justice Program, and based on their needs, created short videos to promote Everytown Wisconsin, a week-long leadership camp for teens. These videos highlighted participants' experiences with the camp, explained the nature of an "anti-oppression summer camp," and helped the YWCA both recruit teen participants and report their success to funders. These videos are now in use by the YWCA, and they can be found online in Marquette's Institutional Repository, where interested readers can also learn more about the course and view the full syllabus: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/english_4210/>.

To teach and create videos, the two of us—a faculty member in writing studies (Beth) and a librarian and coordinator of Marquette's Digital Media Studio (DMS) (Elizabeth)—partnered before, during, and after the course. We worked together (1) to plan, offer, and teach in-class workshops and out-of-class conferences; (2) to design, model, and scaffold video assignments; (3) to pilot a course tutoring program for undergraduate peer mentoring; and (4) to engage in other cross-campus collaborations that further strengthened our learning and relationship with the YWCA. We share these four forms of collaboration *not* as a framework or template for all collaborations to follow, but in order to highlight the variable ways in which collaborations can unfold. Local needs, institutional contexts, and other characteristics necessitate varied and new (as in new to

local context, even if not truly *new*) innovations. What we hope to underscore is the importance of explicitly *naming and claiming* the role cross-campus collaborations play in community-based learning.

To explain further: within educational contexts, we are typically siloed within disciplines, departments, and units on campus (e.g., Tett; Thorp and Goldstein). When such a silo effect is countered (and it too-often is not), this countering emerges through talk about interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary learning: from paired course offerings to digital humanities centers to new research institutes. Notable examples range from George Mason's Center for History and New Media to HASTAC (Humanities, Arts, Science, and Technology Alliance and Collaboratory, with hubs located at Duke University and the Graduate Center at the City University of New York). This turn to interdisciplinary learning, then, centers cross-campus collaborations *within academic contexts*. When community members are brought into conversation with such interdisciplinary initiatives, it is typically as audience members for academic programming—not in the collaborative partnerships we seek to build through community-based learning.

At the same time and in dialectic tension with interdisciplinary initiatives, movement toward community engagement typically brings a single instructor, course, or program into relation with community members/partners (e.g., Deans; Duffy). Such movement invites ongoing attention to collaboration, reciprocity, and mutual learning. Like efforts to break academic silos, these efforts break university bubbles. Still, the turn to community-based learning centers collaborations *within the community*, crossing the university and community divide, and largely ignoring other campus units. When other educators, students, or university-affiliated folks are brought into community-based learning, it is, again, typically as audience members for academic programming—in many cases, to learn about innovative course designs or new campus initiatives. Hence, community-based learning largely ignores cross-campus collaborations, just as cross-campus collaborations largely ignore community-based learning.

By making a call to “name and claim” cross-campus collaborations for community-based learning, we argue that community-based learning both (1) provides unique, multiplicitous opportunities for breaking academic silos and (2) invites, if not requires, campus partnerships to make ambitious projects possible and worthwhile. To illustrate, project-based work like video creation often necessitates a multi-part infrastructure with both campus and community partners, which we describe in this article. Everything from logistical dynamics (e.g., how to schedule and where to record interviews) to technical skill-building (e.g., how to record and edit interviews) to core conceptual, relational, and emotional learning (e.g., why racial justice work is needed) relies on a number of successful partnerships. In our case, the DMS, a service of Marquette’s Raynor Memorial Libraries, emerged as a primary campus partner, and the partnership not only supported the course but also allowed the DMS to initiate the course tutoring program that has expanded the DMS’s offerings and carried forward to other cross-campus collaborations.

In what follows, we begin by discussing the shared value of collaboration in writing studies and librarianship—that is, across our two disciplinary contexts. We then turn to the case of our collaboration, identifying four forms of collaboration, which engaged us in working with each other, with our community partner, and with other partners across campus. From there, we visualize our timeline, turning from *the why* of cross-campus collaborations to *the how*. Finally, we step back and consider the lessons learned from our case, which underscore the need to name and claim—to value and cultivate—cross-campus collaborations for community-based learning.

THE SHARED VALUE OF COLLABORATION IN WRITING STUDIES AND LIBRARIANSHIP

Many scholar-activists engaged in community writing acknowledge the importance of cross-campus partnerships, even if we don’t name them as such. Within writing studies, for example, Tiffany Rousculp describes the importance of departmental, administrative, and student allies on her campus to the funding, creation, long-term vision, and staffing of a community writing center. Ellen Cushman,

Thomas Deans, Linda Flower, Eli Goldblatt, Jeffrey Grabill, Michelle Hall Kells, Paula Mathieu, and Steve Parks, among others, describe the many collaborations that emerge and surround any successful and sustained campus-community partnership. They articulate what Wayne Campbell Peck, Linda Flower, and Lorraine Higgins name in their now-historical piece “Community Literacy”: that is, the work of community literacy “creates bridges and allows for productive working relationships among people of difference” (201). Conversation, community organizing, shared inquiry, and mutual aims are all essential ingredients to community writing work, and we appreciate the many scholars who have underlined the central role collaboration plays in connecting campus and community. What we hope to contribute to these conversations is the explicit naming of cross-campus collaborations as necessary for engaging and sustaining campus-community partnerships.

Libraries and librarians also find cross-campus collaborations at the core of our work. On most campuses, libraries are well positioned to act as a hub for collaboration. Like compositionists who administer campus and community writing programs, librarians have advocated for almost every iteration and variation of the collaborative process: the need for collaboration with faculty, among colleagues, with students, in partnership with community members and organizations, as administrators, and with other campus entities (e.g., ACRL, “2010 Top Ten”; ACRL, *Value*; CLIR; Gashurov and Kenrick; Jaguszewski and Williams). In fact, libraries rely, thrive, and survive on collaboration. As is suggested throughout reports from both the Council on Libraries and Information Resources (CLIR) and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), engagement with campus partners is integral, if not the only way, in which libraries can position ourselves within educational innovation. Current conditions, such as budget cuts, changes in publishing, and creation of digital content, speak to both the necessity of cross-campus collaborations and the importance of reciprocity within collaborations.

Like the goal of achieving reciprocity in service learning partnerships, cross-campus collaborations must benefit all partners. Libraries’ involvement in service learning courses offers an opportunity for students to see libraries and librarians “in a new light” (Herther 387).

As librarians abandon tired library instructional models and instead scaffold practical skills-building, we find new ways of relating that are relevant to students and community members. Librarians have wrestled with our role in community-based learning, asking how best to support courses where much of the learning takes place out of the classroom, and where, in turn, many of the information literacy needs take place out of the library (Riddle). Additionally, community-based learning courses bring new informational literacy challenges as projects extend beyond more traditional research assignments, such as seminar papers, literature reviews, or analytical essays. Genres of community writing from brochures and grant reports to web materials and videos (in our case) invite further divergence from traditional library instruction and inspire new pedagogical collaborations, leading those of us in libraries to embrace expanded campus—and, increasingly, community—roles.

With these changes in mind, many academic libraries have embraced the role of *resource* for supporting creative processes aligned with the “Maker Movement” (“Trends”). We see a shift within libraries to supporting creation and innovation and to moving students beyond consumers of information (ACRL, *Framework*). At Marquette, this shift is taking place through the Raynor Memorial Libraries’ Digital Media Studio (DMS), which Elizabeth coordinates.¹ The DMS is one of many media labs and makerspaces that are now housed within academic and public libraries. Among notable examples are North Carolina State University’s Digital Media Lab, YOUmedia at the Chicago Public Library, and the Chattanooga Public Library’s 4th floor space. Essentially, as libraries become homes of digital media studios, literacy, equipment, and instruction, libraries are able to offer a new array of support for digital scholarship and composing that can easily support community writing projects. And libraries are also able to benefit from such collaborative projects when students, faculty, and community members make relationships with the library that extends beyond a single project or semester. Like writing courses and programs, libraries are well positioned to be collaborators: not only do librarians have a history of engaging in cross-campus collaborations,

¹ At Marquette University, the Digital Media Studio (DMS) is now the Digital Scholarship Lab (DSLAb), which we explain the article’s conclusion. This shift seeks to acknowledge the growing use of and need for institutional support to incorporate digital tools and methods within research and teaching.

but we also have new resources and seek new opportunities to be involved in community-based learning.

THE CASE OF OUR COLLABORATION

Not only do writing studies and librarianship similarly share the value of collaboration, but the two of us (Beth and Elizabeth) have been collaborating since we came to Marquette and identified shared commitments. With a collaborative relationship already in place, in 2014, we began to consider possibilities for the course “Writing for Social Justice.” Broadly, this course engages students in considering how we, as communicators, can intervene into injustice and bring about more equitable relations. Students consider the impact of writing, literacy, and rhetoric on the world: on changing ourselves, others, and institutions. We engage not only in the *critique against* injustice, which involves many critical readings and efforts to develop shared language and frameworks, but we also engage in the *critique for* justice, which involves learning about justice-oriented work already taking place (e.g., by nonprofits like the YWCA) and joining in that work. (For more on the needed pairing and dialectical relationship of *critique against* and *critique for*, see Rasha Diab, Thomas Ferrel, Beth Godbee, and Neil Simpkins’s “Making Commitments to Racial Justice Actionable.” To summarize the argument: we need visionary and positive articulations of justice to make the work truly *actionable*.)

With these aims in mind, Beth met with Martha Barry, Director of the YWCA Southeast Wisconsin’s Racial Justice Program, who identified a concrete need the course could address. Specifically, the YWCA needed short videos of just 2-5 minutes in length to help promote Everytown Wisconsin, the YWCA’s summer leadership camp for teens (YWCA, “Everytown Wisconsin”). After identifying this project, the two of us (Beth and Elizabeth) began discussing what role the DMS could play. The DMS was already equipped to support video projects and offered equipment, space for student collaboration, software tutorials, and consultations. DMS staff was also willing to consult and co-teach with instructors and had facilitated equipment and software orientations, typically in a single class session. At this point, however, the DMS had not engaged in long-term, semester-long collaborations and had never supported a community-based learning course. We realized that, to make such a course work,

the DMS would need to be more deeply involved: from planning assignment sequences to co-teaching new media skills to providing scaffolding and support for students throughout the semester.

Additionally, although “Writing for Social Justice” was an upper-division course, it had no prerequisites, and students could be expected to have little or no prior experience creating videos. Even those who might have composed videos for other courses would not have done so for a community partner, and indeed, during the course, students noted the increased stakes of creating for a real and public audience (and not just to fulfill a course assignment). We knew, therefore, that we would need to scaffold students’ rhetorical and technical learning—alongside other important conceptual, relational, and emotional learning—in order to create videos for our community partner.

In response, we approached our collaboration as co-teaching and engaged in four forms of substantial and sustained cross-campus collaboration:

Co-teaching in-class workshops and out-of-class conferences:

We co-taught one day each week (1/3 of class meetings) as “tech days” and met frequently with students one-with-one and in small group conferences. Both involved students *directly* with staff from the DMS, Marquette’s Service Learning Program, and the YWCA’s Racial Justice Program in addition to the two of us and colleagues in the course. In this way, co-teaching and community-based learning worked together to communicate the importance of relational, reciprocal, and multiple (internal and external) networks.

Co-authoring and co-creating an initial video assignment:

Realizing that students would need practice before creating videos for the YWCA, we planned assignments to scaffold student learning. An initial assignment involved creating videos of just 90 seconds, reporting something of “critical importance” from readings. In addition to collaboratively conceiving of the assignment, we co-created assignment instructions in a 90-second video, following the same form. In this way, we engaged in video creation and co-authoring ourselves, practicing what students would do for the YWCA.

Co-developing a course tutoring program:

By receiving a Seed Grant from the Service Learning Program, the course contributed financially to the DMS piloting a course tutoring program. In turn, this program allowed DMS undergraduate tutors to spend time getting to know the course context, the students enrolled, and the YWCA. The peer tutor attended in-class workshops, provided technical support and feedback, helped students videotape interviews, and offered other support as needed. Of the many ways in which we collaborated, our efforts toward developing this course tutoring program were perhaps the most reciprocal, as the DMS could see direct benefit as well.

Collaborating with others:

In addition to three primary ways in which the course and DMS collaborated, we also worked closely with the YWCA staff and with former Everytown Wisconsin participants, their parents, and volunteers who served as camp staff. And we collaborated with others across campus, including the Service Learning Program; the Center for Teaching and Learning; and Marquette’s Digital Programs, another unit within the Raynor Memorial Libraries. These multiple collaborations added resources, institutional support, and the ability to share our work.

Figure 1: Four Forms of Substantial and Sustained Cross-Campus Collaboration.

In total, these multiple types of collaboration allowed us to collaborate deeply: weekly throughout the semester and in times before and after the course. “Writing for Social Justice” helped us think about collaboration, develop methods for working together, and connect with other campus and community partners that have set up continued and future collaborations. Next, we’ll discuss

these four forms of collaboration toward revealing more about our case, specifically, and toward illustrating the value of cross-campus collaborations, generally.

(1) Co-Teaching In-Class Workshops and Out-of-Class Conferences.

As collaborators, the two of us relied on and trusted each other's knowledges and disciplinary expertise, which we could share through in-class workshops and out-of-class conferences. Co-teaching allowed us to foster an "ecology of feedback"—language we draw from ecocomposition, as Tiffany Rousculp, Sidney I. Dobrin, Christian R. Weisser, and others understand it. This ecology of feedback involved rich and interconnected conditions and relations in which students asked questions of and sought feedback from multiple people: from each other, from undergraduate peer tutors, from faculty and staff, and from folks on campus and in the community. And we, too, benefited from this rich ecology of feedback: learning from each other, reflecting throughout and beyond the semester, and setting new goals based on student input.

In addition to providing both us and students with many opportunities for feedback, the workshops and conferences allowed us to teach technical, collaboration, and research skills. These skills were not taught isolated from the critical and justice-oriented approach to the course, but instead, were taught to make possible our intervention (i.e., our videos for the YWCA). To begin, we co-taught digital media skills, including storyboarding, audio, lighting, video composition, visual design, and video editing. We also focused on collaboration skills, such as managing long-term projects, working through conflict in a group, co-authoring, listening to others, sharing and backing up data, and revising with the audience in mind. Additionally, we co-taught a number of research-based and methodological skills needed to conduct interviews with participants, counselors, and directors of the YWCA's Everytown Wisconsin. These included writing interview scripts, conducting semi-structured interviews, and selecting relevant and representative quotes. These various skills were taught in a just-in-time model (e.g., Novak, Gavrín, Christian, and Patterson) of sequencing in-class workshops with out-of-class assignments and ongoing conferences, making what could be seen as too much new material integrated with the larger projects and

purposes of the course. This teaching, therefore, connected with the larger course structure and assignment sequence, which we also collaboratively created.

(2) Co-Authoring and Co-Creating an Initial Video Assignment.

In addition to co-teaching, we thought together about the larger course structure and collaboratively created an initial video assignment that would provide students with practice before creating videos for the YWCA. We hoped this first assignment would be low stakes and build students' confidence, as it was shorter, more informal, and only for our in-class audience. Also, to give ourselves experience with the format and the tasks we were asking students to undertake, we created the assignment as a video itself, titled "What's This All About? A Short Video about Making Short Videos": http://epublications.marquette.edu/english_4210/6/.



Figure 2: *What's This All About? A Short Video about Making Short Videos.*

Complemented by the syllabus and a fuller assignment sheet, this first video assignment—what we called the “critical importance video”—asked students to engage deeply with key concepts such as bias literacy, linguistic prejudice and rights, and Iris Young’s five faces of oppression. Moreover, the process of creating this video assignment allowed us to deepen our working relationship and to practice collaborative teaching before being “live” with students.

This initial video project proved useful for helping students synthesize conceptual and technical learning: in fact, students struggled as much with what to highlight from their readings as they did with the many facets of video production. It also proved useful for helping students see that videos require time (days to weeks of advance time) in a way that many assignments do not. Specifically, students whose videos were still raw/rough knew so and reported in class what they wished they had done differently. They wished they allowed more time, for example, to rewrite their storyboards once they realized they had over-planned content, to add music once they realized the tone/feel wasn't communicated, or to re-record audio once they realized it was too quiet. In contrast, the students whose videos were very polished and well-received by the class had, without exception, began their projects earlier, conferenced with the two of us and with DMS peer tutors multiple times, and spent time revising before rendering (finalizing) their videos. Beyond the benefits associated with each of us having created a video, this assignment also helped us (students, DMS peer tutors, and the two of us as well) to practice giving feedback. The initial videos led to informed questions and meaningful conversations about what to keep in mind going forward, as co-authoring groups began creating videos for the YWCA.

(3) Co-Developing a Course Tutoring Program.

In addition to the pedagogical partnerships involved in co-teaching and co-creating assignments, another crucial dimension of our cross-campus collaboration involved the piloting of the course tutoring program. The DMS already offered consultations for students working on multimodal assignments, but we realized there would be benefit of having an undergraduate peer tutor dedicated to the course. Our hope was that students would come to know this tutor well and would, therefore, be more willing to schedule out-of-class consultations. In turn, the tutor would know the course context, community-based learning, and importance of delivering quality final products to the YWCA. Luckily, our hopes came true.

With the support of a small grant—financial resources provided by another collaborator, the Service Learning Program—we were able to cover the additional costs of having a tutor attend in-class workshops, offer one-with-one and small group conferences, and

be “on call” during filming. This accessibility proved instrumental in helping students troubleshoot technical issues as they emerged. For example, during an interview, when students forgot to complete a sound check, the tutor was able to identify and correct the issue before too much footage was lost. To recapture the lost footage, DMS staff was able to provide the necessary tools and space for re-filming. Tutors also helped groups with “cleaning up” audio from secondary footage provided by the YWCA and supporting cloud-based storage options. Students in the course appreciated having the course tutor as another point-of-contact throughout the semester.

Now this course tutoring model is another resource that the DMS offers alongside equipment check-out, orientations, drop-in consultations, and other in-class instruction. Though other schools may have long-established course tutoring programs, especially associated with writing centers or multimodal studios, this model is new to Marquette and holds much promise for cross-disciplinary and campus-community collaborations. Peer mentoring adds another layer to cross-campus collaboration, as we consider collaboration not only among programs or between faculty and staff, but also with and among undergraduates. We look forward to continuing to innovate within this model when we next teach “Writing for Social Justice.”

(4) Collaborating with Others.

The ongoing and close collaborations between the course and DMS facilitated a number of other collaborations: both with our community partner (the YWCA) and with other campus partners, including Marquette’s Service Learning Program, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and Digital Programs. In some ways, the nature of the video project and the work of digital scholarship led to these collaborations. For instance, we invited and held collaborative feedback sessions and then a screening of the final videos, which brought together folks from the course, the DMS, the Service Learning Program, and the YWCA. These sessions were important not only for students to learn about the audiences and impact of their work, but also for multiple people across campus and community to meet and interact around the project. And initial connections made during these feedback sessions have nourished other collaborations: for instance, the YWCA now has two interns they identified by

working with staff from the Service Learning Program, staff who were introduced in these meetings.

Collaborations also emerged through excitement for digital scholarship, something our university (like many) is working to foster. The Center for Teaching and Learning became interested in the course and invited Beth to speak with other faculty about our project-based approach to community engagement. And another unit with the Raynor Memorial Libraries, Digital Programs, approached us about showcasing the final videos. Digital Programs supports scholarly communication and maintains the university's institutional repository (IR), or e-Publication. Digital Programs Coordinator, Rose Fortier, suggested publishing the final videos and course materials and provided the publishing platform: http://epublications.marquette.edu/english_4210/. Partnering with Digital Programs allowed us to talk about deeper issues of digital scholarship, such as open access publishing and alternative copyright licenses. Students participated in conversations with the YWCA staff and community members (teens, parents, and volunteers involved in Everytown Wisconsin) about what it would mean to make the videos publicly accessible in the e-Pub. A consensus emerged that additional publicity for the camp (through publically accessible videos) was welcome.

The three videos—targeting audiences of teens, parents/guardians, and the public/potential funders—now live in Marquette's e-Pub and in a YouTube channel created for the course and shared with the YWCA. We hope interested readers will view these videos to get a deeper understanding of Everytown Wisconsin and the collaborations needed for such a project.



Figure 3: One of Three Final Videos Promoting Everytown Wisconsin.

The decision to include videos in Marquette's e-Pub led us back to *core* issues of responsibility, reciprocity, ownership, agency, and access. The relational work necessitated by/for video creation concretized key concepts of the course and engaged us thoroughly in the act of "writing for social justice."

THE TIMELINE OF OUR COLLABORATION

We have presented the case of our collaboration to name and value cross-campus collaborations for community-based learning. The four forms of collaboration, we hope, highlight the ways in which cross-campus collaborations can be cultivated and grown over time. Even when primary partnerships emerge, many additional relations support and strengthen the work. We must recognize, therefore, not only the value of collaboration (which writing studies and librarianship share), but also the values of pairing planning with openness, focus with expansiveness, clear commitments with revision and rethinking. With these values in mind, we share the timeline of our collaboration to show how the multiple forms of co-teaching, co-creating, and co-developing occurred throughout the semester schedule. We share this timeline *not* as a roadmap for others to

follow but as a visualization for getting into the “nitty gritty” of one case of cross-campus collaboration—that is, for imagining how this work takes place week-to-week with both foresight and emergent developments.

As indicated on the syllabus (which is accessible online for interested readers), we approached this community-based learning project through four stages: (1) *orientation*, early in the semester; (2) *planning/design*, around midterms; (3) *development/drafting*, with intensive work through the second half of the semester; and (4) *revision*, toward the course’s conclusion. In many ways, having this plan in place and having drafted timelines and plans (i.e., frontloading efforts) allowed for a more emergent experience as we improvised within the four stages. With frequent check-ins, we made sure we were making progress but also allowed for unexpected situations from scheduling conflicts and lost data to the continued need to shake up/off normalized discourse and to emotionally and critically process what arose from learning. Figure 3 illustrates the overall organization of this collaboration among the course, DMS, and YWCA:

Semester Timeline	In-Class Instruction and Support	Out-of-Class Instruction and Support	Collaboration with Community Partner
Week #1		Writing about technology concerns and expectations.	Visiting the YWCA Southeast Wisconsin for an orientation to their Racial Justice Program, to Everytown Wisconsin, and to the staff whom we worked closely with throughout the semester.
Week #2	Introduction: Introducing the Digital Media Studio staff, resources, and cloud-based storage options.	Reading short texts, and watching online videos prior to each in-class tech day.	
Week #3	Scriptwriting and storyboarding: Introducing the video assignments and different tools for planning and organizing video projects.	Meeting with the course instructor and the DMS staff prior to the first assignment (critical importance video) being due at midterms.	Obtaining still images and already-recorded video footage from the YWCA.
Week #4	Video composition, framing, and lighting: Generating a list of best practices as a class (based on instructional videos watched prior to the workshop), and composing frames using high-definition video cameras.		Planning to conduct interviews with past participants of Everytown Wisconsin.
Week #5	Audio: Discussing audio recording best practices and available tools, and practicing recording and importing audio from several devices.	Forming co-authoring groups to plan and create videos for the YWCA. Meeting as groups during and outside of class sessions and with the course instructor and DMS staff (Elizabeth and the course tutor).	Working closely with the DMS to solve logistical concerns for recording interviews with community members (e.g., identifying interview space, video and audio equipment, and storage options).
Week #6	Editing: Practicing editing with different software, focusing primarily on how to back-up and export projects.		
Week #7	Fair use and copyright: Reviewing creative commons, ways to find and identify public domain images and sound, and the university's policies for social media and online video.	Planning to conduct interviews and to process/incorporate previously recorded video footage and still images after midterms.	

Week #8	Submitting, screening, and responding to critical importance videos.		
Weeks #9-12	<p>Workshops: Offering support, feedback, and in-class consultations during weekly workshop days.</p> <p>Whereas Elizabeth (the DMS coordinator/librarian) co-taught classes in weeks #2-7 and participated in giving feedback in week #8, the DMS course tutor was present and available for consultation these weeks.</p>	<p>Meeting in required group conferences with course instructor and the DMS staff.</p> <p>Meeting in additional/optional conferences, and collaboratively troubleshooting throughout filming and editing.</p>	<p>Receiving feedback from the YWCA on initial plans, scripts, and storyboards.</p> <p>Conducting and filming interviews with YWCA staff and participants of Everytown Wisconsin.</p>
Weeks #13-14	<p>Video editing workshops and feedback sessions: Offering support with video editing, and giving feedback on drafts. Supporting co-authoring groups as they revise, render, and finalize videos.</p>		<p>Getting feedback from YWCA partners, and then revising to meet audience needs.</p>
Week #15	Screening and delivering final videos to the YWCA's Racial Justice Program.		

Figure 4: Semester Overview and Timeline of Cross-Campus Collaboration.

As this figure illustrates, the depth of our collaboration spanned the full semester (beginning before and stretching beyond the course), joined in-class and out-of-class activities, and closely involved our community partner. This plan emerged as we identified skills and concepts (from storyboarding to an understanding of copyright and fair use) that students would need to successfully create videos for the YWCA. And it aimed to build students' rhetorical flexibility and communicative competences, while allowing students to deepen their understandings of social and racial justice through other components of the course, such as readings, in-class activities, reflective writing, contemplative practices, and visits to the YWCA.

While the many components of the course may seem like “too much,” they contribute to a sense of interconnectedness that aligns with collaboration and that helps students shake up/off inherited ways of operating in schools (Godbee). What we found (and what students reported) is that the multiple, interlocking pieces of the course helped us imagine new ways of being, thinking, and acting in the world. These new ways engage the *critique against* injustice and the *critique for* justice, and they help us to commit and make actionable commitments to social justice. After all, these various collaborations—cross-campus and campus-community—are aimed at intervening into inequity and bringing about a more just world. Like other advocates of social justice education (e.g., Adams and Bell; hooks), we believe that education must be “more than an intellectual activity” (Goodman 33); it must engage our whole selves, cultivating more mindful ways of thinking-being-acting in the world. To make change, we need cross-campus collaborations, as they secure institutional investment for building, sustaining, and growing justice-oriented work.

THE ARGUMENT FOR CROSS-CAMPUS COLLABORATIONS

We certainly are not alone in recognizing how community-based learning and other community writing work create the need for engaged infrastructure, as this work involves “complex systems of activity and value” (Grabill 26) that necessitate “chains of agencies that ‘get things done’” (20). Just as scholars have long noted the need for reciprocal, reflective, and responsible campus-community collaborations (e.g., Cushman; Deans; Flower; Mathieu; Parks and Goldblatt; Rousculp), so too must the infrastructure-building

(including the infrastructure internal to educational institutions) be mutually beneficial. As we hope our case illustrates, cross-campus collaborations are important to the process of building more intentional, robust, engaged, and lasting infrastructure. And we believe this infrastructure has the potential not only to strengthen community-university partnerships, but also to help those of us within educational institutions break down academic or disciplinary silos. When part of ongoing community engagement, cross-campus collaborations can make possible both cross-disciplinary and community-based learning.

Further, these collaborations respond to and innovate within local contexts. To ensure continued collaborations, the work needs to be exciting to all the parties involved, and this excitement can or perhaps often stems from producing new ways of working, new ways of relating, and new ways of building together. What may be innovative in one context may be old news in another. In our case, the development of a course tutoring program for the DMS was innovative for Marquette and something that could benefit the DMS and its future campus and community partners. Similarly, the DMS's contributions to "Writing for Social Justice" showcase new (well, new for us) models of co-teaching, embedded librarianship, and peer mentoring that can benefit members of the English Department and other departments and organizations as well.

What would be difficult to achieve in a single class became possible by having many people involved, who together were brainstorming, troubleshooting, revising, and rethinking. Toward reciprocity, the DMS benefited by being able to pilot the model of course tutoring and expanding to departments that have not previously worked with the Studio. For instance, since collaborating with "Writing for Social Justice," the Digital Media Studio was able to support a 90-student lecture within the sciences and a deeper collaboration with the First-Year Writing Program, two lessons in scale that wouldn't have been possible without first supporting one course so intensely. One lesson learned, for instance, is that whether a small seminar, a large lecture, or a multi-section curriculum, it is important that the DMS tutors are closely acquainted with the assignments. Our support of larger courses has relied heavily on walk-in hours and tailored out-of-class

workshops instead of the more intensive in-class instruction and scheduled conferences. When peer tutors are prepared by knowing assignments and course objectives, then they can better serve students regardless of the course structure or delivery.

Another lesson is the importance of flexibility and adaptability. Even though we planned for several weeks before and reflected regularly throughout the semester, unexpected situations arose, which led to the DMS offering more resources than initially planned. For example, when our YWCA partners determined that Marquette would be the best place for filming interviews, the DMS offered space and staffing. Though Marquette is centrally located in Milwaukee and accessible by multiple bus routes, making it an geographically desirable for campus-community relations, it is also largely a closed campus. Community members cannot gain access to the library without leaving ID cards at the front desk or being accompanied by people affiliated with Marquette. Though students were assigned the role of welcoming and accompanying community members into the library, students were also falling down on this responsibility, failing to greet our YWCA partners when they arrived on campus. DMS staff recognized this problem and assigned a staff person to wait in the library lobby, making sure that community members were welcomed upon arrival. In this example, as in many others from our collaboration, the DMS took real responsibility over the shared community-based project. Students, in turn, came to see logistical coordination as part of social justice work. Truly, the DMS became a full partner-in-learning, interacting with and strengthening ties with our community partner, the YWCA, as much as other members of the course.

Bigger than any one lesson, however, has been the year-long expansion and transition of the Digital Media Studio to the Digital Scholarship Lab. With this name change comes an intentional effort to dissolve disciplinary silos around digital media, scholarship, and library pedagogy. By supporting faculty in the use of digital tools and methods both in scholarship and teaching, the DSLab is networking faculty with similar pedagogical and research interests across departments and colleges. The DSLab is now designed to be a hub, a widely accessible space that cultivates and encourages cross-

campus collaborations. For example, since becoming the DSLab, we have partnered with Marquette's Writing Center to offer workshops on research posters; these workshops draw a wide, cross-disciplinary audience of undergraduate, graduate student, and faculty researchers. As the DMS becomes the DSLab, we continue to seek collaborative opportunities, across departments and with other campus units. This expansion includes a new shared space and even closer ties with Digital Programs. The physical proximity to this partner invites yet more collaboration with Digital Programs, including opportunities to further promote an open access platform for distributing student media. This partnership provides the infrastructure we're advocating for breaking down disciplinary silos; making research and resources broadly, publicly accessible; and strengthening campus-community partnerships as well as public relations.

Whatever local innovations may be, our case of cross-campus collaboration indicates the importance of not "going it alone," as we are able to build better together. In the process, we are able to raise the local visibility of what that we're doing and that we'd like to see done. And we are able to ask our institution to look inward and to change the self, when working outward, with others. It is not that we are advocating for entirely new course structures or failing to recognize the important collaborative work that many educators already value and do. Instead, we are advocating explicit attention to the role cross-campus collaborations play in community-based learning: that is, to "name it and claim it." In this way, we remember what James Porter, Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey Grabill, and Libby Miles remind us: "Institutions R Us: we made 'em, we can fix 'em" (611).

WORKS CITED

- Adams, Maurianne, and Lee Anne Bell, editors. *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*. 2nd ed. Routledge, 2007.
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. ACRL, 2015, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Research Planning and Review Committee. "2010 Top Ten Trends in Academic Libraries: A Review of the Current Literature." *College & Research Libraries News*, vol. 71, no. 6, 2010, pp. 286-92.
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). *Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report*, compiled by Megan Oakleaf. ACRL, 2010, www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/files/content/issues/value/val_report.pdf.
- Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR). *No Brief Candle: Reconceiving Research Libraries for the 21st Century*. CLIR, 2008, <https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub142/pub142.pdf>.
- Cushman, Ellen. "Sustainable Service Learning Programs." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2002, pp. 40-65.
- Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition*. NCTE, 2000.
- Diab, Rasha, Thomas Ferrel, Beth Godbee, and Neil Simpkins. "Making Commitments to Racial Justice Actionable." *Across the Disciplines*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2013, <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/race/diabetal.cfm>.
- Dobrin, Sidney I., and Christian R. Weisser. *Natural Discourse: Toward Ecocomposition*. SUNY P, 2002.
- Duffy, Cheryl Hofstetter. "Tapping the Potential of Service-Learning: Guiding Principles for Redesigning Our Composition Courses." *Reflections*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2003, pp. 1-14.
- "English 4210: Writing for Social Justice." *e-Publications@Marquette*. Raynor Memorial Libraries, Marquette University, 2015, http://epublications.marquette.edu/english_4210/.
- Flower, Linda. *Community Literacy and the Rhetoric of Public Engagement*. Southern Illinois UP, 2008.
- Gashurov, Irene, and Curtis L. Kendrick. "Collaboration for Hard Times." *Library Journal*, vol. 138, no. 16, 2013, pp. 26.

- Getto, Guiseppe, Kendall Leon, and Jessica Getto-Rivait. "Helping to Build Better Networks: Service-Learning Partnerships as Distributed Knowledge Work." *Reflections*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2014, pp. 71-95.
- Godbee, Beth. "Pedagogical Too-Muchness: A Feminist Approach to Community-Based Learning, Multi-modal Composition, Social Justice Education, and More." Unpublished manuscript, forthcoming in *Composing Feminist Interventions: Activism, Engagement, Praxis*, edited by Kris Blair and Lee Nickoson. The WAC Clearinghouse's Perspectives on Writing Series.
- Goldblatt, Eli. *Because We Live Here: Sponsoring Literacy Beyond the College Curriculum*. Hampton P, 2007.
- Goodman, Diane J. *Promoting Diversity and Social Justice: Educating People from Privileged Groups*. 2nd ed. Routledge, 2001.
- Grabill, Jeff. "Infrastructure Outreach and the Engaged Writing Program." *Going Public: What Writing Programs Learn from Engagement*, edited by Shirley K. Rose and Irwin Weiser. Utah State UP, 2010, pp. 15-28.
- Herther, Nancy K. "Service Learning and Engagement in the Academic Library." *College and Research Libraries News*, vol. 69, no. 7, 2008, pp. 386-389.
- hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as a Practice of Freedom*. Routledge, 1994.
- Horton, Myles, with Judith Kohl and Herbert Kohl. *The Long Haul: An Autobiography*. Teachers College P, 1997.
- Jaguszewski, Janice, and Karen Williams. *New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries*. Association of Research Libraries (ARL), 2013, http://www.arl.org/publications-resources/2893-new_roles_for_new_times-transforming-liaison-roles-in-research-libraries#.WGV67pLt3BQ
- Kells, Michelle Hall. "Writing Across Communities: Deliberation and the Discursive Possibilities of WAC." *Reflection: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2007, pp. 87-108.
- Mathieu, Paula. *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition*. Boynton/Cook, 2005.
- Novak, Gregor, Andrew Gavrín, Wolfgang Christian, and Evelyn Patterson. *Just-in-Time Teaching: Blending Active Learning with Web Technology*. Addison-Wesley, 1999.

- Parks, Steve, and Eli Goldblatt. "Writing Beyond the Curriculum: Fostering New Collaborations in Literacy." *College English*, vol. 65, no. 5, 2000, pp. 584-606.
- Peck, Wayne Campbell, Linda Flower, and Lorraine Higgins. "Community Literacy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 46, no. 2, 1995, pp. 199-222.
- Porter, James E., Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey T. Grabill, and Libby Miles. "Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 51, no. 4, 2000, pp. 610-642.
- Riddle, John S. "Where's the Library in Service Learning? Models for Engaged Library Instruction." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2003, pp. 71-81.
- Rousculp, Tiffany. *Rhetoric of Respect: Recognizing Change at a Community Writing Center*. NCTE, 2014.
- Tett, Gillian. *The Silo Effect: Ordered Chaos, the Peril of Expertise, and the Power of Breaking Down Barriers*. Simon & Schuster, 2015.
- Thorp, Holden, and Buck Goldstein. "How to Create a Problem-Solving Institution." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 29 Aug. 2010, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/How-to-Create-a/124153/?sid=cr>.
- "Trends: Maker Movement." *Center for the Future of Libraries*. American Library Association (ALA), 2016, <http://www.ala.org/transforminglibraries/future/trends/makers>.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Five Faces of Oppression." *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton UP, 1990.
- YWCA Southeast Wisconsin. "Everytown Wisconsin," 2015, http://www.ywcasew.org/site/c.7oJELQPwFhJWG/b.8090731/k.CFC/Everytown_Wisconsin.htm.
- YWCA Southeast Wisconsin. "Racial Justice," 2015, http://www.ywcasew.org/site/c.7oJELQPwFhJWG/b.8083605/k.62/Eliminating_Racism_in_Southeast_Wisconsin.htm.

Assistant Professor of English at Marquette University, **Beth Godbee** addresses matters of equity in education, relational communication, and composition theory and pedagogy. Among her publications are articles in *Research in the Teaching of English*, *Community Literacy Journal*, *Feminist Teacher*, *Writing Center Journal*, *Across the Disciplines*, and *Praxis*.

Elizabeth Andrejasich Gibes is the digital scholarship librarian at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. She coordinates the libraries' Digital Scholarship Lab, where she provides support to undergraduates working on multimodal coursework.