

Information Literacy Sponsorship and Intersections in Writing Center and Librarian Collaborations

Daniel Lawson

Central Michigan University

ABSTRACT

Programmatic collaboration on information literacy-oriented First Year Experience courses enables university literacy sponsors to articulate the terms of literacy sponsorship, negotiate them, and thus create and access nodal points to work toward a more equitable, less stratified literacy pedagogy. The author first explains how the concept of information literacy is inextricably bound up in issues of sponsorship. Second, the author relates Deborah Brandt's (1998, 2001) concept of literacy sponsorship to institutional sponsors such as librarians and writing center practitioners. Third, the author argues that multidisciplinary FYE programs are crucial in enacting meaningful critical approaches to information literacy by encouraging stakeholders to juxtapose disciplinary and institutional norms and their associated literacies. Finally, the author shares a small liberal arts college's efforts in this endeavor, focusing especially on the role of the writing center and library in cultivating these relationships.

Introduction

In their edited collection, *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Libraries in Collaboration*, Elmborg and Hook (2005) assembled several case studies examining the affordances and implications of writing center and librarian partnerships. These studies highlight the many educational opportunities inherent in such collaborations—especially regarding the role information literacy might play in these partnerships. As Elmborg (2005) has pointed out, the information literacy metaphor is encouraging for those in writing centers because it links the act of navigating information to arguments for critical literacies:

“These definitions of literacy, descended in large part from the work of Paulo Freire, reframe education as the process of developing empowered students who create personal knowledge” (p. 4). As a Writing Center Director, Writing Across the Curriculum coordinator, and compositionist, I agree with Elmborg. I contend in this essay, however, that despite the Freirean impulses often driving the information literacy movement, more work fully examining the ideological implications of information literacy is needed. Elmborg (2006) himself has drawn on scholarship from critical literacy studies to call for “librarians and library educators [to] better engage the educational

climate on campuses by defining academic librarianship through the scholarship of teaching and learning in general, and the scholarship of literacy in particular” (p. 193). In this essay, I wish to extend his call to librarian partners, and specifically to incorporate scholarship on literacy sponsorship.

I mean sponsorship here in the sense that Brandt (2001) employed the term *sponsors*, as “any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, and model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold, literacy—and gain advantage by it in some way” (p. 19). That is, if the act of navigating, accessing, and evaluating networks of information constitutes a form of literacy, a sponsor has something to gain from propagating it. Without an examination of the implications of information literacy sponsorship, the potential regulatory and suppressive functions of library and writing center partnerships are rendered invisible and thus unavailable to scrutiny. Worse, without this sort of examination, the very terms associated with critical literacy and pedagogy are at risk of being co-opted by the very forces they seek to critique.

In this article, I explore the sponsorship dimensions of information literacy and the pedagogical potential for writing center director and librarian partnerships based on this acknowledgement. Similar to the way Brandt (1998) described composition teachers, writing center practitioners and librarians are “neither rich nor powerful enough to sponsor literacy on our own terms” and serve instead as “conflicted brokers between literacy’s buyers and sellers” (p. 183). But perhaps more so than composition teachers, writing center practitioners and librarians are often embedded in larger institutional networks and have access to a greater number of nodal points in which to engender change. These brokers of literacy thus have a greater opportunity for engaging in an approach to change that corresponds to Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985) theory of

articulatory political practice, the kind of incremental approach to change that may have a lasting impact upon the institution(s) to which it is tied.

In short, I assert that through programmatic collaboration (rather than the isolated collaboration of individual teachers or librarians) on information literacy-oriented First Year Experience (FYE) courses, institutional and disciplinary literacy sponsors articulate the terms of literacy sponsorship and thus create a space for a more equitable, less stratified pedagogy. In this regard, I draw on the New London Group’s (1996) definition of pedagogy as “a teaching and learning relationship that creates the potential for building learning conditions leading to full and equitable social participation,” rather than simply reproducing the conditions wherein a powerful group or demographic retains its privilege (p. 60).

I first discuss how the concept of information literacy is inextricably bound up in issues of sponsorship. Second, I more fully explain Brandt’s (1998, 2001) concept of literacy sponsorship—particularly as it pertains to institutional sponsors—and the stratifying effect of literacy sponsorship. Third, I argue that multidisciplinary FYE programs are crucial in enacting meaningful critical approaches to information literacy by encouraging stakeholders to juxtapose disciplinary and institutional norms and their associated literacies. Finally, briefly describing a small liberal arts college’s efforts in this endeavor and focusing especially on the role of the writing center and library, I offer an example of the way one of these partnerships might look. Because of their unique positioning in the university, writing centers and librarians are ideally suited to act as moderators and facilitators in fostering these kinds of programmatic cross-curricular literacy pedagogies.

I want to note here that while this article focuses on the role of librarians and writing center directors in these kinds of programs, I do not wish to diminish the importance of

Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) or compositionists. Rather, the specific circumstances of my experiences in the Intersections program (in which there was not a traditional first-year writing program) inform how I frame this approach. My hope is that compositionists might export some of the pedagogies described in this essay (which is in turn informed by a great deal of composition work) to programs in their own institutions and extend this conversation with a more compositionist bent.

Information Literacy and Sponsorship

Broadly defined, information literacy refers both to the ability to “recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information,” and to the library-based movement that advocates this approach (American Library Association, 1989, para. 3). Perhaps the most obvious manifestation of information literacy in the university can be found in the one-shot librarian-run research sessions. In these sessions, librarians liaise with a class to demonstrate how to do library-based research and navigate a school’s online holdings. Behrens (1994) found the term’s first appearance in its inclusion in a 1974 proposal submitted to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Drafted by Zurkowski, the president of the Information Industry Association (IIA), the proposal suggested the goal of achieving nation-wide information literacy through changing the traditional relationship between libraries and the services and resources he was promoting, such as “information bank vendors, publishers, information by-products, and information evaluation activities” (Behrens, pp. 309-310). In describing the outcomes of information literacy, Zurkowski (1974) wrote, “People trained in the application of information resources to their work can be called information literates. They have learned techniques and skills for utilizing the wide

range of information tools as well as primary sources in molding information-solutions to their problems” (p. 6). The way Zurkowski employed the term has several implications for examining information literacy as a sponsored activity, particularly highlighting the role of sponsorship in information literacy’s origins.

First, the term *information literate* implies that there are information *illiterates*. Further, as information literates *have* techniques, literacy is implied to be both a property and *property*—something that can be possessed. One either has it or one does not. Rather than defining literacy as a continuous process of acculturation into a particular discourse community, Zurkowski (1974) defined it as a product—it is owned. As a product, literacy is a resource, tied to work. It has value only in what it can bring to bear on work. As Zurkowski put it, what distinguishes an information literate from an illiterate is the ability to apply “information resources to their work” (p. 6). Second, information literacy is thus instrumental, in that it is defined in terms of what it *does*, which in this case is the accrual of capital. Indeed, Zurkowski emphasized information literacy as an economic endeavor several times in the document, such as when he noted that “anticipating these changing needs and packaging concepts and ideas to meet them is a major evolving economic activity...” and “the infrastructure also includes all of the human skills necessary to the functioning of these physical means, as well as the wide variety of economic structure on which their continued viability depends” (p. 5). The emphasis on work is important, highlighting the third assumption: that to become information literate, one must be “trained,” as one would in an apprenticeship. In this concept one cannot become information literate without proper training, without a sponsor.

At the time, of course, Zurkowski (1974) represented the Information Industry Association (IIA), which had the materials that would distinguish an information literate

from an illiterate. As head of the IIA, he worked to sponsor information literacy because his industry directly benefitted: an increase in the number of information literate individuals would necessitate an increase in the use of the resources and services his industry proffered. As Zurkowski himself described the IIA, it was “limited by its charter to commercially chartered, for-profit companies, but the functions of the industry are also performed by non-profit and government agencies” (p. 5). I point this out not to portray Zurkowski as some sort of exploitative capitalist, but rather to make clear the historical relationship between librarians, information literacy, and its for-profit sponsors. Indeed, in these instances, he merely demonstrated what Brandt (2001) has asserted, that economic forces are typically what drive efforts to recruit literacy learning.

Third and finally, Zurkowski’s (1974) proposal also highlighted the danger in ignoring the sponsorship dimension of information literacy. As the New London Group (1996) has warned,

The new management theory uses words that are very familiar to educators, such as knowledge (as in ‘knowledge worker’), learning (as in ‘learning organization’), collaboration, alternative assessments, communities of practice, networks, and others.... As we remake our literacy pedagogy to be more relevant to a new world of work, we need to be aware of the danger that our words become co-opted by economically and market-driven discourses, no matter how contemporary and ‘post-capitalist’ these may appear. (p. 67)

And while information literacy finds its origins in the information systems industry, this industry is not information literacy’s sole sponsor. Local institutional sponsors also have something to gain from cultivating it.

Literacy Sponsorship and Institutional Contexts

For those interested in the institutional level of literacy sponsorship, Goldblatt (2007) approached the concept of sponsorship somewhat differently from Brandt (1998, 2001). While Goldblatt acknowledged the socio-material dimensions of sponsorship, he also associated sponsorship (as I do here) with how institutional realities authorize the writers who operate within and who are granted social power from their institutional sponsors. Colleges and universities act as institutional literacy sponsors that authorize writers: the class and education markers demonstrated through fluency in those disciplines and in the dialect of academic English enable writers to assimilate more ably into a society that privileges that dialect. In turn, both the larger institution of the college as well as the individual disciplines housed within it have something to gain from sponsorship, whether it be successful student retention rates; a continuous stream of alumni donors; prestige; or through cultural, disciplinary, and institutional continuity. Sponsoring literacy, particularly in the privileged literacy of standard written academic English, thus authorizes writers; however, it does so at a cost. As the New London Group (1996) pointed out, “Institutionalized schooling traditionally performed the function of disciplining and skilling people for regimented industrial workplaces, assisting in the making of the melting pot of homogenous national citizenries, and smoothing over inherited differences between lifeworlds” (p. 72). Seen from this angle, the work of information literacy takes on more troubling dimensions.

Writing center scholarship has addressed similar issues and can provide some insight that can inform information literacy-based partnerships. Perhaps the best analogue to demonstrate the potential regulatory functions of information literacy and information literacy sessions is through looking briefly at

Grimm's (1996) work on the regulatory function of literacy in the writing center. Grimm drew upon Foucault (1979) to implicate the writing center in the exertion of disciplinary and regulatory power, particularly through its panoptic capabilities. She pointed out Foucault's observation that, "tutors were added to the hierarchical organization of the school in order to increase disciplinary observation, to establish the 'network of gazes'" (p. 7). In short, tutors act as extensions of institutional authority—they work to round out the perceived jagged edges in student writing, smoothing over differences. Moreover, because the teacher isn't present and yet the tutor and the student feel they are accountable to the teacher, the subjects self-regulate: they enact panoptic institutional power upon themselves. This isn't something that is necessarily externally imposed (although historically that has often been the case in writing centers through referral forms and similar documents), but rather something that the subjects impose themselves because they are being monitored through the performance of the student's work.

Additionally, as Grimm (1996) noted, given the limited time and scope of a session, "writing center tutors rarely have time to analyze the conflicts that underlie the writing struggles that bring students to writing centers in the first place, nor are they institutionally positioned to have anything to say about these conflicts" (p. 7). So even those tutors who are trained and inclined to notice such conflicts are rarely in a position to intervene in any systemically meaningful way. In fact, the isolated and individualistic nature of the session ensures that there is always a layer of insulation between sponsor and subject; the various means in which sponsorship regulates literacy learning (or rather, perhaps, literacy disciplining) are rendered invisible. The institution, ambiguous and seemingly contradictory at times (given the differing expectations about writing that different disciplines have) can gaze upon the student,

but the student cannot gaze back. In this conception, it is not the system that is in need of remediation or examination; there is no visible system. Rather, the student requires remediation because the student is configured as deficient, unable to navigate the supposedly singular and normal discourse of the university.

The deficiency paradigm mirrors what Jacobs and Jacobs (2009) characterized as the inoculation view of the composition course and the one-shot library session. In this model, these sites act as an inoculation against bad writing or bad research practices. Jacobs and Jacobs described some of the problems with conveying information literacy in one-shot sessions; these critiques are very similar to those Grimm (1996) outlined for writing center practice. Like tutors, librarians are often presented with students (whether through individual consultations or through one-shot library sessions with classes) whom faculty feel need to be "inoculated" against bad research habits. The approach elides the recursive and unreplicable nature of research and assumes that one "dose" will cure the student of the perceived illness. Of course, the inoculation metaphor echoes the Foucauldian metaphors long associated with the writing center (and decried by its advocates): the clinic, the hospital, the prison, and the madhouse, among others (Grimm, 1996; Healy, 1994; North, 1994; Pemberton, 1992). Each of these metaphors asks us to find "fault" or the need for remediation in the subject and to make him or her "normal" (at least in terms of the privileged literacy).

As many have pointed out, definitions of *normal* or *literate* are often bound up in issues of race and class, and these definitions often function to alienate those already configured in the cultural margins (Delpit, 1995; Elmborg, 2006; Kohl, 1994; Rose, 1989). Consequently, what is "normal" is someone who can not only fluently use the services provided by the information industry, but can do so in a way copacetic to institutional and disciplinary sponsors, often tacitly privileging

white middle-class dialects and cultural norms. Further, this is even more complicated because the expectations of disciplinary sponsors are often vastly different from one another and can enact competing epistemologies and worldviews. When these contradictions manifest in student writing or research practice—such as through improper voice, confused citations, non-credible source work—they may be interpreted by sponsors as signifying abnormality rather than as the result of a novice member of a heterogeneous discourse community attempting to incorporate the conflicting norms of that community (and its sub-communities) into his or her praxis.

The student is referred to the librarian to become inoculated against the perceived abnormalities, enacting the sorts of practice that Grimm (1996) critiques in the context of the writing center. My point here is that even with the best of intentions, the very framework of single session interventionist approaches to information literacy and peer tutoring implicitly argue for the deficiency model of literacy. Thus, rather than simply plugging these features into an already existing course or project and calling it a “collaboration,” a more programmatic and formative approach is required. The same argument applies to partnerships among librarians, writing center practitioners, and individual faculty: as long as these partnerships remain cordoned off from the rest of the institution, these collaborators cannot address the larger issues surrounding literacy sponsorship in that institution. While these collaborations can provide a more meaningful experience for students in the context of that class, library session, or writing center session, they only briefly unite these stakeholders while they and their students remain enmeshed in larger systems of literacy regulation and discipline.

Literacy Sponsorship and Programmatic Approaches

As Goldblatt (2007) has explained, while Brandt (2001) stresses that sponsors have something to gain by their sponsorship, it does not have to be an unfair situation: “As long as the partners come to know each other well enough to recognize where they share interests and where their interests diverge...it is possible for them to sponsor literacy jointly for a particular group or groups; all can benefit and none need to feel subordinated or exploited” (p. 140). The key here is that the stakes need to be spelled out, both among sponsors and those sponsored. Without making those stakes clear, sponsors further muddy the waters and engage in exactly the sort of panopticism and regulation that negates learner agency. Consequently, sponsors must be better positioned to articulate the stakes of their sponsorship, joining those stakes to other sponsorship endeavors and subsequently evaluating them.

Grimm (1996) has drawn upon Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985) theory of articulatory political practice to advocate for the writing center to remediate systems rather than writers. One could also apply this to information literacy endeavors as well. She explained,

Articulatory practice, rather than hopefully holding out for a revolutionary event, constantly seeks ways of changing the discursive terrain, identifying nodal points that can be articulated and moved in the direction of a more democratic practice.... Laclau and Mouffe argue that the possibility for a deeper democracy exists in an acceptance of the multiplicity of viewpoints in circulation and the ongoing effort to articulate multiple discourses in the direction of greater democratic practice. (pp. 21-22)

In the case of the writing center and the library, while both have often been positioned

in somewhat marginalized ways as a remedial service to faculty and students instead of serious intellectual endeavors in and of themselves (Grimm, 1996; Jacobs & Jacobs, 2009; Pemberton, 1992), they have access to nodal points across campus in that they work with people throughout the school (faculty, staff, and students) rather than within a particular department. Both share a great deal of common ground in positing the objects of their study as processes (writing, research) rather than solely as products or content, and they share an interest in critical literacy and the ways in which meaning is made. Moreover, because of the generalist nature of their objects of inquiry, they have a pan-disciplinary understanding of the ways in which meaning is made and privileged in the various disciplines housed in the university. In short, they have the connections and knowledge to engage in meaningful articulatory practice.

As the New London Group (1996) has observed, “When learners juxtapose different languages, discourses, styles, and approaches, they gain substantively in meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic abilities and in their ability to reflect critically on complex systems and their interactions” (p. 69). This can apply as much to faculty in Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and information literacy workshops as it does students: by juxtaposing the different disciplinary norms and epistemologies inherent in navigating the information associated with their disciplines, institutional sponsors have a chance to engage in exactly the kind of critical reflection that may enable them to see the role they play in regulating literacy subjects. I share now one example of such an attempt at a small liberal arts college through an FYE program called “Intersections.”

Intersections

In brief, the Intersections program at this Midwestern, private college is a required first-semester liberal arts class. This student body is comprised primarily of white Midwesterners,

though there is a minority of students of color and international students. The students come from a variety of backgrounds: due in part to a robust athletics program, students are recruited from a diverse range of academic ability and socio-economic backgrounds. Many students are admitted provisionally and are required to take courses such as Reading and Writing Skills to continue their coursework. Consequently, writing tutors at the college have historically been more demographically diverse than the general student body in order to more ably speak to a wider variety of student experience.

Because of the college’s small size, Intersections serves as the first writing intensive course freshmen take there in lieu of a required first-year composition course; there simply are not enough compositionists or contingent faculty to run a traditional Writing Program. The common framework of the class focuses on critical literacy as engaged through reading, formal and informal writing assignments, peer review sessions, and information literacy seminars. Faculty members from across the disciplines volunteer to teach the class, and such work counts toward tenure and promotion. To prepare to teach the course, instructors attend an approximately week-long workshop at the end of the school year, during which they are trained by the Intersections Council director, by librarian partners, by the WAC coordinator, and by each other. These workshops provide librarians and WAC proponents a point of intervention for a more critical approach to writing and research pedagogy among a variety of faculty. The work done in these sessions is reinforced via Intersections meetings and WAC workshops held throughout the school year. In essence, the workshops provide librarians and writing center practitioners a chance to sponsor a more critical form of information literacy, encouraging faculty members to become more reflective sponsors themselves.

Librarian and writing center partnerships are hardwired into the course. Both are

represented on the Intersections Council, the governing body of the program. Each section of the course is partnered with a writing tutor who works with the instructor and students both in and outside of the class. Tutors typically assist in librarian-guided information literacy sessions, in responding to student writing, and in modeling and mediating peer review. Librarians also partner with individual sections of the class to consult with faculty and students on research issues for writing assignments specific to that section. Librarian involvement went from initially hosting a limited number of drop-in sessions to a more formative approach that informs the design of writing and research assignments. They participate in the annual training workshop, emphasizing in particular the concept of information literacy. Their in-class contributions typically consist of hosting citation formatting sessions, workshops on plagiarism, and sessions on information literacy.

So, rather than work in isolation through one-shot sessions, the various stakeholders at the college—writing center practitioners, librarians, and faculty—have instead sought to foster a collaborative model in which the interests and values of the various sponsors involved in student literacies are made more transparent through dialogue. In the workshops that prepare faculty to teach Intersections, librarians and writing center practitioners lead sessions that ask them to consider the research and writing practices of their own disciplines in relation to others. For example, in a recent Intersections workshop, librarians presented a document about student learning outcomes for information literacy. They then used the document to prompt discussion among faculty participants about the way they do research and their expectations for research among students in their disciplines. Many faculty members were surprised at the degree of difference that separated their disciplines and commented on the sorts of confusion their students must encounter due to this difference. They then

collaborated with the librarian partners and negotiated with one another to revise the outcomes document in as mutually beneficial a way as possible. The revised document then provided faculty with a model to present to their respective departments and also helped inform colleagues in their departments about the sorts of preparation their prospective students would have emerging from the Intersections course.

Similarly, the writing center director helps faculty develop writing assignments, rubrics, peer review opportunities, and ways to respond to student writing. Intersections faculty members upload their assignment sheets and syllabi to a common Blackboard site, and these documents are shared and discussed at length in the workshop. Again, they are often surprised at the ways in which different disciplinary lenses are brought to bear on the same assignment. The center director and librarian partners then act as moderators as faculty negotiate how the assignments might best prepare students for both other liberal arts courses as well as discipline-specific courses. The discussions about rubrics and ways to respond to student writing have been particularly fruitful in encouraging faculty to articulate and explicate the various values that frequently inform the way they assess student writing. These conversations also allow librarians and the writing center director a point of intervention to address the often invisible class- and background-based norms that circulate regarding these expectations.

For example, as the writing center director, I was able to engender a conversation on class and language norms among faculty members in one of the WAC workshops that Intersections instructors are encouraged to attend. Using material from Bean's (2011) *Engaging Ideas*, I led a discussion on common usage issues in student writing. Although many faculty members began by expressing frustration with their students' ostensible neglect of "standard" English, the conversation quickly turned to ways that

annoyance with student usage often reflects the privilege that faculty members' native dialect enjoys in the academy. They also discussed how often they confused and conflated the sense of grammar as etiquette with grammar as traditional school conventions. In other words, they began to see that what they perceived to be "errors" in student usage derived not from stupidity or laziness, but rather from either an alignment with a culture or discourse outside of privileged dialects or an unfamiliarity with (or even resistance to) the norms of a given privileged dialect and/or academic genre. Further, participants extended this discussion to stylistic and research conventions within and among their disciplines; they began to see that there is no singular information literacy but rather several information literacies.

These differences thus confront students and stakeholders with the fact that knowledge-making and literacies are social practices that perform culture- and discipline-specific values and ideologies. Their individual ideas of what constitutes "proper" or "academic" English are problematized because they are juxtaposed with conceptions that are often similar but just different enough to cause some cognitive friction. WAC, writing center, and information literacy practitioners capitalize on this friction in the workshops by elaborating their own experiences working with students navigating these discursive contexts in which each, though different, is presented as universal. Practitioners act as student advocates in describing the sorts of confusion that arise when students blend all of these discourses and literacies together in an often-contradictory mishmash of "academic English." In other words, writing center practitioners and librarians work to provide narratives of the confusion and stratification that result from rounding out the supposedly jagged edges of student literacy. They present the results of uncritical approaches to information literacy to faculty members and negotiate potential approaches together.

Again, despite the intentions of the program, partners in Intersections acknowledge that it is not enough to simply put faculty in a program and hope they come to these realizations themselves, or worse, that they somehow escape the problem of exercising power on students. Even as self-supposed benevolent sponsors, as Grimm (1996) has suggested, "when we pretend that this regulatory power is liberating or culture-neutral, we miss opportunities for honest and critical engagement that might eventually change practices and create a more equitable distribution of power" (p. 8). While the workshops, student advocacy, and student membership in the Intersections Council help to ameliorate the inequitable nature of any literacy-learning enterprise, Intersections partners are continually in the process of (re-)negotiating the stakes of the collaboration.

Obviously, the sort of program I have described here is not necessarily generalizable. The conditions specific to the college, both in terms of resources and limitations, have been vital in crafting the program's identity as it now stands. The school's small size (composed of approximately 1,650 students) and decades-long tradition of WAC have enabled faculty across disciplines to engage in the conversations necessary for a multidisciplinary program like Intersections to work. Further, the lack of any form of required first year composition course has provided a sort of exigency for faculty to participate. That is, the deficiency model ironically provides a rationale for the program's existence among faculty who might otherwise be dismissive of a liberal arts course—because doing otherwise means that their specific discipline may not be adequately represented to first year students. They then become stakeholders and fellow advocates through the workshops and their firsthand experiences teaching the course. As a result, the school's small size and the direct stake of faculty members across disciplines (even outside of the program) have been deciding factors in Intersection's longevity.

That said, many of the principles and models developed in the program can act as templates for those interested in fostering programmatic collaborations in larger university contexts. To be clear, I am not asserting that Writing Intensive FYE programs like Intersections can or should replace first year composition courses or programs. Because of the college's small size, during my time there, I was the only compositionist. As a result, there couldn't be a composition program in the traditional sense. Rather, I would encourage fellow WPAs and compositionists to consider the possibilities such a program has to offer in terms of reinforcing and supporting what occurs in FYC programs. Conversely, I would encourage other stakeholders in programs like Intersections to consider what compositionists have to offer in terms of their expertise and sponsorships lenses. Given my own background and discipline, I still reserve concerns about substituting a liberal arts FYE course for a first year composition course. Accordingly, I worked to try to bring a more composition-oriented pedagogy to the program. In this regard, I suppose I was not unlike other stakeholders who wanted their own disciplinary lenses and norms to have more of an influence on the program's content.

While the conditions inherent to that college were vital in cultivating the program, they were not deterministic. Intersections evolved through a process of articulation. Partnerships between FYE programs, writing programs, writing centers, librarians, and faculty can provide the basis for long-term and large-scale collaborations that seek to take what each knows about best practices and put it in conversation with one another—to foster an environment in which multiple perspectives work to articulate the diversity of discourses within, among, and about student literacies toward more reciprocal and participatory practices. For the reasons I enumerated above, information literacy is crucial to this work, and librarians and writing

center staff have been pivotal in initiating it at this college.

As for the Intersections program, it continues to evolve. Participants still encounter and address the deficiency model, and faculty still often harbor vague expectations about what the program really does. Some expect students who emerge from Intersections to be completely conversant in that faculty member's discourse of choice, and they are aghast when students are not. Consequently, conveying the expectations and the goals of the program has become increasingly important for participants. Further, although the curriculum currently requires students to take sophomore- and junior-level writing intensive courses, these courses are not necessarily discipline specific. That is to say, students are not required to take Writing Intensive courses specific to their major as part of the requirement, and not all Writing Intensive courses at these levels presume to teach students how to write specifically for that discipline. Though some courses do exactly this (for example, Writing in Psychology), others do not (such as Personal Essay, or Writing Theory, Methods, and Tutoring). Some majors require a discipline specific sophomore-level class; others do not. Student familiarity with discipline-specific writing and information literacy thus varies (often drastically) depending upon the discipline.

Finally, although the Intersections program seeks to foster a critical approach to information literacy at the college, it is important to remember that as a resource, literacy still serves to stratify and to determine economic possibilities. Harkening back to the New London Group (1996), a pedagogy that engenders equitable social participation does not end at the edges of campus. So, while projects like Intersections can broaden notions of literacy within the college, if institutional literacy sponsors take the New London Group's definition of pedagogy seriously, they must seek to expand partnerships beyond the college. Several

scholars outline the importance and interconnection of multiliteracies and local activism (Flower, 2008; Goldblatt, 2007; McLeod & Maimon, 2000; Parks & Goldblatt, 2000), providing models for writing center and librarian practitioners to export multiliteracy pedagogies to community partners. Consequently, the college's writing center and library have been discussing ways in which to develop reciprocal partnerships with local libraries, schools, and nonprofits through its Center for Community-Based Learning.

To conclude, collaborative information literacy projects provide the opportunity for faculty and staff to develop into what Brandt (1998) has referred to as "the right kinds of literacy sponsors," who foster "sites for the innovative rerouting of resources into projects of self-development and social change" (p. 169). And while the work of establishing partnerships and finding new ways to incorporate student voices can be rewarding and appear self-evidently good, it must continue to be problematized and examined.

For example, more scholarly work explicating the sponsorship of information literacy endeavors beyond the institutional level is necessary, though work on the "Open Access" movement has been addressing it from another angle. Further, advocates should examine the implications of non-expert and non-composition faculty teaching Writing Intensive FYE courses and information literacy. Although there have been productive critiques regarding the practice of teaching assistants who instruct in first year composition, there has not been a similarly thorough examination of the practice of faculty members teaching writing and information literacy practices outside of their disciplines. While the Intersections model frames this practice as beneficial, it still leaves many questions unaddressed. These concerns—and others—inform the evolving reflexive practice of those involved in a program of intersections between literacy and information, among literacies and students, and among students and their sponsors.

References

- American Library Association. (1989). *American Library Association presidential committee on information literacy: Final report*. American Library Association.
- Bean, J. C. (2011). *Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Behrens, S. J. (1994). A conceptual analysis and historical overview of information literacy." *College & Research Libraries (July)*, 309-322.
- Brandt, D. (1998). Sponsors of literacy. *College Composition and Communication* 49(2), 165-185.
- Brandt, D. (2001). *Literacy in American lives*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: the New Press.
- Elmborg, J.K. (2005). Libraries and writing centers in collaboration: A basis in theory. In J.K. Elmborg & S. Hook (Eds.), *Centers for learning: Writing centers and libraries in collaboration* (pp. 1-20). Chicago, IL: ACRL.

- Elmborg, J.K. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32(2), 192-199.
- Elmborg, J.K., & Hook, S. (2005). *Centers for learning: Writing centers and libraries in collaboration*. Chicago, IL: ACRL.
- Flower, L. (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of public engagement*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Goldblatt, E. (2007). *Because we live here: Sponsoring literacy beyond the college curriculum*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Grimm, N.M. (1996). The regulatory role of the writing center: Coming to terms with a loss of innocence. *The Writing Center Journal* 17(1), 5-29.
- Healy, D. (1994). Countering the myth of (in)dependence: Developing life-long clients. *Writing Lab Newsletter* 18, 1-3.
- Jacobs, H. LM. & Jacobs, D. (2009). Transforming the one-shot library session into pedagogical collaboration: Information literacy and the English composition class. *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 49(1), 72-82.
- Kohl, H. (1994). *I won't learn from you: The role of assent in learning*. New York, NY: the New Press.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London: Verso.
- McLeod, S., & Maimon, E. (2000). Clearing the air: WAC myth and realities. *College English* 62(5), 573-583.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review* 66(1), 60-92.
- North, S. M. (1994). Revisiting the idea of a writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 15(1), 7-19.
- Parks, S., & Goldblatt, E. (2000). Writing beyond the curriculum: Fostering new collaborations in literacy. *College English* 62(5), 584-606.
- Pemberton, M. (1992). The prison, the hospital, and the madhouse: Redefining metaphors for the writing center. *The Writing Lab Newsletter* 17(1), 11-16.
- Rose, M. (1989). *Lives on the boundary: The struggles and achievements of America's underprepared*. New York, NY: the New Press.
- Zurkowski, P. (1974). *The information service environment relationships and priorities*. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.