12-2020

Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors: A Collaborative Approach

Melissa Bowles-Terry
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, melissa.bowles-terry@unlv.edu

Kaitlin Clinnin
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, kaitlin.clinnin@unlv.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/comminfolit

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors:
A Collaborative Approach

Melissa Bowles-Terry, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Kaitlin Clinnin, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Abstract

Writing programs and academic libraries are frequent collaborators based on shared concerns about writing and research. However, in these collaborative relationships librarians often share their expertise with writing program administrators and individual instructors without developing the information literacy expertise of the majority of writing program instructors. At the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the library instruction program and the writing program recognized that by facilitating collaborative professional development, they could together provide enhanced support for instructors teaching research-based writing courses. The authors present a case study of their local professional development institute that developed writing instructors' information literacy confidence and expertise. Based on this experience, the authors offer ways that libraries and writing programs can collaborate to develop writing instructors' information literacy expertise so that the instructors are better prepared to integrate research and writing into the writing curriculum and support students' research and writing learning needs.

Keywords: information literacy, writing, collaboration

Innovative Practices
edited by Andrea Baer, Carolyn Gamtso, and Merinda McLure

Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors: A Collaborative Approach

Library instruction programs collaborate with writing programs at many institutions in the United States due to their shared focus on research-based writing. These collaborations are a natural outgrowth of shared goals and values of inquiry, critical thinking, reading, and communication that are present in our respective disciplinary frameworks such as the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL, 2015) *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* and the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA, 2014) *WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition*. Our shared goal is that students become aware consumers and producers of information who can locate, evaluate, and use information in their academic, professional, and personal lives. When compared, the library and rhetoric/composition disciplinary frameworks present a mutual understanding about construction of knowledge and authority, research and writing as processes, and research and writing as inquiry-based (Friedman & Miller, 2018; McClure, 2016). The alignment of our respective disciplinary threshold concepts facilitates productive collaborations between libraries and writing programs including curriculum development, classroom instruction, and research into writers' composing and research practices (Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Brady et al., 2009; Elmborg, 2003; Jacobs & Jacobs, 2009; Nelson, 2013; Norgaard, 2004; Teagarden & Carlozzi, 2017).

Although libraries and writing programs often partner to instruct, support, and assess student learning, one potential area for additional collaboration is writing instructor professional development. In our experience, Melissa as head of instruction in the Libraries and Kaitlin as director of composition in the English department, our most valuable partnership emerged when we recognized a shared goal—to develop information literacy teaching skills in writing instructors—and collaborated to develop a program that would benefit the library instruction program and the writing program. In this article, we suggest that librarians and writing program administrators should collaborate to offer professional development to writing instructors. We first examine the most common collaborative library-writing program partnerships, and then identify some of the key issues within the discipline and within our specific institutional context that joint professional development could mitigate. We argue that developing writing instructors' information literacy expertise benefits both libraries and writing programs. Libraries can develop more sustainable models of information literacy instruction, and writing programs can support students' information literacy skills throughout the course curriculum. We detail our collaborative efforts to facilitate a

two-day professional development institute on information literacy and research-based writing for part-time instructors and graduate teaching assistants in the writing program.

Current Approaches to Library-Writing Program Partnerships

Typical library-writing program partnerships have been based on a model of sharing expertise. As information literacy experts, librarians share their expertise to help writing instructors design effective research assignments and to instruct students in information literacy practices via one-shot workshops, embedded librarianship, integrated curricula, or other formats (Mackey & Jacobson, 2010; Markgraf et al., 2015; Reale, 2016). Librarians function as information literacy experts who consult with and support writing instructors so that they can focus on the course aspects that fall within their own content expertise. The writing instructors ideally learn about information literacy through these interactions and apply this knowledge in future instructional situations, but it is not intended that writing instructor develop any information literacy expertise through this process.

One of the most common activities that falls under the sharing expertise model is classroom-based information literacy instruction. Librarians work with instructors to provide information literacy instruction in writing courses, often through one-shot instruction models. The problems with a one-shot library instruction model are well-documented (Bowles-Terry & Donovan, 2016). One-shot instruction is not an effective pedagogical approach because students need ongoing instruction and practice in order to develop information literacy and research skills. One-shot instruction is also resource-intensive, particularly for very large, required, multi-section courses like first-year writing, and the logistics alone (making matches between librarians and instructors, booking rooms, etc.) may demand a full-time staff member. In short, one-shots are neither sustainable nor scalable. Librarians have developed creative solutions to this problem, such as supplemental online resources, embedded librarianship, and credit-bearing information literacy courses attached to an existing writing course (Artman et al., 2010). However, regardless of the format, the librarian still functions as the information literacy expert who develops information literacy-related curricula and provides ongoing research support to students *and* instructors.

In contrast to the traditional model of sharing expertise, we suggest that libraries and writing programs partner to *develop* expertise. Librarians and writing program administrators can collaborate on developing writing instructors' information literacy expertise so that instructors more effectively scaffold information literacy concepts and practice throughout the writing course curriculum. With a solid foundation in information literacy, instructors can present writing and information literacy from the beginning of the courses not as separate, distinct processes but as a

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Bowles-Terry & Clinnin
Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors

braided process of inquiry (Kastner & Richardson, 2016). Writing instructors will also be better prepared to assist students with critical research needs throughout the course. Although some librarians may worry that preparing writing instructors to teach information literacy will reduce the overall need for academic librarians, developing instructors' information literacy expertise does not diminish librarians' importance in first-year writing courses. Instead, shared expertise will enable writing instructors and librarians to better incorporate information literacy into the first-year writing curriculum and to use librarians' disciplinary expertise beyond showing students how to navigate scholarly databases. Instructors can reinforce information literacy dispositions and practices before and after library instruction.

Developing shared information literacy expertise will also help libraries to offer their resources sustainably. The administrative and instructional labor necessary to support many classes lessens as instructors are better prepared to incorporate information literacy into the curriculum, allowing librarians to develop new partnerships across campus.

Librarians and writing programs are still critical partners on curriculum design, instruction, assessment, and student support, but these will be more collaborative endeavors that fully and sustainably use librarians' expertise.

The Need for Shared Expertise in Institutional and Program Context

Our desire to move from a model of sharing expertise to developing expertise has emerged from our experiences as the head of instruction in the Libraries and director of composition at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). Our institutional and program contexts, instructor population, and previous partnerships on curriculum design and assessment revealed the need for instructor professional development. Although our collaborative activities were productive, we also recognized that the library-writing partnership could have greater, sustained impact by including more members (both librarians and writing instructors) and developing shared expertise in information literacy and writing. In the following section, we explain more of our institutional context and specific experiences that led us to develop expertise through writing instructor professional development.

UNLV is a large, public, broad access university that recently earned R1 status. *U.S. News & World Report* named UNLV the most diverse university for undergraduates in the United States, and UNLV is classified as a Minority-Serving Institution; an Asian American, Native American, and Pacific Islander-Serving Institution (AANAPISI); and a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI). Additionally, UNLV serves many students who have risk factors that may impact their ability to

Bowles-Terry & Clinnin
Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

succeed and persist in college. The class that entered UNLV in 2016 included 37% of students who were eligible for Pell Grants and 51.2% who were the first generation in their family to attend college. The university is committed to increasing retention, persistence, and completion rates and has emphasized the importance of students' first-year experience.

A key component of the first-year experience is the composition course sequence. All students are required to complete two composition courses, English 101 (introduction to college writing) and 102 (research-based writing), ideally within their first academic year. The Composition Program annually enrolls about 9,000 ethnically and socio-economically diverse students. Approximately 100 instructors teach composition, and 96% of instructors are contingent faculty (part-time instructors and graduate teaching assistants). The Composition Program is a critical site for university efforts to retain and support students because the critical reading, thinking, writing, and research skills students begin to develop in the composition sequence set students up for success in the rest of their academic careers.

The University Libraries and the Composition Program have been long-time partners to provide support to English 102 students and instructors. Before the 2018-19 academic year, the Teaching & Learning librarians met with most English 102 classes (approximately 70 sections per semester) for two class sessions and taught students about research topic development and source location and evaluation. The Libraries assessed the classroom instruction and students' information literacy skills by collecting annotated bibliographies from the English 102 courses. However, the Libraries and the Composition Program had not collaborated on programmatic assessment or curriculum design, although librarians worked with individual instructors to assist with assignment design for the final research project. In 2017, Kaitlin began her position as the new director of composition and initiated a major revision of the English 102 curriculum that involved the Libraries faculty from the beginning. The goal of curriculum reform was to address issues with existing curriculum and include more explicit instruction in research. Specifically, the new curriculum aimed to change student habits of looking for sources to support a predetermined position and to change instructor habits of assigning an arbitrary number of sources to complete a paper. The goal of curriculum reform was to address issues with the existing curriculum. The new curriculum, informed by the ACRL *Framework* and the WPA *Outcomes Statement*, presents writing and research as braided, inquiry-based processes. Students begin by generating research topics and research questions, then locating and evaluating sources, understanding and synthesizing ideas from sources, and ultimately developing a research-based argument.

The new English 102 curriculum was piloted in Spring 2018 by a mix of part-time instructors and graduate teaching assistants. The Composition Program, the University Libraries, and the Center for Research and Educational Assessment jointly assessed the pilot and "traditional" English 102 curricula by reviewing student annotated bibliographies and final argumentative research essays using collaboratively-developed rubrics. The assessment analysis found no significant difference in student performance between the two curricula. The assessment results were surprising because as information literacy and writing experts, we believed that the new curriculum better scaffolded writing and research skills and practice throughout the semester to support student learning. Kaitlin facilitated focus group discussions with the pilot program instructors, who revealed that they felt unprepared to teach information literacy content. Instructors perceived information literacy instruction as the librarians' responsibility during the one-shot sessions. Based on the assessment findings, instructor feedback, and our own reflections, we realized that we had been *sharing* our respective expertise to revise the curriculum, but without *developing* instructors' expertise there would be no impact on student learning.

Based on this realization, we proposed an interdisciplinary professional development institute to help instructors teach research-based writing in a scaffolded, synthesized way. We wanted to emphasize the "braided" nature of research-based writing so that instructors would teach information literacy as an integral part of the writing curriculum. Our goal was not to eliminate one-shot instruction, but to ensure that information literacy instruction occurred throughout the writing course. We envisioned a train-the-trainer model to develop information literacy skills, knowledge, and dispositions in the writing instructors. Some train-the-trainer models focus on tools or scripts for teaching databases, but we wanted to focus on dispositions so instructors could identify and support students through difficult points like finding and scaling a research topic or reading and synthesizing new information. We also imagined the professional development institute as a space to bring together experts from different areas to collaboratively develop our shared expertise related to research-based writing: writing faculty (part-time instructors, graduate teaching assistants, and administrators) as professional writing experts, and library faculty (teaching and learning librarians, administrators, and peer research coaches) as information literacy experts. Given the professional expertise of all participants, regardless of their employment status, we were committed to compensating all participants for their time and contributions. In the following section, we explain what this professional development opportunity looked like in our specific context.

A Collaborative Model of Writing Instructor Professional Development

The purpose of the professional development institute for writing instructors was two-fold: first, to develop a shared understanding of writing and information literacy concepts in the English 102 curriculum, and second, to create course materials informed by these concepts. Participants worked with librarians, writing program administrators, and other writing instructors to understand the course learning outcomes and assignment sequence and to create course materials (lesson plans, class activities) that support student learning about research-based writing throughout the semester. At the end of the institute, participants shared their materials on the Composition Program site for all instructors to use.

We offered the professional development institute prior to the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters. The institute was open to all Composition Program instructors, a potential pool of approximately 100 part-time instructors and graduate teaching assistants. Interested individuals completed a brief application that asked about their plans to teach English 102 and their professional reasons for attending the institute. We selected instructors whose goals aligned with the institute's objectives and who would be teaching English 102 in the coming semester. The nature of our course scheduling process meant that more part-time instructors participated in the fall workshop while more graduate teaching assistants participated in the spring workshop, but we intentionally selected instructors with a range of teaching experience to diversify each institute's cohort. We accepted 20 instructors for each session, and 40 instructors participated overall. Participants received a stipend and meals. To receive the stipend, participants were required to attend the two-day institute; work with librarians and other instructors to create course materials to develop writing and information literacy skills; and share created materials on the Composition Program instructor site.

We structured the two-day institute around 1) developing learning outcomes for lesson plans that aligned with assignment and course goals, 2) designing learning activities for class time that would help students reach the learning outcomes, and 3) using classroom assessment techniques to measure student progress towards the outcomes. (See Appendix A for full outline of the two-day workshop.)

Developing Learning Outcomes

On the first day of the institute, we established a shared foundation of knowledge about writing and information by examining the disciplinary and local context for research-based writing. Prior to the institute, participants read the ACRL *Framework*, the WPA *Outcomes Statement*, and articles about

backward design and classroom assessment practices. During the institute, we facilitated several activities for participants to understand how information literacy concepts aligned with and supplemented their existing expertise in writing instruction. First, participants worked with the disciplinary frameworks to identify shared concepts, goals, and outcomes for research-based writing. After participants understood the disciplinary context and expectations, we examined how these disciplinary frameworks informed the local English 102 curriculum by presenting five learning outcomes for research-based writing instruction. These learning outcomes were drafted collaboratively by writing program administrators and instruction librarians, and the outcomes represented our collaborative goals for research in English 102. Our five shared learning outcomes, which structured the rest of the institute, were:

- Question: Students will be able to identify a research question that is appropriate in scope and feasibility in order to guide a research project.

- Explore: Students will be able to develop and apply search strategies in order to locate sources to fill information needs. They will demonstrate flexibility and persistence as they revise their strategies. Students will be able to find information from a variety of types of sources in order to address a research problem.

- Analyze: Students will be able to evaluate information sources for different uses in order to complete research projects. They will apply critical thinking in order to determine the reliability, applicability, and responsible use of the resource.

- Extend: Students will contribute to the scholarly conversation at an appropriate level and credit the contributing work of others in their creation of new information.

- Communicate: Students will communicate their research process and findings in a range of disciplinary and professional genres to academic audiences.

The five learning outcomes helped instructors understand information literacy and writing as integrated concepts to scaffold throughout the semester. After discussing these learning outcomes, we discussed how to develop learning outcomes for a class session. Participants then worked in groups to develop learning outcomes for different class sessions related to the "Question" outcome. We focused on the "Question" outcome because the research question was a new curricular concept, and librarians had previously addressed research topic development and refinement in their instructional sessions. We anticipated that instructors would be the least familiar with the "Question" outcome and could benefit from analyzing and practicing the outcome. In collaboration with the library faculty, participants developed the following "Question" class session outcomes:

Bowles-Terry & Clinnin
Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

- Students will identify components of an effective research question to evaluate peer questions

- Students will identify potential stakeholders surrounding their research topics

- Students will discover potential research topics by categorizing keywords from their mind-maps into what is arguable, what is factual, and what constitutes personal/unsupportable opinion

Instructors can use these learning outcomes, developed in partnership with librarians, to structure a class lesson before or after the library instruction session.

Creating Learning Activities

After developing learning outcomes, the second part of the professional development institute focused on designing learning activities to meet these outcomes. Participants spent the afternoon identifying common bottlenecks[1] in research-based writing courses (e.g., choosing an appropriately-scoped research topic) and developing activities to help students overcome these issues and make progress towards developing a research question. Writing instructors and library faculty collaboratively worked on designing learning activities that would help students address bottlenecks and practice research skills. We asked instructors to consider:

- **Where** might students get stuck when tackling this skill?

- **How** can they practice mastering this skill in class? Out of class?

- **What** order is best for sequencing these practice activities?

- **What** resources will students need?

Using this process, we again focused on the "Question" so that instructors would have a variety of activities related to this outcome. One "Question" lesson plan designed by instructors guides students through a process of discovering subtopics within a larger topic. Students discuss the difference between a report they may have written in high school and an argumentative research paper, define arguments, and discuss what is arguable and what it means to take a position. In a previous class session, students would have created a mind-map with potential keywords describing their "big" topic, and then in the class they would categorize their keywords and subtopics into categories: fact-based, argument-based, and personal-opinion based. Students then provide feedback to one another on the categories they identified and the potential arguable research questions they are working toward. (See Appendix B for full lesson plan.)

Selecting Classroom Assessment Techniques

On the second day of the workshop, we shared various classroom assessment techniques (CATs) that instructors could use in daily lesson plans to determine what students are learning in the classroom and how well they are understanding it (Bowles-Terry & Kvenild, 2015). We offered instructors a few options for classroom assessment, including preconception checks, minute papers, transfer and apply, and other quick ways to check student understanding of writing and research concepts.

We incorporated several of these assessment techniques into the professional development institute to check instructors' understanding. The major assessment technique was the final deliverable: two completed lesson plans for the "Question" and another learning outcome presented on day one. After learning about the importance of assessment and CATs, instructors collaborated to finalize their "Question" lesson plans. Instructors then formed new groups to work on a new learning outcome. In these groups, instructors created lesson plans by developing specific learning outcomes for a class session, then designing learning activities to meet the outcome, and finally using assessment techniques to evaluate student understanding of the outcome. By the end of the institute, all participants completed a lesson plan for the "Question" outcome and an additional outcome of their choice. The completed lesson plans were shared in an online folder accessible to all writing instructors and instruction librarians. At the end of the day, instructors showcased their lesson plans to share and celebrate their work. Figure 1 shows the overall process for the institute that begins with "braiding" outcomes for writing and information literacy disciplinary frameworks and subsequently creating collaborative learning outcomes for our local programmatic context, which in turn informed the learning outcomes, class activities, and classroom assessment techniques that instructors and librarians designed.

We also incorporated reflection opportunities for all participants and facilitators throughout the two-day institute as another low-stakes assessment technique. We used reflective prompts for instructors to connect their expertise and previous practices to the new information literacy and pedagogical concepts.

Figure 1: Connections Between Disciplinary Frameworks, Course Outcomes, Class Session Outcomes, Activities, and Assessment Techniques

Disciplinary Frameworks	UNLV English 102 Learning Outcomes	Learning Outcome for Class Session	Class Activity	Classroom Assessment Technique
WPA Critical Thinking, Reading, and Composing Outcome: Students should use composing and reading for inquiry, learning, critical thinking, and communicating in various rhetorical contexts ACRL "Research as Inquiry" Frame: Research is iterative and depends upon asking increasingly complex or new questions whose answers in turn develop additional questions or lines of inquiry in any field	Question Students will be able to identify a research question that is appropriate in scope and feasibility in order to guide a research project	Students will discover potential research topics by categorizing keywords from their mind-maps into what is arguable, fact, and personal or unsupportable opinion	Students create mind-maps to identify keywords describing their "big" topic and then categorize keywords and subtopics into categories: fact-, argument-, and opinion-based.	Mind-maps and lists recorded in student journal entries; instructor distributes index cards to anonymously check for "muddiest point"

Institute Assessment, Revisions, and Future Planning

We used multiple methods to assess whether the institute's outcomes (i.e., to develop a shared understanding of writing and information literacy concepts within the English 102 course curriculum and to create course materials informed by these concepts) were met. We examined the final deliverables to identify instructors' understanding of the writing and information literacy concepts and the course learning outcomes. We solicited participant feedback by asking instructors to complete an event evaluation form and to write an anonymous reflective letter about their experience. We have also been able to assess the ongoing effectiveness of the institute by how many instructors (including those who were not participants) have accessed the institute resources and lesson plans. We also plan to collect student work from English 102 as part of the next writing program assessment so that we can determine if the professional development opportunities have positively impacted student performance.

Based on our assessment, we are confident that the institute met our stated goals. The final lesson plans demonstrate an understanding of how information literacy concepts can be taught within the

writing curriculum. The collected lesson plans provide over 30 class activities that integrate information literacy and writing instruction, a clear increase over the one-shot library instruction. The collaborative process of working from learning outcomes to design class activities and assessment techniques also resulted in a greater diversity of teaching strategies. Participants noted that "Lesson planning . . . is usually a very solitary activity, so having people to discuss with was nice and extremely helpful" and that they appreciated "The time and space to go through planning sessions for different learning outcomes."

We also found that the institute had an unintended but important outcome: it increased the sense of collaboration not only between instructors and librarians but also amongst the writing instructors themselves. The instructors were particularly excited about the opportunity to talk to their colleagues about teaching and to collaborate with librarians and instructors on classroom materials. In their workshop feedback, participants commented that they found it most helpful to "network/connect with fellow instructors with varying levels of experience" and to "collaborat[e] and shar[e] with other instructors whose methods differ from my own."

Now that we have successfully facilitated the professional development institute twice in the 2018-2019 academic year, we are envisioning the future needs and possibilities of our collaborative professional development endeavor. Through this process, we have developed a framework that other librarians and writing program administrators can use to design and implement similar programs in their own institutional contexts (see Appendix C). We explain each of the analytical steps here and illustrate these steps using our own institutional context.

The first step is to identify the local need, or the existent challenge, problem, or situation that could benefit from a professional development program. At UNLV, we recognized that there was a need to better prepare writing instructors to teach writing and information literacy within the research-based writing curriculum. A now emerging need is to sustain this professional development opportunity so that all current and future writing instructors have access to this training.

The second step is to identify the desired resolution, or the ideal way that the local need would be met. In our situation, we would like all instructors to participate in a condensed workshop that would not be as resource-intensive.

The third step is to identify the target audience who could help achieve the desired resolution. Our target audience is the writing program instructors, who are contingent faculty with limited time for uncompensated work activity.

The fourth step is to identify other local stakeholders who are similarly invested in the challenge and available institutional or professional resources that can help achieve the desired result. The libraries and writing program are obvious collaborators, but we can also work with other stakeholders who support instructors across campus such as the faculty center, graduate college, and office of faculty affairs. Some available resources that we have used include campus rooms, professional development funding through different stakeholder offices, and existing professional development opportunities offered by the writing program (such as the required pedagogy course for all new graduate teaching assistants and the orientation meeting for all instructors each semester).

The final step is to design a professional development workshop that meets a local need, targets a particular audience, and uses available personnel and resources to collaborate on the initiative. As we address our emerging local professional development needs, we are integrating information literacy content into existing writing program offerings in order to not to create additional labor for our overworked and under-compensated instructors. We are also creating more online resources such as webinars and annotated, collected course materials so that instructors can access professional resources on their own schedule. Our revised professional development format is a work-in-progress, but we are confident that by using this analytical framework we will find innovative ways to continue developing our shared expertise in sustainable ways that meet our instructors' needs.

Conclusion

The information literacy professional development institute, collaboratively facilitated by the University Libraries and Composition Program, was our response to a local need to develop shared expertise in research-based writing instruction. The institute brought together part-time and full-time faculty as experts in their respective fields with the shared goals of learning more about information literacy and writing disciplinary knowledge and implementing this knowledge in their pedagogical practice. Together, instructors, librarians, peer research coaches, and administrators shared their professional expertise and local experiences to create course materials. Importantly, the institute was designed to meet the needs of contingent faculty, who teach one of the most important courses for student success and retention yet rarely have access to institutional resources to support their success as instructors. The institute resulted in more effective lesson plans to scaffold information literacy instruction throughout the writing course curriculum, an increased sense of

confidence and preparation for writing instructors, and a greater sense of collaboration and community for all participants.

We recognize that our institutional context, for all of its constraints, also presented certain resources to conduct professional development opportunities that may be limited in other institutional settings. We are fortunate to have a large staff of instruction librarians, undergraduate peer research coaches, and writing program administrators who facilitate professional development as part of their jobs. We also had access to event space and funding for stipends, which helped to recruit instructors.

However, we believe that interested librarians and writing program administrators can use the grounding principles of our professional development institute to create collaborative learning opportunities in whatever form best meets their institutional context. An institute of this type can be connected to institutional goals such as retention, progression, and graduation, and its impact can be assessed based on those goals as well as other institutional priorities. Instructors and librarians can advocate for resources based on assessment goals and larger institutional goals in their own contexts.

A collaborative approach to professional development will enable librarians to better understand the curriculum and needs of writing faculty so that they can offer more effective instruction and research services. For writing faculty, such collaborations with information literacy experts will help them create more effective course materials, develop relationships with librarians for continued support, and feel more confident in their own research-based writing knowledge. We believe this model of developing expertise can improve our services, courses, and ultimately, the student learning experience.

Endnote

[1] Bottlenecks are defined by Middendorf and Shopkow (2018) as either *cognitive bottlenecks*, where students' learning is blocked because they have failed to master particular skills or content, or *emotional bottlenecks*, where students have a negative emotional reaction to either the processes of the course or to its subject matter.

References

Artman, M., Frisicaro-Pawlowski, E., & Monge, R. (2010). Not just one shot: Extending the dialogue about information literacy in composition classes. *Composition Studie*s, *38*(2), 93–110.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education.* http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework

Bowles-Terry & Clinnin
Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Bowles-Terry, M., Davis, E., & Holliday, W. (2010). "Writing information literacy" revisited: Application of theory to practice in the classroom. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, *49*(3), 225–230.

Bowles-Terry, M., & Donovan, C. (2016). Serving notice on the one-shot: Changing roles for instruction librarians. *International Information & Library Review*, *48*(2), 137–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1176457

Bowles-Terry, M., & Kvenild, C. (2015). *Classroom assessment techniques for librarians.* Association of College and Research Libraries.

Brady, L., Singh-Corcoran, N., Dadisman. J. A., & Diamond, K. (2009). A collaborative approach to information literacy: first-year composition, writing center, and library partnerships at West Virginia University." *Composition Forum 19.* http://compositionforum.com/issue/19/west-virginia.php

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2014). *WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition (3.0).* http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/243055/_PARENT/layout_details/false

Elmborg, J. (2003). Information literacy and writing across the curriculum: Sharing the vision. *Reference Services Review*, *31*(1), 68–80. https://doi.org/10.1108/00907320310460933

Friedman, S. & Miller, R. (2018). "Give all thoughts a chance": Writing about writing and the ACRL *Framework for information literacy. WPA: Writing Program Administration 42*(1), 72-88.

Jacobs, H. L. M., & 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.

Kastner, S., & Richardson, H. (2016). Researching and writing as braided processes: A co-curricular model. In R. McClure (Ed.), *Rewired: Research-writing partnerships within the frameworks* (pp. 127–150). Association of College and Research Libraries.

Mackey, T., & Jacobson, T. (2010). *Collaborative information literacy assessments: Strategies for evaluating teaching and learning.* Neal-Schuman.

Markgraf, J., Hinnant, K., Jennings, E., & Kishel, H. (2015). *Maximizing the one-shot: Connecting library instruction with the curriculum.* Rowman & Littlefield

McClure, R. (Ed.). (2016). *Rewired: Research-writing partnerships within the frameworks.* Association of College and Research Libraries.

Middendorf, J., & Shopkow, L. (2018). *Overcoming student learning bottlenecks: Decode the critical thinking of your discipline* (1st ed.). Stylus Publishing.

Nelson, J. (2013). "It takes a whole campus": Information literacy in composition and across the curriculum. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 28*(1), 85–116. http://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/teachingwriting/article/view/20719

Norgaard, R. (2004). Writing information literacy in the classroom: Pedagogical enactments and implications. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 43*(3), 220–226.

Reale, M. (2016). *Becoming an embedded librarian: Making connections in the classroom.* ALA Editions.

Teagarden, A. & Carlozzi, M. (2017). Time enough? Experimental findings on embedded librarianship. *WPA: Writing Program Administration 41*(1), 12–32.

Appendix A: Outline for Workshop

Day 1: 9:00 AM–3:00 PM

8:30–9:00   Registration and Breakfast

9:00–9:10   Opening Remarks & Introductions & Logistics
Outline of Workshop Structure:

1. Learning Outcomes

2. Learning Activities

3. Classroom Assessment Techniques

9:10–9:30   Table Introductions & Ice Breaker

9:30–9:50   *Reflection Exercise*

9:50–10:00   **BREAK**

10:00–11:15 Context Setting

- Information literacy & composition outcomes: how do they align?

- What do students bring from ENG 101? What skills do they have on day 1?

- What do we most want them to know, do, and value in ENG 102?

- Introduce and discuss shared outcomes:
  Question/Explore/Analyze/Extend/Communicate

11:15–11:45 *1. Learning Outcomes*

- How to identify primary traits for learning outcomes

- Essential elements of learning outcomes

11:45–12:00 *Reflection Exercise*

12:00–1:00   **LUNCH** provided

1:00–2:00   Develop Learning Outcomes

- Sample learning outcome: developing a research topic

2:00–2:45   *2. Learning Activities*

- Identify bottlenecks & design appropriate scaffolding and practice

- ENG 102 Topic Development Activity

2:45–3:00   *Reflection Exercise*

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]   *Bowles-Terry & Clinnin*
                     Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors

Day 2: 9:00 AM–3:00 PM

8:30–9:00　　Breakfast and Brainstorm

　　　　　　　Reflection

9:00–10:30　*3. Classroom Assessment Techniques*

- Why use CATs?

- Options

  o   preconception check

  o   minute paper

  o   muddiest point

  o   defining features matrix

  o   RSQC2

  o   transfer and apply

10:30–10:40　**BREAK**

10:40–12:00　Lesson planning in groups w/library partners

　　　　　　　Goal: Instructors will develop drafts of lesson plans

- Elements of good lesson plans

  o   Self-check using checklist and consider:

  o   Do your activities align with your learning outcomes?

  o   Does your lesson plan build skills for the big class assignments?

  o   Does your lesson plan include comprehension checks?

12:00–12:45　**LUNCH** provided

　　　　　　　Reflection Exercise

12:45–2:00　Lesson planning in groups w/library partners

2:00–3:00　　Lesson Plan Showcase

- Ask questions, provide feedback, revise where necessary

- Course Plan, Reflection, and Next Steps

Bowles-Terry & Clinnin
Professional Development for Research-Writing Instructors

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Appendix B: Lesson Plan on Refining a Research Topic

English 102: Week 2, Day 2
Lesson Plan Contributor(s):
Kayla Miller, Scott Tenney, Gentry Noel, Merrill Horton, and Rachelle Weigel

Lesson Topic or Title	Refining Your Research Topic: Discovering Subtopics!	
Teacher Materials	Index cards (if not using student journals)	
Student Materials	Journals (if not using index cards)	
Preparation	Ensure students bring materials from previous class (mind-map with peer feedback)	
Outcomes	• Students will discover potential subtopics by categorizing keywords from last class' mind-maps into what is arguable, fact, and personal/unsupportable opinion. • Students will create specific research questions by refining initial topics of interest.	
Evidence	Journal entries or index cards	
Introduction and Lesson/Lecture	Welcome students Get attention with a "hook" or "anticipatory set" Outline goals and agenda for session: • Creating specific research questions Elicit prior knowledge: • High school papers or "book reports" (surveys) versus argumentative research papers Definitions of argument, grounds suitable for argument • What is arguable? • What does it mean to take a position? • Argument versus debate versus opinion	Time: 25

Learning Activities	Students categorize the keywords and subtopics from their mind maps into fact-based, argument-based, or personal opinion-based. Then, students will select three keywords or subtopics from the "argument/arguable" category to form research question. Students will then provide peer feedback on categorizations and potential research questions.	Time: 35
Classroom Assessment Techniques	Deliverables housed in student journals or on index cards	
Closing	Wrap-up, final questions/comments/concerns	Time: 15
After Class		
Student Learning Assessment	• What did students learn? • What do students have left to learn? • How do students know what they have learned and have left to learn?	
Lesson Evaluation	• What parts of the lesson worked well? • What will I do differently next time?	

Appendix C: Institutional Context Analysis handout

Institutional Context: What characteristics define your institution? Your student body? Your instructors? Your administration?	
Local Needs What challenges, problems, or situations exist that may benefit from a professional development program?	
Desired Resolution What is the ideal resolution to the challenge? What would your ideal end goal look like?	
Target Audience Who is your target audience who could help achieve the desired resolution with the help of professional development?	
Stakeholders What other institutional entities in academic affairs, student affairs, IT, facilities, etc. may be interested in this challenge?	
Available Resources What disciplinary, professional, or institutional resources can you use to achieve the desired resolution?	
Program What type of professional development program (online, face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, etc.) will work best in your local context based on this analysis?	