Rollins College
Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Publications

Summer 6-18-2015

From Co-location to Collaboration: Working Together to Improve Student Learning

Susan Montgomery
smontgomery@rollins.edu

Suzanne D. Robertshaw
Rollins College, srobertshaw@rollins.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub

Part of the Information Literacy Commons

From Co-location to Collaboration: Working Together to Improve Student Learning

Abstract

An academic librarian and the coordinator of a campus tutoring and writing center recently relocated to the library researched their value to second-year students. Differences in the amount and type of available data called for conducting in-depth interviews with students about their research and writing processes. The researchers also reviewed relevant material regarding similar collaborative efforts at other college and universities. The gaps revealed in the environmental scan along with the best practices of librarian/writing center collaboration helped determine future steps needed for both units to move from mere co-location to working in true collaboration.

Collaboration is key to academic libraries' services. Within libraries, departments work together to improve efficiency for user access.   Externally, libraries seek campus partners in helping students achieve academic success.   As mentioned in the 2011 "ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education" academic libraries should develop partnerships toward the goal of "advancing and sustaining their role as partners in educating students" (5).   Although not mentioned in the standards, the campus writing center is an obvious choice as partner, since students seek feedback from writing center tutors at various stages of their writing process. Both the library and the writing center are committed to helping students meet their academic goals (Ferer 2012, 544). As Elmborg states, "treating these two domains as separate, we create a disconnection" in our students' learning (2006, 7). The push for these two services to join forces may vary. For some libraries budgetary constraints drive the decision, while in others, conveniently locating services that support the institution's academic mission is key (Elmborg 2006; Cooke and Bledsoe 2008). Indeed, during the 2000s, libraries redesigning their spaces to integrate diverse student services and various technologies fueled the "learning commons" trend (Massis 2010, 161). Student learning, students' academic success, needs to be the goal for these collaborative programs on a college campus (Walter and Eodice 2007, 221).

On our campus, the content tutoring program and the writing center are joined in what we call the Tutoring and Writing Center (the TWC). Following the relocation of the TWC into the Olin Library in January 2013, we wanted to understand our roles in our students' research and writing processes, and even more fundamentally, what that process is. Effective writing depends on competent research. The process is linear, from researching to writing, but it is also recursive. As we find new sources, we may change our focus, reshape our main questions. The process goes back to questioning, searching, and reading as we are writing what we're learning and thinking. We wanted to ascertain what our students'

processes are, and how they use library resources and writing center and/or content tutoring services to complete their research projects. From a pedagogical perspective, collaboration between the library and the writing center helps students realize the strongly intertwined relationship between reading and writing processes (Elmborg 2005, 9). Co-location of services in libraries provides students with "one-stop shopping" where they can easily get the academic assistance they need, provided that librarians and writing center staff communicate well about guiding students (Cooke and Bledsoe 2008, 120). Both the library and the writing center have a "shared commitment to student learning," the heart of an academic collaborative effort (Giglio and Strickland 2005, 138). That commitment compels us to collaborate with the intention to improve our students' learning.

Context

The writing center, as part of the Tutoring and Writing Center (TWC), joined forces physically with Olin Library in January 2013. We had seen that librarians and peer tutors both knew much about the learning demands facing students, albeit from different angles. We both worked with students in various ways to help them succeed, at times somewhat differently. With both groups down the hall from each other rather than in neighboring buildings, we wanted to discover more about how our work with students intersects, both presently and potentially. Capitalizing on the first round of the Assessment in Action (AiA) program of the Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL), our joint research would tease out how students use our expertise as they work on research projects. We wanted to trace their research and writing processes, in the aggregate and individually, to find their points of intersection with us. We hoped that our research would transform the co-location of the TWC to the library from merely sharing space to collaborating with each other and with students as they learn.

.

We chose to narrow our scope to second-year students, since administration already had them in their sights in their retention efforts. A new Director of Student Transitions would be in place in Student Affairs. Our research focused on these students' use of our various services to complete a research project. Specifically, we wanted to investigate gaps in the students' learning processes and how our collaboration could fill those gaps better by working together rather than staying in our academic silosSecond-Year Student Data

Our methodology included gathering aggregate data about second-year student use of both library and TWC services along with individual data from environmental surveys gathered from ten interviews with students (Ferer 2012, 554). We expected that this data would inform our future collaborative efforts. Gathering data on second-year students, however, proved to be challenging. We wanted to focus our research on students who had completed their first year at our college, yet the institution identified students by credits earned, labeling sophomores as those successfully completing at least 30 semester hours. This meant that some sophomores were still considered freshmen, and other were juniors. We worked with the Office of Institutional Research to identify clearly those students who were in their second year at the college. We encountered this challenge throughout our data collection phase since the institution defined the parameters of library data.

We looked at library use data collected at main points of service: the circulation and research help desks, the Tutoring and Writing Center, and library gate counts. We learned that sophomore (not necessarily second-year) students checked out equipment such as headphones, computer chargers, laptops, etc. Not surprisingly, they checked out more books than freshmen but at a lower rate than juniors or seniors. Research desk interactions in the library were challenging for a different reason. Traditionally, libraries do not maintain records of individual user activity out of respect for their privacy. We could only determine the number and the level of interaction between the librarian and the user – 1

(easiest), 2 (somewhat challenging), or 3 (most challenging), and none of this had any specific course or user identification.

Even though TWC usage statistics and library gate count data before and after the TWC move into the library showed increases, we could not depend on some of the data. For the spring 2012 semester, the TWC registered 2,444 appointments made by 861 unique students (accounting for repeat appointments). In spring 2013, the first semester the TWC opened in the library, 1,001 unique students made 2,735 appointments, an increase of 16 percent in students. Gate counts also increased, but these counts do not indicate unique students (not accounting for people's multiple entries and exits): spring 2012, the year before the TWC move, 150,497 entrees to the library; for the spring when the TWC moved, 180,952 entrees. It was thus impossible to attribute more people entering the library to their using the TWC, not only because the data does not measure unique students, but also because that year the psychology faculty relocated to the basement and more professors across the curriculum taught in our classrooms during the science building's renovation. Overall college enrollment increases and more visitors to the library could have also added to that gate count.

The lack of reliable data does indeed limit the library's ability to assess its contribution to student learning. Regardless, the traffic increases we saw in the first term that tutoring and writing consulting came to the library were probably partly due to students seeing the library as a place to get work done on their own, in collaboration with other students, with the help of librarians and after the TWC move, with their peers working in the TWC.

Our library instruction statistics offered some insight, but still had drawbacks. During the fall 2013 semester, our librarians taught 23 in-class research sessions to courses enrolling second-year students. We were unable, however, to confirm how many second-year students received this library instruction since most 200-level classes did not restrict enrollment to second-year. Furthermore, students could have been absent the day of the library instruction class.

The TWC statistics told the opposite story. Unlike the library's data, the TWC could isolate data

for second-year student usage for the 2013 fall semester. During that semester, 270 first-year students

made appointments. Slightly fewer second-year students, 213, did so. As students advanced

academically, they went to the TWC less frequently; third- and fourth-year students made the least

number of appointments. These robust statistics can partly be explained by the 30 years of writing

across the curriculum on our campus; many 100-level (and some upper-level) course professors strongly

encourage or require their students to meet with a writing consultant or tutor as part of an assignment.

As expected, this quantitative data could only tell us part of the story about second-year students'

library use. To complete the picture, we decided to interview ten second-year students about their

research and writing processes.

Student Profile

We identified ten second-year students who had completed a research project and had received

at least one library instruction as first-year students. From these ten students we hoped to uncover

patterns in their research and writing processes. Similar library research revealed that "even a small

sample provides useful and potentially actionable information." (Asher and Miller n.d., 12) The

interviews would allow us the opportunity for deep conversation about the steps students took to

complete their research assignments.   We recruited students majoring in a variety of disciplines –

History (2), International Business (2), Art History (1), Communications (1), Economics (1), Education (1),

English (1), and Psychology (1).   In these 2014 spring semester interviews, we asked the students about

their research and writing processes and how the library and the TWC factored into them (See

Appendix). All ten had previously received library instruction in a credit-bearing course (i.e. a one shot

session)In one or more of their first three semesters; fFive specifically for the course in which they had

written the research paper or project. Nine students had visited the campus TWC at some point, not

necessarily for this paper, to receive writing feedback. We transcribed the interviews and then analyzed

them for common themes, gaps in student learning, and their perceptions of the library and the TWC.

Library as a Place

These interviews with second-year students could enable us to understand the impact, if any, of

this co-location to their research and writing process. Very often, students think of the library as a place

to complete their work (Head 2013; Treadwell et al. 2011). Six of our students did, making comments

such as "It's quiet," "I come here to get work done," and "There are a lot of space options for students

to study." Two students commented that our making the main floor of the library open 24 hours helped

them complete their work. In addition, they also appreciated having the TWC in the library (the TWC

had been in the library more than a year when these interviews took place). One student said, "When I

was a first-year [student], [the TWC] wasn't here (in the library). So that was frustrating cause I didn't

know where it was located. So I didn't use [the TWC] basically all first year." This student was part of

the increase in student usage after moving to the library

Research Assignment

All ten students had previously completed a research project. Papers varied in length from 4-6

pages to 10-12 pages with the longest at 15 pages. One student had to complete a poster project but

equated it to writing a 10-12 page paper. Five students wrote their paper for a 300-level course, three

students for a 200-level course, and two for a 100-level course. All assignments were included in the

syllabus and professors discussed the research project at the beginning of the semester. Professors

provided additional handouts for the research assignment including more detailed information about

length, citation style, and semester deadlines for choosing a topic, submitting an outline, and turning in

a rough draft.   All students appreciated having intermediate deadlines because, as one student said, "It

forced me to get started." Nine assignments were due near the end of the semester while one student

had three short papers due during the term.

During the interview, we asked the students at what point they encountered trouble completing

the assignment. Six students found citation formatting as the most challenging step. As one student

said, "I didn't think about citations until the end." These students completed that step when they

organized their bibliography or references. Eight students said they did their research in "chunks at a

time" usually spending a couple of hours to gather the information. Two students did all their research

in "one sitting" and spent several hours to get what they needed to write the paper. One described

herself as a "huge procrastinator" and kept delaying until she decided, "I'm just going to do the whole

thing in one day." That course satisfied a general education requirement and at that time she was more

focused on courses in her major. Another student who wrote her paper for a course in her major

reported that "I probably should have spent more time on the research than I did." She continued, "It

was difficult because the taxonomy we were given [from the professor] was different in all the articles."

She was expected to know how to do research in her major because she was in a 300-level course, yet

she had not been taught the necessary skills. She relied on general search techniques she had learned in

another course but not the more advanced ones she needed for the project. The majority of students

indicated that locating secondary sources such as journal articles for their project to be the easiest.

Students in 300-level courses found it challenging to locate specific information relevant to their project,

particularly primary sources, as well as to revise and narrow their topic as they progressed.

Seeking Assistance

During the interviews, we asked these students whom they went to for help in many aspects of

research and writing. All ten students referred to their class professor as their main resource for advice.

Comments included, "She said we could contact her for help", "The syllabus said 'Come to me if you

can't do it'", "If we had questions, to come to him." Several students also turned to their professors for help with formatting their citations. Students also mentioned the TWC; eight students had made appointments at the TWC at some point during the writing process and a third of those made multiple appointments for the same project. One student said, "I'm a big fan of [the TWC]" and another said, "I go there all the time." Students who made appointments went there either after they had put together an outline or started writing the paper. Students who did not use the TWC said they got feedback from a peer such as an R.A. or an upper-class student in the major. Two students who made appointments at the TWC mentioned they only did so "when it's required." Yet reflecting on their sessions, they did find them useful, one student saying, "I should definitely incorporate [the TWC] more." We found it disheartening to learn that students did not think of librarians as a resource for them to turn to when researching and writing their papers. Only three students indicated they went to a librarian for help with their work. One student who struggled with completing the research assignment said, "I never thought about [seeking help from a librarian]; it may have helped."

That student communicated a major gap in our students' learning experience. Professors

During fall 2012, the year these students were beginning at the college, librarians taught introductory sessions in all 25 first-year seminar courses. During these sessions, librarians introduce students to the library and its resources and familiarize them with how a librarian can help them. Our instruction for 200-level courses is sparse. These students reported that their 200-level professors emphasized course materials over outside research in their research assignments. Furthermore, those students enrolled in the 300-level courses reported that their professors stressed research in the discipline but did not necessarily provide the assistance to do so. During one interview, a student enrolled in a 300-level course said that her professor "believes we all know how to go through the process and that if we don't, we know where to go (to get help)."

That student communicated a major gap in our students' learning experience. Professors teaching advanced courses in the major, 300- or 400-level, expect students to complete advanced

research, yet, they do not always request library instruction. According to our fall 2013 statistics,

librarians taught only nine "one-shot" sessions to 300-level courses.   Perhaps professors assume that

the students are majoring in the discipline and would have received research instruction previously, so

they should already know how to get accurate and reliable information for their project. However,

these same professors often require students to make appointments with the TWC. One student noted

in her interview that the professor for her 300-level course explicitly stated in the guidelines for a

research project that, "You will go to [the TWC] for your paper." She also reported that the professor did

not schedule a library instruction session or require students to seek research help from a librarian. It is

evident that we need to make a concerted effort to reach out to these professors to include a librarian

instruction in their research project Assignment.

Recursive Research and Writing Processes

        As students talked about their research process, we wanted to learn how they integrated

writing into it. Students benefit from a holistic approach in which their search and use of information

informs their writing process (Elmborg 2006, 24). Both the research and writing processes are recursive,

starting at one point, progressing but sometimes retreating and then continuing again: linear but

recursive. Students need to realize that as they progress in their research, they will need to alter their

process according to what they are reading and learning from that research. For example, students may

revise their initial research topics as they gather more information from what is available. In our

interviews two students explicitly spoke about their complex and intertwined research and writing

processes. A student writing an Art History paper said, "I didn't find all the research and then write the

paper. It was kind of like a process." Another student writing a history paper explained, "I told [the

professor] what I was going to study but it changed dramatically throughout the semester once I got

more sources and stuff and I remember my original topic was like super super narrow and then I had to

broaden it out and then I narrowed it down again to something different. That by the end when I turned

the paper in and it was completely different."

In contrast to seeing research and writing inextricably linked with each other, other students

framed the research process as separate from their writing. One student said, "I liked gathering it all

together and then writing came more easily because I did all the work in finding everything." Yet when

asked how she organized her research, she said, "I print[ed] everything out and I wrote on them."

Another student had a similar experience saying, "Well, as I researched when I found things that kinda

applied to my prompt, and everything, I already knew what I wanted to write about, so I would just

mark those, or sticky note things everywhere and write notes and everything." As the interview

proceeded, she clarified her process, saying, "I got a lot of books and did a lot research and writing notes

and things. The actual writing didn't actually begin until close to the deadline." So for these students,

the writing process was separate from the research process. They did not perceive note taking as part

of the writing process even though they wrote as they researched. One student wrote the paper in one

sitting, "I came up to the 3rd floor, I isolated myself, I'm pretty sure I was right outside this room and

just sat there for hours and I just did it … knocked it out." For that paper, because of the time restriction

she placed on herself, she wanted to complete the assignment as quickly as possible, in one big process.

The majority of these students did not see the research and writing process as overlapping. For

them it was a linear process to find sources, read them, and then write the paper. One student writing a

psychology paper had to submit a list of her sources to her professor prior to beginning her paper.

From the interviews, we learned that students need more instruction and information about the

research process itself as well as incorporating writing strategies to help them complete their

assignments. That instruction can be provided in collaboration between both the library and TWC in

order for students to better understand the overlap between the two processes.

Lessons Learned

Our research revealed gaps in our students' learning, as illustrated in their research and writing processes. Students are progressing through their academic courses quickly and sometimes haphazardly. 300-level courses do not solely enroll junior standing students and may include seniors, second-year students, and in some cases first-year students. Thus, when librarians are teaching how to conduct academic research for an in-depth project in a 300-level course, they must realize the diverse skill levels in the classroom and cover a wide array of research skills and sources of information.

Our research also revealed that students are creatures of habit. As reported in the Project Information Literacy report, students tend to use the resources they are most comfortable using in their research (Head 2013, 475). For example, an elementary education major in our study relied on multi-disciplinary databases such as Academic Search Premier and ProQuest when searching for information for her education course. She indicated she was unfamiliar with ERIC and ProQuest Education – two subject specific databases available through our library with more relevant content for her major.

Finally, we learned that once students try something that they found useful, they will come back to it. Students who visited the TWC early in their academic career, whether it be a requirement for an assignment or on their own initiative, they tended to return for help. Students found it beneficial to work with a peer on an assignment. That positive experience often kept them using the service to improve their learning.

Opportunities for collaboration

These in-depth interviews and our usage data from the TWC pointed the researchers to ways the library and the TWC could collaborate to enhance our students' learning. As we know, librarians and writing center staff fulfill many of the same student needs. They both ask students many questions about the professor's assignment; what direction the student wants to take, in a research question or

already written in a draft; what their point is, in a thesis statement or in discussion; what sources they

have already found or need to find; how those relate to one another and support the student's claims

(Hook 2005, 25). They also use the same techniques ("clustering, mind-mapping, listing, asking the *who,*

what, where, when, and *how* questions") but with different outcomes. As Fister says in her article

"Teaching the Rhetorical Dimensions of Research," "In the writing process, [these techniques] serve as

an exercise in critical thinking and reflection before being exposed to the research process; in the

research process, they serve as an exercise in exploration of stored memory and some reinvention of

that" (Fister 1993, 216).

Various ways of facilitating of library and writing center collaboration have been more popular

than others have. In Ferer's 2012 survey, the most popular was cross training tutors about information

literacy and library services, 22%. Others included co-teaching classes and workshops, 21%, cross-

promoting and referring services, 14%, learning more about each other and their best practices, 13%,

while only 6% collaborated on professional development. While training the writing center staff in

library resources was the most popular, only a scant 1% trained library staff as writing tutors (Ferer

2012, 552). Our burgeoning collaborative practices in Rollins' Olin Library follow some of these trends.

The writing center staff is learning more about librarians' expertise, which will help them to refer their

own clients to librarians in the future. Some have attended library instructions to advertise their

services. One simple step we took to encourage collaboration was to integrate the TWC website into

the library's larger website. Librarians can now indicate its location and services to students during their

instruction sessions. Furthermore, its prominence on the library's website gives students one more

place to find information about TWC service and appointment scheduling.

As the *Getting Feedback* handout from UNC Chapel Hill's Writing Center website explains, there

are many sources of feedback available in the research and writing process and students need to be

strategic about deciding whom to ask for help, at which points in their process, and for which purposes.

Those sources with the most content expertise (professors, teaching assistants, content tutors and fellow students in the course) can give different feedback in writing from those without course knowledge (writing tutors and others outside the course) who might ask important questions about flow and clarity (The Writing Center 2012). The ten second-year students we interviewed did not think of librarians as resources after they had started their research, preferring their professors, despite our librarians' expertise in finding sources in their disciplines and for those students' specific research topics. Some students said they remembered enough from a library instruction session or two. Our students were, however, quite comfortable in asking their peers for feedback in their writing. Five went to a writing consultant while only one student met with a librarian.

Clearly our college culture, at least as shown in these ten students' research and writing processes, embraces peer learning assistance. Thus, as part of the library's three-to-five year strategic plan, we are developing a peer research-assistance program. These students will serve as the first point of contact for students seeking research assistance, after being trained to help students with simple searching and basic information seeking questions (i.e. locating a book on the shelves). They will refer students to librarians for more complex research needs. Freed from their shifts on the research desk, librarians will have time to focus on these in-depth research interactions with students as well as to consult with faculty members to expand and improve their library instruction. As the experiences at the University of New Hampshire at Manchester show, training should focus on real-life reference strategy and problem-solving techniques and address specific issues that arise during a library reference interaction (White and Pobywajlo 2005, 184).

We need to make students realize that they can also turn to librarians for help in their complicated research and writing processes. Our librarian-staffed research desk data (as we collect it now) does not tell us at what point in their process do students actually consult a librarian either at the

research help desk or in the librarian's office. Our in-depth interviews showed that only one in ten

students sought one-on-one research assistance from a librarian.

With the peer tutoring model's success on our campus, we think that our peer writing

consultants and content tutors can communicate the value of librarians to their student clients. To

ensure they are more informed about library online resources, an assignment requires them to study

thoroughly all the resources available in the library research guide in their major and then meet their

librarian liaison to discuss those resources and let him or her know of any other available resources that

are not yet included. So far, many of these high-performing undergraduate tutors had not used their

major's research guide before, and librarians are hearing about other helpful sites. Content tutors and

writing consultants are also valuable points of contact for the librarians to learn more about work in the

majors and complement information available to the librarians from professors. Tutors and consultants

are apprenticing in those disciplines and have recent knowledge of curriculum and specific course

design. Furthermore, they are just down the hall. Our next step for our peer staff is for each to have a

research interview with the librarian liaison to their major department, at some point in a research

project of their own. Their own understanding of the librarian's value to their learning in using search

tools, narrowing their research question, or evaluating source material will become clearer. Tutors can

then refer their clients to librarians more appropriately, depending on the students' needs at that

moment. Students in turn might be more likely to follow their peer's advice, especially when the help is

timely and available. Similarly, librarians can remind students that content tutors and writing

consultants can assist students with course specific questions as well as help them organize and

structure their arguments within their papers.

While conducting this research, our college was in the midst of changing its general education

program. In addition to professors' assessing their students' understanding of the disciplinary

knowledge in these courses, they will also be assessed for many of the intellectual and practical skills

they have developed, using the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) Value Rubrics

(https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics). Professors are using the Written Communication and Information

Literacy rubrics in developing their 100-level courses (which enroll only first-year students) and 300-level

capstone courses (which are meant for third-year students); overall general education program

assessment will also use these rubrics. We are seizing the opportunity to collaborate with professors as

they develop their courses and assignments to ensure student learning in these important intellectual

skills. Faculty members have been grateful for our input in small meetings as they prepare their syllabi

and writing assignments. They appreciate the visual summary of these two rubrics, which clarifies the

overlaps in the two skill areas: in students' finding information appropriate to the academic task and

discipline as well as in their creating a written product that integrates this evidence logically and clearly

to prove their assertions.

 Conclusion

        The library and our content tutoring and writing center provide services to improve students'

research and writing processes. The strong connection between the two justifies more collaboration

between our departments. In fact, as the collaboration at the University of New Hampshire at

Manchester reported, "Together, we have been able to lay the foundation for an effective program that

incorporates the expertise of librarians, learning center staff, and classroom instructors" (White and

Pobywajlo 2005, 194). As the Olin Library at Rollins College welcomed the addition of the Tutoring and

Writing Center (TWC) to its building in 2013, we recognized that in order to collaborate more

intentionally, we needed to learn what role our two departments play in student learning. We realize

that the available data on library use and librarian consultation greatly impedes our ability to assess our

contribution to student learning, while the TWC's data affords them a much clearer picture. We need to

improve our data collection concerning our students' library usage – space, resource and individual

consultations--in order to devise strategies that better inform our practice and improve our services.

In this extensive research project focusing on second-year students, our ethnographic interviews

revealed that while our students value library resources in their research and the library as a place in

their learning, they very rarely seek out research assistance from librarians. In contrast, many of our

students find the services of the TWC valuable in their learning, at various stages of their learning and

writing processes.

We need to improve how we teach and guide students in the recursive research and writing

process. One opportunity is during one-on-one contact points between the student and either the

librarian or the writing consultant. Our peer educators need to learn more about the specialized

knowledge of the librarians provided in their research guides and during research interviews so they can

better refer student clients to librarians. The new general education program at our college is another

opportunity for the library and the TWC to collaborate and offer their expertise to faculty as well as to

students in those courses. The student interviews also revealed the need to improve our outreach with

professors teaching advanced courses in the major. Librarians need to communicate the importance of

library instruction to those professors who assign major research projects to their students. These

conversations can focus on their students' need to learn advanced research skills that will help them

produce better assignments.

The collaborative efforts between the TWC and the library at our college will require extensive

conversation and commitment if we want to be more integrated into our students' research and writing

processes. These efforts will demonstrate to our campus community that our two units are not merely

co-located in a convenient space but truly collaborating to improve student learning.

References

ACRL Board of Directors. 2011. "ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education." Chicago: American

Library Association. http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/standards/slhe.pdf

Asher, Andrew and Susan Miller. n.d. "A Practical Guide to Ethnographic Research in Academic

Libraries." http://www.erialproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Toolkit-3.22.11.pdf

Cooke, Rachel and Carol Bledsoe. 2008. "Writing Centers & Libraries: One-Stop Shopping for Better Term

Papers." *The Reference Librarian* 49 , no. 2,,

http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02763870802101310#.VTjiuJPG8Xg

Elmborg, James K. 2005. "Writing Centers and Libraries in Collaboration: A Basis in Theory." In *Centers

for Learning: Writing Centers and Academic Libraries in Collaboration*, ed. James K. Elmborg and

Sheril Hook, 1-20. Chicago: Association for College and Research Libraries.

---. 2006. "Locating the center: Libraries, writing centers, and information literacy." *The Writing Lab

Newsletter* 30, no. 6 (February),https://writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v30/30.6.pdf.

Ferer, Elise. 2012. "Working together: library and writing center collaboration." *Reference Services

Review* 40, no. 4,

http://ezproxy.rollins.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1147298625?ac

countid=13584.

Fister, Barbara. 1993. "Teaching the Rhetorical Dimensions of Research." *Research Strategies* 11 (4):

    221, quoted in Sheril Hook, "Teaching Librarians and Writing Center Professionals in

    Collaboration: complementary practicesIn Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Academic

    Libraries in Collaboration, ed. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook, 21-41. Chicago: Association for

    College and Research Libraries.

Giglio, Michele R. and Constance F. Strickland. 2005. "The Wesley College Library and Writing Center: A

    Case Study in Collaboration," In *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Academic Libraries in*

    Collaboration, ed. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook, 138-147. Chicago: Association for College

    and Research Libraries.

Head, Alison J. 2013. Project Information Literacy: What Can Be Learned about the Information-Seeking

    Behavior of Today's College Students? Paper presented at the Association of College and

    Research Libraries (ACRL) Annual Conference,, April 10-13, in Indianapolis, IN 472-482

    http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/2013/p

    apers/Head_Project.pdf

Hook, Sheril. 2005. "Teaching Librarians and Writing Center Professionals in Collaboration:

    complementary practices." In *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Academic Libraries in*

    Collaboration, ed. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook, 21-41. Chicago: Association for College and

    Research Libraries.

Massis, Bruce. 2010. "The academic library becomes the academic learning commons*." New Library*

    World 111 (3/4): 161-163,

http://ezproxy.rollins.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/229567439?acc
ountid=13584.

Treadwell, Jane, Amanda Binder, and Natalie Tagge. 2011. "Seeing ourselves as others see us: library

spaces through student eyes." In *College Libraries and Student Culture: what we now know*,

ed.Andrew D. Asher and Lynda M. Duke, 127 – 142. Chicago: American Library Association.

Walter, Scott, and Michele Eodice. 2007. "Meeting the student learning imperative: Supporting and

sustaining collaboration between academic libraries and student services programs." *Research

Strategies* 20 (4) 219-225,

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0734331006000218.

White, Carolyn and Margaret Pobwajlo. 2005. "A Library, Learning Center, and Classroom Collaboration:

a case study." In *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Academic Libraries in Collaboration*,

ed. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook, 175-203. Chicago: Association for College and Research

Libraries.

The Writing Center. 2012. "Getting Feedback." *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*,

http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/getting-feedback/.

Appendix

Research Questions

These questions are merely a guide and depending on the progress of the interview some questions may not be asked.

In this study we are interested in learning how second-year students use the library and its resources.

1. Please let us know your major and GPA.

First, I'd like to know what do you like most about the Olin Library.

What don't you like about it?

If you could change one or two things about the library, what would it be?

Do you have a favorite place to study in the library? Why?

2. If you could tell an incoming first year the most important thing he/she needs to know about the library, what would it be?

We are also interested in learning what students really do when they write their papers.

3. How many research papers did you write last semester?

4. We'll be talking about one paper: the one you wrote for [pick a course].

5. Describe the assignment. Do you recall the requirements? (page length, paper type, etc.)

6. Did you understand the requirements for this assignment? If not, did you try to get more information about it?

7. When was this assignment due?

8. When did you start your research for this assignment?

9. Where did you start your research for this assignment? Why?

10. What sources did you use for this assignment?

11. Did you ever have a point where you felt stuck in your research for this assignment? (e.g. finding good books or articles, time management issues, difficulty in judging appropriate source materials, etc.) If so, what did you do?

12. Was there anything about your research for this assignment that you found frustrating? Why?

13. When did you start writing the paper or putting together the presentation for this assignment?

14. Did you ask anyone for help during your work on this assignment? Why? Who?

15. Did your professor require or encourage you to use a writing consultant or tutor? Did you? What did you apply to your paper?

16. Were there parts of your work on this assignment that were easy for you? Why?

17. Were you happy with the grade you received on this project? Was it as you expected?

18. Did you enjoy working on this assignment?

19. How much total time did you spend on this assignment?

20. Thinking back on it now, is there anything you would do differently to complete this assignment? Or that you would do differently next time?

21. Are there any resources/services that the college could provide that would be helpful with assignments like this one?

22. What help do you think the library could have offered you to help you on this assignment?

23. How do you think your research process compares to that of other students?