

Student Research Journal



Student Research Journal
Volume 11, Issue 2
ISSN 2577-2499



Call for Submissions

The *SRJ* invites submissions from currently enrolled graduate students from all disciplines and institutions. Submit original research, literature reviews, book reviews, critical essays, or evidence summaries, covering topics in all fields of library and information science theory, policy, application, or practice.

The journal accepts submissions on a rolling basis and publishes two issues annually. For more information, please visit: scholarworks.sjsu.edu/slissrj

SJSU | SCHOOL OF
INFORMATION

A SCHOOL WITHIN THE COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SCIENCES

ischool.sjsu.edu



Journal of Western Archives

The *Journal of Western Archives* is a peer-reviewed, open access journal sponsored by Western regional archival organizations. The journal focuses on contemporary issues and developments in the archival and curatorial fields, particularly as they affect Western archives and manuscript repositories.

Contributing to the Journal

If you are interested in contributing to the journal or serving as a peer reviewer for journal content, please contact the managing editor at jwa.editor@gmail.com. Article submissions may also be made online at the journal website.

JWA

<http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/westernarchives/>

VOLUME 11, ISSUE 2

Editor-in-Chief

Tierra Holmes

Managing Editor

Meghan Duffey

Content Editors

Benjamin Brown

Ariel Dyer

Kristen Jacobson

Amber Morrell

Copy Editors

Maya Lomeli

Stephanie Sandoval

Editorial Advisory Board

*Faculty with San José State University, School of
Information*

Dr. Anthony Chow, *Director*

Dr. Linda Main, *Associate Director*

Dr. Anthony Bernier, *Journal Faculty Advisor*

Dr. Sue Alman

Dr. Joni Richards Bodart

Dr. Mary Bolin

Dr. Michelle Chen

Dr. Souvick Ghosh

Dr. Debra L. Hansen

Dr. Mary Ann Harlan

Dr. Deborah Hicks

Dr. Darra Hofman

Alison Johnson

Jason Kaltenbacher

Dr. Geoffrey Z. Liu

Dr. Ziming Liu

Dr. David V. Loertscher

Dr. Lili Luo

Dr. Kristen Rebmann

Dr. Tonia San Nicholas Rocca

Alyce Scott

Dr. Michael Stephens

Dr. Virginia Tucker

Dr. Michele A. L. Villagran

Beth Wrenn-Estes

**VOLUME 11, ISSUE 2
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Editorial

Experience Peer-Review With SRJ
Tierra Holmes, San José State University

Invited Contribution

Academic Libraries and Writing Centers: Collaborations at US Public Research Universities
Dr. Mary Bolin,

Reviews

Book Review: Kathleen Campana and J. Elizabeth Mills' Create, Innovate, and Serve: A Radical Approach to Children's and Youth Programming
Mateo Campos-Seligman, San José State University

Book Review: Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies Through Critical Race Theory, Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight
Jessica Nombrano Larsen, San José State University

January 2022

Experience Peer-Review With SRJ

Tierra Holmes
tierra.holmes@sjsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj>



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), [Cataloging and Metadata Commons](#), [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), [Information Literacy Commons](#), [Museum Studies Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Acknowledgements

Recommended Citation

Holmes, T. (2022). Experience Peer-Review With SRJ. *School of Information Student Research Journal*, 11(2). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj/vol11/iss2/1>

This article is brought to you by the open access Journals at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Information Student Research Journal by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Experience Peer-Review With SRJ

Acknowledgements

About Author

Tierra Holmes graduated from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte with a B.A. in History and a B.A. in Art History. She served as the editor-in-chief (EIC) of *Sanskrit Literary-Arts Magazine* during her senior year as an undergraduate and is excited to serve as the EIC of *SRJ* as well. She anticipates graduating from SJSU's MLIS program this Spring.

In our welcome video to Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) students completing San Jose State University's (SJSU) introductory course on information communities, we discussed the importance of peer-review as a standard for ensuring the integrity of academic research (SLIS Student Research Journal, 2021). With this in mind, the *Student Research Journal (SRJ)* has renewed its commitment to providing a valuable experience to both our readers and graduate students in Library and Information Science (LIS) and related fields who wish to experience peer-review and academic publishing. The editors and authors who have tirelessly worked to make this issue possible have demonstrated an astounding dedication to *SRJ's* vision, despite enduring the unprecedented circumstances wrought by living through a global pandemic.

Dr. Mary K. Bolin, a lecturer at SJSU and Professor Emeritus at University of Nebraska—Lincoln Libraries, has contributed a wonderfully thought-provoking piece on academic libraries as collaborative spaces. Her study explores the relationship between writing centers and libraries at public research universities as part of a logical evolution of library services.

SJSU MLIS candidate Mateo Campos-Seligman offers an insightful review of Campana and Mills' *Create, Innovate, and Serve: A Radical Approach to Children's and Youth Programming*. Campos-Seligman discusses how Campana and Mills build upon work by Dresang to develop a progressive new resource for children's and youth services librarians and identifies areas of further study.

Jessica Nombrano Larsen, another SJSU MLIS candidate, provides a discerning review of Leung and Lopez-McKnight's exceedingly relevant *Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies Through Critical Race Theory*. Larsen discusses Leung and Lopez-McKnight's use of Critical Race Theory (CRT) to confront the lack of diversity in the LIS field and offers suggestions for further research and how the book could be used to educate future LIS students.

This issue, though succinct, is a testament to both the skill and passion cultivated by students at SJSU's School of Information. After 10 years of excellence, we hope that you, our supporters and readers, will continue to be part of the *SRJ* experience as we endeavor to become a valuable resource for graduate LIS writing at SJSU and abroad. We look forward to forging meaningful connections with students as they begin their journey into academic publishing, for decades to come.

Acknowledgements

I can scarcely find the words to express my profound appreciation for the diligence displayed by *SRJ's* editors during the Fall 2021 semester. Our Managing Editor,

Meghan Duffey, assumed her role at a critical time for *SRJ* and has done a remarkable job. This issue would not have been possible without her thoughtful insight. In addition to providing astute feedback for prospective authors, our Editorial Team has demonstrated an exceptional level of commitment with their willingness to take on extra assignments and special projects that elevate *SRJ*'s vision.

Our Faculty Advisor, Dr. Anthony Bernier, has been an invaluable guiding force for the journal. He has helped *SRJ*'s editors cultivate the skills we needed to publish this issue through our own merit.

We would also like to offer our sincere gratitude to the Faculty Advisory Board, led by iSchool Director Dr. Anthony Chow and Associate Director Dr. Linda Main, for their continued support. By enabling students across the globe to experience the peer-review process, *SRJ* also hopes to uphold the values of our institution and increase SJSU's research profile by establishing our journal as a premiere source for graduate research in LIS and related fields.

References

SLIS Student Research Journal. [SJSU's iSchool Student Research Journal]. (2021, December 28). *INFO 200 Welcome Video* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=US3ityZNTP4>

January 2022

Academic Libraries and Writing Centers: Collaborations at US Public Research Universities

Mary K. Bolin

University of Nebraska—Lincoln Libraries; San Jose State University, mary.bolin@sjsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj>



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), [Cataloging and Metadata Commons](#), [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), [Information Literacy Commons](#), [Museum Studies Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Acknowledgements

Recommended Citation

Bolin, M. K. (2022). Academic Libraries and Writing Centers: Collaborations at US Public Research Universities. *School of Information Student Research Journal*, 11(2). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj/vol11/iss2/2>

This article is brought to you by the open access Journals at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Information Student Research Journal by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Academic Libraries and Writing Centers: Collaborations at US Public Research Universities

Abstract

The websites of 71 US research universities were the source of data on the relationship of academic libraries and campus writing centers, which provide support for developing written communication skills. All 71 institutions have writing centers, generally administered by the academic success operation, the English department, or a college such as arts and sciences. Just under half (n=35) of the institutions have a writing center located in the library. In 16 of those institutions, the library is the only location of the writing center. The general issues of academic success and “library as place,” as well as the space that was gained by weeding and storage of print collections, has led to this and other opportunities for collaboration between academic libraries and other campus units, part of the ongoing transformation of library organizations and their programs and services.

Keywords

academic libraries, writing centers, information literacy, public research universities

Acknowledgements

About Author

Dr. Mary K. Bolin is a full-time Lecturer in the SJSU School of Information and an Emeritus Professor in the University Libraries at the University of Nebraska—Lincoln, where she served as Chair of the Technical Services Department and as a Catalog and Metadata Librarian. She is an Emeritus Fellow of the Center for Digital Research in the Humanities. She completed her PhD in Education in 2007. Dr. Bolin is one of the founding editors of the peer-reviewed electronic journal *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Before returning to her home state of Nebraska in 2004, she spent 17 years as a faculty member in the library at the University of Idaho.

In the past 15-20 years, academic libraries have explored both collaborations with other campus units and the idea of “library as place.” After several years of declining gate counts, the replacement of print with electronic resources, and the rise of remote services such as chat reference and Ask Us, libraries began to think once again about the functions of the library as a place to gather for study, leisure, discussion, and collaboration. The reduction of print collections created new spaces, and many libraries explored the concept of an “information commons” that included services and offices of units outside the library, such as IT support. This same period has seen the flourishing of student and academic success services, part of an institutional effort to strengthen undergraduate education, revamp core curricula, create support for first generation students, and bring together support for writing, research skills, time management, planning, and so on.

One common and fruitful partnership has been that of the library and the writing center. Writing is a fundamental skill that is critical to academic success. The need for students to write well is an interdisciplinary concern and one that is shared with the library, whose information literacy mission can be seen as including some aspects of writing, e.g., citation, use of research sources, and avoiding plagiarism. Writing centers are widespread on campuses and may be administratively housed in the English Department, student success services, a college such as arts and sciences, or other areas. Those administrative units have developed partnerships with academic libraries to create spaces where faculty or student writing tutors can meet with students to help with research papers and with writing skills in general. In the past two decades, writing centers thus began to be located in library buildings, either as their main or only location or as a satellite. This collaboration is a good match for the library’s mission in areas such as information seeking, information literacy, and reducing academic dishonesty. Basic information literacy instruction by librarians has often been targeted at freshman composition courses and is frequently organized in collaboration with the English department. Furthermore, the library’s long opening hours and general accessibility are other reasons that this partnership has been successful.

In the time since this collaboration began to be common, has it persisted or declined? Data was gathered from a group of seventy US public research institutions. University websites were the source of information on whether the university has a writing center, where its administrative home is, whether there is a library location, and whether the center also offers online appointments. The results showed that just under half (35) of the 71 institutions had a library writing center location, and 16 of those had the library as the only location. This shows the persistence of the trend and the potential for further collaboration.

The Covid-19 pandemic caused most institutions to switch to mostly or entirely online services, but institutions are switching back to in-person services, and all or most will probably offer in-person services (probably in addition to virtual appointments) at some point in the near future. The data on location is presented without regard to whether institutions are presently offering in-person service.

Academic Success

In the 1990s, colleges and universities faced pressure to re-evaluate the role of teaching, to give greater value to teaching skill, and to become more “student-centered.” This included recognizing and accommodating multiple learning styles and reassessing the roles and relationships of students and teachers. Universities began to use the phrase “teaching and learning” to describe the activities of faculty and students in the classroom and other learning environments. This led many institutions to establish campus teaching enhancement units that provided support to faculty in their efforts to become better teachers. McDaniel, James, and Davis (2000) describe this process at one state university, where faculty and administrators, “analyzed retention ... evaluated physical space ... and evaluated student services.” The university then created “a single student services center” that combined “Academic Support, Career Development, Student Counseling, and Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition.”

Along with the effort to improve teaching and rethink faculty-student relationships came the recognition that students were often unprepared to meet the demands of higher education curricula. That led to the redesign of core curricula, with the revamped curricula emphasizing broadly-applicable skills such as writing and other forms of communication. It also led to more prominence for student services offices, and sometimes an administrative realignment to bring student services together with academic affairs.

Student services operations began to create academic success centers, sometimes called student success centers. Those centers offered services and instruction on study skills, curriculum planning, academic writing, time management, and other skills that would lead to success for students. Writing centers predate academic success centers. They represent the most basic element of academic success that cuts across disciplines. The writing center has become a widespread feature of academic success operations, but it can also be seen as a model for the tutoring, individualized instruction, and collaboration among disciplines that are characteristic of academic success efforts. The library also practices tutoring, one-on-one instruction, and an interdisciplinary approach, which creates affinities between libraries and writing centers, and makes the library, and information literacy, foundational for academic success.

Library as Place

The discussion of “library as place” arose in the early 2000s as a response to declining gate counts and the growing reliance on networked electronic resources that could be accessed remotely. The use of print collections declined sharply, and academic libraries also felt pressure, like other academic units, to become more evidence-based and data-driven and to create assessment measures that would help shape user-centered library programs and services. The assessment of the print collection and its use (or lack thereof) led many libraries to consider aggressive weeding or storage of little-used material and the repurposing of the space that had been taken up by those print holdings. MacWhinnie (2003) describes the creation of an information commons as a means of combining access to “information resources, technology, and research assistance.” Nitecki (2011) proposes a model

for assessing library space, emphasizing the importance of, “aligning library space with the role of the library.”

Space has always been at a premium in academic libraries, but just as the removal of card catalog cabinets made way for things like computer labs, the removal of print collections made way for collaborative space for students and for services that are not traditionally thought of as library services. The removal of print, however, is and was not without resistance and angst. Some librarians had a (print) collection-focused view of library services and viewed the removal of print as the dismantling of what makes the library a library. Teaching faculty who had not been seen in the library for years suddenly claimed that browsing the stacks was something they did daily and something that was utterly vital to their work as scholars. There were genuine questions about the role and use of print and the best approach to weeding the print collection. Some angst was relieved by the availability of compact storage facilities as well as regional shared repositories, particularly for periodical volumes.

Libraries found ways to overcome some of this resistance and most large academic libraries have done substantial weeding of print in the past decade, but the controversy over this issue uncovered something more basic: the question of what a library is or should be. Most librarians would probably agree that a library is not simply a building that houses a collection of resources. The idea that a library is a kind of warehouse is objectionable to librarians. If we grant the idea that a library is not (or is more than) its collection, then we are left with the question of what it is. This article does not attempt to answer that question. Clearly, the answer develops and emerges continuously. But the present environment of collections and resources has allowed us to consider the library as an organization that occupies space and exists virtually.

Traditionally, academic library space has been occupied by collections, by areas for direct user services such as circulation and reference, areas for processing material, and offices and workspace for librarians, staff, and administrators. The largest areas by far were those for collections, which require load-bearing floors and room for users and staff to shelve and retrieve material. There has always been space for users to read and study as well, often including group study rooms.

Review of the Literature

There is a great deal of literature on academic success, library as place, writing centers, and academic library collaborations with writing centers and other units. This literature review is limited, and only includes some of the most interesting and relevant research on these topics.

The literature on academic success efforts in colleges and universities includes Burton (2013), who advocates for collaborative learning as a path to student success, and who emphasizes the role of a student success center in helping to achieve that. McDaniel, James, and Davis (2000) describe the creation of a student success center at a state university, while Osborne, Parlier, and Adams (2019) assessed the impact of academic success efforts on student learning. Smith, Baldwin, and Schmidt (2015) view student success centers at community colleges as drivers of a change in institutional focus from access to success. Sullivan (2015)

examines the role of tutoring in academic success. Additionally, the library's role in academic success is further explored by authors such as Courtney (2009), who examines varieties of outreach and collaboration in academic libraries, including partnering with K-12 education and various activities that support academic success. The literature on the academic library's changing position within colleges and universities is described by Cox (2018), who finds many opportunities for collaboration with other campus units and supporting academic success.

The discussion of "library as place" includes consideration of general trends in libraries and higher education. An early study by Feret and Marcinek (1999) reports on forecasting activity to predict trends and needs for staffing, training, and resources for academic libraries in the 21st century. Nitecki (2011) explores the relationship of library spaces to the role and mission of the library and the shape of library services. Bailin (2011) recounts the views of students on the role of the academic library as part of a remodeling project, including the need for collaborative and study space. Collins (2014) gives examples of reimagined library spaces and the benefits to users, and students' use of the library as a learning space is recounted by Cunningham and Tabur (2012), who find that students do this even when they do not have to come to the library to use collections and resources. Delaney and Bates (2015) urge academic librarians to continue to examine their roles and relationships and to find new collaborations. Gardner and Eng (2005) report on the changing needs of Millennial students and how libraries can respond to them, with the issue of generational change continuing to be important for library programs and services.

Furthermore, trends and issues for the 21st century academic library are explored by many authors and organizations. Shoid and Kassim (2012), who examine learning organization disciplines and their effect on organizational learning in academic libraries, are generally relevant to the topic of organizational transformation, of which collaboration is a part. Likewise, work by Jantz (2017), which examines research library vision statements and their relationship with innovation, is pertinent to this discussion. Budd (2005) describes organizational, administrative, governance, staffing, and collections in academic libraries and the changes that are taking place in the 21st century, while Campbell (2006) ponders the transition from print to electronic collections and the implication for the role and mission of academic libraries. The move from collection-centered library organizations and facilities to a model where relationships, collaborations, and services are the focus is described by Latimer (2011). This transformation is also discussed by Michalak (2012), who examines the evolution of an academic library organization and culture to meet the needs of the current learning and technology environment. Specific advice on shifting the collection paradigm is provided by Spitzform and Sennyey (2007), who look at demand-driven acquisitions (now very common) as a solution to underused library resources. Gayton (2008) depicts the social and communal aspects of academic libraries, finding that social approaches (e.g., cafes) are a means of combating falling gate counts and declining collection use. Early research by MacWhinnie (2003) explores the emergence of the information commons as a focus for library facilities and services in a collaborative

learning environment. Silver (2007) describes the use of collaborative spaces in an academic library with 70 percent of space devoted to collaborative learning.

A number of authors have recounted experiences with library/writing center collaborations, including Brady, Singh-Corcoran, Dadisman, and Diamond (2009), who partnered with composition teachers to support writing and composition skills along with information literacy. Epstein and Draxler (2020) describe a library/writing center collaboration that paired students with writing tutors as a way of strengthening library support for academic success, while a collaboration in which librarians trained writing tutors in information literacy skills and instruction and worked together in shared office hours or reference desk staffing is described by Ferer (2012). A survey of 157 colleges and universities performed by Todorinova (2010) found that 94 percent of institutions had a writing center and 44 percent of those had a library location. Only 23 percent had collaborations beyond the shared location. Utter (2018) describes the integration of the writing center into the academic library, with both a physical location and collaboration between librarians and writing center staff. Zauha's (2014) exploration of the library/writing center collaboration as an aspect of information literacy instruction is an important aspect of this discussion. She describes a relationship that goes beyond the convenience of the library as a meeting place for students and tutors.

There is a great deal of research on student-centered learning. Brooks, Fuller, and Waters (2012) describe changes occurring to all campus spaces, including new models of teaching and learning and virtual spaces. The case for student-centered learning is made by Kaput (2018), who describes learning that is individualized and acknowledges different learning styles. Lightweis (2013) examines student-centered K-12 teaching as a pathway to academic success in college, while Wright (2011) looks generally at student-centered learning, including faculty-student relationships and ways of implementing this approach.

Results and Discussion

The population for the study consisted of 71 public universities in the US, including the flagship "University of ..." and the land grant university that was created by the Morrill Act of 1862, if different. For example, in the state of Washington, the University of Washington is the flagship state university and Washington State University is the 1862 land grant, whereas the University of Illinois is both flagship and land grant. All are public institutions except for Cornell University, which is the only private land grant. California State University, Northridge was added to represent the very large California State University system. University websites were used to gather data on whether the university has a writing center and whether the writing center has a library location.

All 71 universities have a writing center, housed administratively in several places. In 20 institutions, the writing center is part of the academic success operation, in 19 it is found in a college such as arts and sciences, in another 19 in the English or rhetoric department, and with the remainder (13) found in areas such as the provost (academic affairs), teaching and learning, or undergraduate studies. There is no correlation in this data between the administrative home and the relationship with the library. Just under half (35) of the institutions have a writing

center location in the library. Sixteen institutions have a writing center whose only location is the library. Since none of the 35 writing centers located in the library are administered by the library, they are staffed by students or staff from academic success, the English department, the college of arts and sciences, an interdisciplinary writing and communication program, and so on. Many campus writing centers have been in existence for decades but may have been physically and administratively relocated as part of teaching enhancement, student success, and campus-wide written and oral communication programs.

All institutions offer virtual appointments, and because of the Covid-19 pandemic, some institutions currently offer only virtual appointments. That situation is not a part of this discussion.

Conclusion

This data shows that the trend of campus writing centers being located in academic libraries has become well-established and widespread, with some evidence of further collaboration on efforts such as information literacy. The brief investigation reported on here provides evidence that librarian's well-established collaboration with composition instructors for information literacy instruction has meant that writing center location and collaboration is a natural next step. The success of this collaboration also supports further organizational transformations for academic libraries. Libraries who have been willing to reduce the footprint of print collections were rewarded with the ability to use that space for new services and partnerships that are as much a part of the mission of libraries as collections.

Libraries were ready for the student-centered model of instruction. The library reference desk has always offered individualized instruction and reference desk staff are prepared for any question that appears. Services such as Ask Us and embedded librarians have gone further to focus on the individual needs of students and faculty, along with services such as appointments with a librarian for research assistance. Librarians can continue to be pioneers and leaders in student success and student-centered institutions if we continue to shift our focus from collections to a library that is focused on teaching and learning.

Further study on this topic could include other populations, such as liberal arts or community colleges. The degree of integration of writing and information literacy instruction, tutoring, and curricula is also worth deeper exploration and could be a natural next step for this research area. Zauha (2014) asks whether the library's relationship with the writing center is one of "[p]eaceful coexistence, détente, or active collaboration?" and states further that, if libraries ignore "the real opportunities for collaboration with writing centers, and by extension with other tutoring services on campus, we are missing a great way to breach the traditional boundaries of both the library and these services." Rethinking those "traditional boundaries" should be part of the ongoing transformation of both academic libraries and the institutions they are part of.

References

- Bailin, K. (2011). Changes in academic library space: A case study at the university of new south wales. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 42(4), 342-359.
- Brady, L., Singh-Corcoran, N., Dadisman, J., and Diamond, K. (2009). A collaborative approach to information literacy: First-year composition, writing center, and library partnerships at West Virginia University.
- Brooks, R., Fuller, A., & Waters, J. (2012). Changing spaces of education: An introduction. *Changing spaces of education* (pp. 15-32) Routledge.
- Budd, J. (2005). *The changing academic library: Operations, cultures, environments* ACRL.
- Burton, S. D. (2013). Promoting student success through collaboration: Implementation of a student success center.
- Campbell, J. D. (2006). Changing a cultural icon: The academic library as a virtual destination. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 41(1), 16-18.
- Collins, L. M. (2014). Changing spaces. *AALL Spectrum*, 19(1), 32.
- Courtney, N. (2009). Breaking out of our shell: Expanding the definition of outreach in academic libraries.
- Cox, J. (2018). Positioning the academic library within the institution: A literature review. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 24(3-4), 217-241.
- Cunningham, H. V., & Tabur, S. (2012). Learning space attributes: Reflections on academic library design and its use. *Journal of Learning Spaces*, 1(2), n2.
- Delaney, G., & Bates, J. (2015). Envisioning the academic library: A reflection on roles, relevancy and relationships. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 21(1), 30-51.
- Epstein, M., & Draxler, B. (2020). Collaborative Assessment of an Academic Library and Writing Center Partnership: Embedded Writing and Research Tutors for First-Year Students. *College & Research Libraries*, 81(3), 509.
- Ferer, E. (2012). Working together: library and writing center collaboration. *Reference Services Review*.
- Feret, B., & Marcinek, M. (1999). The future of the academic library and the academic librarian: A delphi study. *Librarian Career Development*.
- Gardner, S., & Eng, S. (2005). What students want: Generation Y and the changing function of the academic library. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5(3), 405-420.
- Gayton, J. T. (2008). Academic libraries: "Social" or "communal?" the nature and future of academic libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(1), 60-66.
- Jantz, R. C. (2017). Vision, innovation, and leadership in research libraries. *Library & Information Science Research*, 39(3), 234-241.
- Kaput, K. (2018). Evidence for student-centered learning. *Education Evolving*.
- Latimer, K. (2011). Collections to connections: Changing spaces and new challenges in academic library buildings. *Library Trends*, 60(1), 112-133.
- Lightweis, S. K. (2013). College success: A fresh look at differentiated instruction and other student-centered strategies. *College Quarterly*, 16(3), n3.

- MacWhinnie, L. A. (2003). The information commons: The academic library of the future. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 3(2), 241-257.
- McDaniel, N., James, J. B., & Davis, G. (2000). The student success center at Auburn University. *About Campus*, 5(1), 25-28.
- Michalak, S. C. (2012). This changes everything: Transforming the academic library. *Journal of Library Administration*, 52(5), 411-423.
- Nitecki, D. A. (2011). Space assessment as a venue for defining the academic library. *The Library Quarterly*, 81(1), 27-59.
- Osborne, J. D., Parlier, R., & Adams, T. (2019). Assessing impact of academic interventions through student perceptions of academic success. *Learning Assistance Review*, 24(1), 9-26.
- Shoid, M. S. M., & Kassim, N. A. (2012). Systems thinking and shared vision and mission as determinants of organisational learning capabilities (OLC) in academic library. *Journal of E-Learning & Higher Education*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Silver, H. (2007). *Use of collaborative spaces in an academic library* Simmons College.
- Smith, C. A., Baldwin, C., & Schmidt, G. (2015). Student success centers: Leading the charge for change at community colleges. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 47(2), 30-39.
- Spitzform, P., & Sennyey, P. (2007). A vision for the future of academic library collections. *International Journal of the Book*, 4(4).
- Sullivan, T. A. (2015). The role of tutoring at a campus student success center and student perceptions of academic success . Masters thesis, Valdosta State University.
- Todorinova, L. (2010). Writing center and library collaboration: A telephone survey of academic libraries.
- Utter, M. (2018, February). The Library+ The Academic Writing Center= A True Story How to Integrate The Academic Writing Center in the Library. In 2018 5th International Symposium on Emerging Trends and Technologies in Libraries and Information Services (ETTLIS) (pp. 96-99). IEEE.
- Wright, G. B. (2011). Student-centered learning in higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(1), 92-97.
- Zauha, Janelle. "Peering into the Writing Center: Information Literacy as a Collaborative Conversation." *Communications in information literacy* 8.1 (2014): 1-6.

Appendix

List of universities

Arizona State University
Auburn University
California State University Northridge
Clemson University
Colorado State University
Indiana University
Iowa State University
Kansas State University
Louisiana State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michigan State University
Mississippi State University
Montana State University
New Mexico State University
North Carolina State University
North Dakota State University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
Rutgers University
South Dakota State University
State University of New York Buffalo
Texas A&M University
University of Alabama
University of Alaska
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of California Berkeley
University of Colorado
University of Connecticut
University of Delaware
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii
University of Idaho
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky

University of Maine
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Mississippi
University of Missouri
University of Montana
University of Nebraska--Lincoln
University of Nevada--Reno
University of New Hampshire
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill
University of North Dakota
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Rhode Island
University of South Carolina
University of South Dakota
University of Tennessee
University of Texas
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
Utah State University
Virginia Tech University
Washington State University

January 2022

Book Review: Kathleen Campana and J. Elizabeth Mills' Create, Innovate, and Serve: A Radical Approach to Children's and Youth Programming

Mateo Campos-Seligman
San Jose State University, mcamposseligman@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj>



Part of the [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Information Literacy Commons](#), [Other Education Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Acknowledgements

Many thanks and appreciation to every single professor who has aided me throughout my MLIS journey and provided me with the tools and knowledge needed to make writing this review possible. I would especially like to shout out: Instructors José Aguiñaga, who indirectly challenged me to write and submit this for publishing, and Lisa Houde, who was kind enough to look this over and encourage its publication; as well as Charlie (I love you), Stevie (come home), Alex (I don't know if you'll read this), and finally, Jess Dang, who told an eighth grader once to never, ever stop writing - hopefully this counts as proof that I took that advice to heart.

Recommended Citation

Campos-Seligman, M. (2022). Book Review: Kathleen Campana and J. Elizabeth Mills' Create, Innovate, and Serve: A Radical Approach to Children's and Youth Programming. *School of Information Student Research Journal*, 11(2). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj/vol11/iss2/3>

This article is brought to you by the open access Journals at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Information Student Research Journal by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Book Review: Kathleen Campana and J. Elizabeth Mills' *Create, Innovate, and Serve: A Radical Approach to Children's and Youth Programming*

Keywords

children's and youth programming, Radical Change, public libraries

Acknowledgements

Many thanks and appreciation to every single professor who has aided me throughout my MLIS journey and provided me with the tools and knowledge needed to make writing this review possible. I would especially like to shout out: Instructors José Aguiñaga, who indirectly challenged me to write and submit this for publishing, and Lisa Houde, who was kind enough to look this over and encourage its publication; as well as Charlie (I love you), Stevie (come home), Alex (I don't know if you'll read this), and finally, Jess Dang, who told an eighth grader once to never, ever stop writing - hopefully this counts as proof that I took that advice to heart.

About Author

Mateo Campos-Seligman (he/him) is a current Library and Information Science Master's candidate at San Jose State University with hopes to further his aspirations of working in children's and youth services in a K-12 or public library. His research interests include accessible youth-driven programming, educational technology, environmental and mobility justice, geography and urban studies, storytelling, and punk rock. He currently lives in a basement in Alameda, California, with his partner and dog.

Campana, K., & Mills, J. E. (Eds.). (2019). *Create, innovate, and serve: A radical approach to children's and youth programming*. Ala Neal-Schuman.

Campana and Mills' *Create, Innovate, and Serve: A Radical Approach to Children's and Youth Programming* provides a passionate, accessible, and grounded discussion of the current state and ideal future of children's and youth programming in libraries. It is meant, first and foremost, as a reference text for current Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) students intending to enter the fields of children's and youth services. Published in 2019, this text is produced and compiled by Dr. Kathleen Campana and J. Elizabeth Mills. Campana is an assistant professor at the Kent State University School of Information in the field of youth services. J. Elizabeth Mills is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Washington Information School and a children's book author.

Campana and Mills' intent is clear: they want to support the current master's candidates of Library and Information Science (LIS) in becoming the compassionate, flexible, radical, and knowledgeable children's and youth services librarians of today and tomorrow. The origins of this book began in 2015, when Campana and Mills co-taught an MLIS course at the University of Washington entitled *Libraries as Learning Labs in the Digital Age*. In setting out to compile texts to support the class's curriculum, the two authors searched for a text that would provide a broad scope of programming for children and youth from birth through the age of eighteen. They also wanted a text that included the professional input of both academics and passionate professionals who are currently working in, or implementing, radical children's and youth programming in some way within their professional spaces. "We wanted a book that would emphasize the importance of diversity, learning through play, outreach, and community in every aspect of what children's librarians do every day," the two scholars tell us in their introduction. As part of the process of creating the resource they were searching for, Campana and Mills sought to answer three key questions:

1. What would current library school students and future children's librarians like to know about the cognitive and sociocultural development of children at different stages of life?
2. What are libraries offering in terms of innovative, radical programming for children and teens?
3. What are the major studies and publications in the library and information science field that pertain to, support, and expand upon current practice in the field? (Campana & Mills, 2019, pp. 157)

As is often the case in information science, seeking out the answer to these questions eventually resulted in a comprehensive project intended to provide an entry point to and broad overview of the ways today's librarians are providing creative, innovative, and participatory programming for children and young adults, utilizing the late Dresang's theory of Radical Change (1999) as their theoretical framework.

Through the use of Dresang's information age principles of connectivity, interactivity, and access (Dresang & Koh, 2009), Campana and Mills describe how librarians embrace young adult and children's programming in this new digital

world. Decades later, Dresang's original information age principles continue to inform how scholars approach design thinking for children and young adults and the radical content found in new texts meant for their age demographic. These principles, along with Dresang's three recommendations for types of radical change—changing formats, changing perspectives, and changing boundaries—make up the foundation and lens through which Campana and Mills present the various examples of radical approaches to children's and youth programming that are found within this book's pages.

While the authors wryly note that Dresang would encourage the reader to interact with the text “radically and synergistically, skipping around, reading what fits with what [they] need to know in the moment, and not necessarily reading in a linear fashion” (Campana & Mills, 2019, pp. 18), the book is organized into two distinct parts. Part I focuses on the seven critical areas necessary for effective youth programming: diversity, storytelling, play and production, media mentorship, assessment, outreach and partnerships, and advocacy. This provides a grounding foundation the reader can then utilize when creating their own programs and services to meet the needs of digital age youth. The chapters in this section stress the importance of the library as an informal learning space for children and youth; this informality allows the library to expand past traditional literary programming and into a more hands-on, learner-motivated environment. This section draws on the expertise and contributions of librarians and academics around the country, as well as reliable and concrete research in youth learning and development and gives the reader an in-depth analysis of how these key areas are essential to modern-day learning. One such example is Naidoo's contribution on the importance of intentionally inclusive and diverse programming. Here, Naidoo argues the necessity of such programming for children and young adults, and the way it speaks to the needs of young people, on two fronts: representation and inclusivity for underrepresented patrons who deserve to see their stories told, and representation of those historically underrepresented for those who would not have a chance to encounter these more inclusive narratives otherwise.

This concept has been echoed by several other LIS professionals and academics in recent years, most notably by youth-focused professionals such as Bernier (2019), Cart (2016), and Houde (2018). Other voices from the LIS field that are cited in Part I include Goldsmith and Martin on the power of storytelling, Ward and Evans sharing a play-based framework that is useful to youth programming, Koester and Haines discussing the importance of digital media, Gross with information on how to evaluate youth programs and whether they are effective, and Crist and Nelson discussing outreach and advocacy. In addition to being leading voices within the LIS field when it comes to radical children's and youth programming, these contributors also cite studies and papers produced by the aforementioned scholars Bernier, Cart, and Houde, among others.

Part II then takes these ideas and contextualizes them in the real world with information drawn from research on youth socialization and development and case studies contributed by libraries that are currently implementing them in their children's and youth programming. The questions posed by Campana and Mills are answered through these case studies. Part II is divided into three sections: Early

childhood (ages from birth to five), middle childhood (ages five to twelve), and teens (ages thirteen to eighteen). Each section is anchored by a review of learning and developmental theories relevant to each age group. Then, using these theories, Campana and Mills present tangible and real-world examples of how these ideas positively impact the learning that occurs through radical, digital-conscious youth and children's library programming. These case studies, or program profiles per Campana and Mills, include contributions from librarians around the country who have used the studies presented in Part I to further the success of their home libraries' youth programs.

By organizing the text into these two distinct parts, Campana and Mills present an incredibly accessible and informative compilation of information that will surely aid any MLIS student on their own learning journey, regardless of whether they eventually work with young people. In outlining their seven critical areas of learning and providing practical applications of those areas, Campana and Mills offer a template for learner-directed, community-first library programming. This text is meant to be used as a foundation to begin from as well as an inspiration for those planning to enter the field to specifically aid young people on their growing and learning journeys. However, one gap in the research presented in this book worth noting is that the subject matter does not branch farther than public libraries in the United States. While this book is a great tool that can be used by school librarians, or any youth-facing information professionals, its scope and focus is that of the interests of its publisher, the American Library Association. Scholars interested in international youth services and programming studies will need to search for a handbook elsewhere.

Ultimately, Campana and Mills provide a wealth of knowledge and information to lean on as we look forward into the future of radical LIS programming, weathering changing technologies, shifting demographics, and new generations of learners. Campana and Mills sum up the point of the book they made best: "This is the end of this book, but it's the beginning of an innovative, service-oriented approach to creating library programming for children and youth. This is your call to action" (Campana & Mills, 2019, pp. 408).

References

- Bernier, A. (2019). *Transforming young adult services*. Chicago: ALA-Neal Schuman.
- Campana, K., & Mills, J. E. (Eds.). (2019). *Create, innovate, and serve: A radical approach to children's and youth programming*. ALA Neal-Schuman.
- Cart, M. (2016). *Young adult literature: From romance to realism*. ALA Neal-Schuman.
- Dresang, E. T. (1999). *Radical change: Books for youth in a digital age*. H.W. Wilson Co.
- Dresang, E. T., & Koh, K. (2009). Radical change theory, youth information behavior, and school libraries. *Www.ideals.illinois.edu*, 58(1). <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/15294>

Houde, L. (2018). *Serving LGBTQ teens: A practical guide for librarians* (pp. 1–9; 71-91). Rowman & Littlefield.

January 2022

Book Review: Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies Through Critical Race Theory, Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight

Jessica Nombrano Larsen

San Jose State University, jessica.n.larsen@sjsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj>



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), [Cataloging and Metadata Commons](#), [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), [Information Literacy Commons](#), [Museum Studies Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my family for all their love and support. Many thanks to Professor José A. Aguiñaga for supporting this work.

Recommended Citation

Nombrano Larsen, J. (2022). Book Review: Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies Through Critical Race Theory, Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight. *School of Information Student Research Journal*, 11(2). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/ischoolsrj/vol11/iss2/4>

This article is brought to you by the open access Journals at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Information Student Research Journal by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Book Review: Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies Through Critical Race Theory, Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight

Keywords

critical race theory, diversity, BIPOC, library and information professionals

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my family for all their love and support. Many thanks to Professor José A. Aguiñaga for supporting this work.

About Author

Jessica Nombrano Larsen is pursuing her MLIS degree at San Jose State University. She is Program Manager of the Empowering Autistic Scholars Program at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. She earned her M.A. in English from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo in 2020.

Leung, S. Y., & Lopez-McKnight, J. R. (Eds). (2021). *Knowledge justice: Disrupting library and information studies through critical race theory*. MIT Press.

Despite decades of library diversity initiatives, librarians are still 83% white. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) are severely underrepresented in librarianship as a result of the very structures and policies underlying Library and Information Science (LIS). These structures maintain the white cultural dominance that continues to shape our collections, archives, programs, and services, as well as the policies governing the recruitment, retention, and promotion of librarians of color. BIPOC professionals are too often left out of discussions about making LIS more equitable and are instead tasked with carrying out diversity initiatives that fail to create meaningful change. Determined to transform the LIS landscape into one of justice and equity for all, editors Sofia Leung and Jorge Lopez-McKnight partnered with thirty other BIPOC professionals to create the masterful *Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies Through Critical Race Theory*. Using a Critical Race Theory (CRT) framework, they detail their experiences as BIPOC professionals in a predominately white field. This innovative work presents an uncompromisingly honest view of the state of our discipline as the authors seek to open our eyes to the complex workings of White Supremacy in LIS. They want to move CRT to the forefront of discussions regarding oppression in LIS, create a healing community that empowers its members to undertake transformative change, and provide strategies and recommendations we can use to revolutionize our discipline and make it “antiracist, anti-oppressive, and equitable” (Leung & Lopez-McKnight, 2021, p. 12).

Per Leung and Lopez-McKnight, our society’s refusal to admit that White Supremacy is ingrained in our laws and institutions, including our libraries and archives, is the primary reason that racial justice is still so elusive decades after the end of the mainstream Civil Rights movement. Our adoption of a liberal diversity framework that espouses color blindness allows the dominant social group (i.e., white, middle class, Christian, able-bodied, heterosexual men) to maintain the status quo, all the while pretending a sincere interest in solving the diversity problem. Of course, this “performative commitment to diversity” (Leung & Lopez-McKnight, 2021, p. 4) will not eradicate racism, and harms those it purports to help. Diversity residencies created for underrepresented academic librarians are an example of this. Individuals are placed in short-term positions, typically must perform diversity and inclusion work on top of what their full-time position requires and are often the only librarian of color in their institution, requiring them to assimilate to white cultural standards to be successful or risk being driven out. This system may nominally increase the number of racialized bodies in academic libraries, but no one benefits from a diversity that is only skin deep.

Part of the power of this text is that the writers have a real, vested interest in what they are writing about. Editors Leung, a librarian, consultant, educator, and facilitator who works with educational institutions to develop workshops and trainings that employ anti-racist and anti-oppressive frameworks, and Lopez-McKnight, a faculty librarian at Austin Community College, forged a bond as a

result of their dedication to exploring CRT's applications in LIS. Written by and for BIPOC, this text is meant to inspire and empower its readers, including those with little knowledge of CRT. Their ardent introduction includes a brief history of CRT, as well as an explanation of its methodologies and tenets, which effectively orient the reader and provide the requisite background information to enable the reader to fully engage with the work. The book is composed of three parts, each containing multiple chapters focused on interconnected themes, with every section beginning with an introduction penned by a different CRT scholar. Each chapter is centered around multiple tenets of CRT and reveals the systemic racism the authors have experienced during their careers.

In Part I, "Destroy White Supremacy," the writers utilize counterstorytelling, racism as ordinary, whiteness as property, and critique of liberalism to break down the institutional fallacy of neutrality. Neutrality promotes the idea that library staff must be fair and unbiased because libraries were developed on democratic principles and librarians are expected to espouse the core values defined by the ALA—including access, democracy, diversity, the public good, service to all library users, and social responsibility. Morales and Williams extend the concept of inherent bias to information itself. Consciously or not, human biases affect everything we do, including the research we conduct, the works we publish, the collections we develop, and the information we provide our patrons. Epistemic supremacy, which destroys the knowledge systems of marginalized groups to uphold those of the dominant class, contributes to the proliferation of biased knowledge and institutional racism. Librarians, archivists, and cataloguers wield incredible power in this respect; they can dismantle epistemic supremacy by giving equal space to the works of authors of all races and ethnicities, providing accurate stories and representations of POC, and ensuring the discoverability of the works of authors of color.

In Part II, "Illuminate Erasure," authors use CRT to develop strategies of resistance and transformation, including utilizing voice and counterstorytelling to expose exclusionary practices in scholarly communication, collection development, and information access that disenfranchise BIPOC library staff and patrons. Natarajan uses counterstorytelling to challenge the master narratives that perpetuate the stigma that POC are somehow deficient and must be assimilated to save them from themselves. This includes preventing them from accessing culturally relevant information about their communities and histories. Walker frames counternarrative and collection development as important tools to combat the misrepresentation of Black people resulting from the many one-sided stories found in libraries.

In Part III, "Radical Collective Imaginations toward Liberation," the writers use storytelling to "illuminate and explore experiences of racialized oppression while also envisioning more liberatory and emancipatory futures" (Leung & McKnight, 2021, p. 220). Espinal, Hathcock and Rios use counterstorytelling to reveal the weaknesses inherent in the diversity narrative embraced by LIS and replace it with a transformative racial equity project to dewhiten LIS. The project included reallocating part of the library's budget to help BIPOC staff obtain their Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) degree. Quiñonez, Nataraj, and

Olivas challenge the fallacy that Higher Education is either neutral or objective, and utilize validation theory, community cultural wealth, and relational-cultural theory to “empower both students and librarians to assert their rightful places as scholars and members of a larger academic community” (Leung & McKnight, 2021, p. 241).

While the authors make an excellent argument for the use of CRT in LIS and give space to many BIPOC voices across the field, representatives of two important groups are missing: library support staff and faculty teaching CRT in LIS programs. Library staff are vital to keeping libraries and archives running, but their work is often overlooked because of their lack of status. This book would have been even stronger had their voices been included because they add the element of class to the discussion and face even more challenges than higher-level personnel. It would also have been informative to hear from instructional faculty, who could have detailed their challenges with teaching CRT in a hostile environment and what strategies and recommendations they have for bringing it to the fore in LIS.

This is not your typical scholarly text. It is not written in formal academic English but in dynamic, evocative language that is representative of the vibrance and individuality of the writers and reiterates that all voices have value; there is more than one valid way to engage in scholarly communication. If utilized widely, this book has the potential to revolutionize LIS education. It provides enlightenment, hope, and a sense of community; it also reminds us that there are no quick or easy solutions. Many of the strategies provided require money, time, and power that many of us do not have. However, one important thing we can do is advocate for the addition of this text to foundational LIS courses. While it was written to create community and inspire solidarity among geographically isolated BIPOC students and professionals, it has the potential to reach a much wider audience. Studying this book in foundational LIS courses would bring a vital discussion to the attention of students of all backgrounds and career aspirations. It is an important text to read as a community; there is a lot to unpack, the writing is very different from most academic works, and students who have not encountered CRT before may have difficulty keeping an open mind. Allowing students to come together to discuss the text will enable them to engage with it more thoroughly and better understand the wide-spread damage resulting from the current system. These enlightened students will be much more likely to center CRT in the discussion of equity and prioritize social justice in their work. Leung, Lopez-McKnight, and their contributors have written a powerful call to action: it is now up to us to take up their challenge.

References

- Leung, S. Y., & Lopez-McKnight, J. R. (Eds). (2021). *Knowledge justice: Disrupting library and information studies through critical race theory*. MIT Press.