



RSR
41,1

Not at your service: building genuine faculty-librarian partnerships

80

Yvonne Nalani Meulemans and Allison Carr

Information Literacy Program, CSU San Marcos, San Marcos, California, USA

Received 12 July 2012
Revised 19 September 2012
25 September 2012
Accepted 6 October 2012

Abstract

Purpose – The old relationship of librarians serving the faculty as research assistants is long gone. The purpose of this paper is to ask, how can librarians and faculty become genuine partners in student learning and move towards the common goal of getting students to think critically? The authors discuss the need for librarians to initiate more collaborative conversations with professors in order to establish true partnerships with them and go on to describe how they did this using a strikingly and alarmingly frank approach. Building on this foundation, the authors discuss the need to shift from a service orientation to a partnership in student learning.

Design/methodology/approach – The authors describe their work with the New Faculty Institute, a multi-day workshop that serves as an introduction to the university, to build upon their assertions regarding the need for instruction librarians to shift from a service orientation to a partnership with professors.

Findings – The paper offers an action plan to develop and implement a value system that can guide collaboration with faculty. The pieces of the plan include articulating a teaching philosophy, craft and clarify personal policies, develop and practice responses and have confidence in your expertise.

Originality/value – Developing partnerships with professors may sometimes require librarians to respond differently to requests from professors that are problematic. Doing so requires a move away from a service orientation, but towards collaborative efforts to support student learning.

Keywords Universities, University libraries, Academic staff, Faculty-librarian collaboration, Partnerships, Information literacy instruction, Professional values, Faculty outreach

Paper type Case study

Words like “collaboration,” “partnerships,” and “teams” are used all over the library literature about information literacy instruction. Three of the most important contemporary professional guidelines, the *Information Literacy Competency Standards* (Association of College & Research Libraries, 2006b), *Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices* (Association of College & Research Libraries, 2006a) and *Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators* (Association of College & Research Libraries, 2008) are also steeped in this rhetoric. The need for librarian-faculty cooperation and the challenge of doing so has long been a part of professional literature (Farber, 1999; Raspa and Ward, 2000). Among librarians, this subject has great permanence and permeation in our everyday conversation. Teamwork is vital for successful student learning in the unique context within which librarians typically teach: a single session within a professor’s class. The librarian profession has concluded these partnerships are essential to creating learning



The authors wish to thank April Cunningham for providing her tremendous knowledge and support on this topic. This article could not have been completed without her.

opportunities for students. Nevertheless, this teamwork with faculty may not actually occur in the everyday practice of many librarians.

Although not the subject of direct study, many librarians who offer on-demand instruction have found themselves receiving problematic or uninformed requests from professors, such as asking the librarian to “give the library talk” to a class (Eisenhower and Smith, 2009, p. 319). Despite the common agreement that collaborative partnerships are necessary for effective information literacy instruction, librarians’ responses to professors’ misinformed, unfeasible, and/or frustrating requests may differ greatly.

In this article, the authors argue that librarians must cease being at the service of faculty. That is, librarians need to decline the aforementioned types of requests, especially when they are not in the best interest in students. Instead, the authors advocate that librarians must sometimes say “no” to such requests and instead question, engage, and converse with faculty. By doing so, the librarian then places creating learning environments and opportunities for students as a guiding professional value, over and above an individual’s discomfort. The authors then describe their recent presentations to the New Faculty Institute at California State University, San Marcos, as an example of how to adopt and advocate for this non-service approach. Additional activities the authors have found helpful in one-on-one conversations are also described. While the evidence for the efficacy of these activities is anecdotal, the authors have found them helpful in adopting their advocated approach.

When collaboration really is not collaboration

Perceiving a deficiency in their students, professors often approach librarians with only a vague idea of how a librarian could remedy this deficiency. Often, their understanding of the teacher-librarian’s role is far different than ours. They seem to have already decided on how to address their students’ apparent lack of research skills. A few common requests from professors:

Show my students the journals while I’m away at a conference.

Take the student on a tour of the library so they can learn how to do research.

Tell them to not use the Internet and use scholarly sources.

I don’t have a research project for them, but can you talk to my students about the library?

A librarian’s initial reactions to such requests are a silent groan and a roll of the eyes, yet the request is ultimately fulfilled. Commonly heard explanations from librarians for this grin-and-bear it approach indicate an unwillingness to engage to professor further:

But at least I get in front of the students.

I want the professor to know I can be helpful.

It’s the students who will suffer if I don’t do it.

Even if they get something little out of it, it’s worth it.

Students will know that the library is a friendly place.

This is a simplistic explanation, but the behavior indicates much about our teaching philosophy and professional values as teacher-librarians. Instruction librarians know

the responses described above are not how genuine partnerships for instruction are built, and that fulfilling such requests are devoid of any meaningful collaboration, are ineffective professional or pedagogical practices, and lacking student learning outcomes. As Raspa and Ward (2000, pp. 15-16.) aptly claimed: "We have reached a point at which neither librarians nor instructional faculty can adequately teach the research process in isolation of each other." Effective instruction requires the professor and librarian to work together as partners to achieve a common goal. Based on her research on librarian-faculty collaboration, Ivey (2003) found four behaviors that are essential for success in collaboration: a shared, understood goal; mutual respect, tolerance, and trust; competence for the task at hand by each of the partners; and ongoing communication. The responses above do not demonstrate any of these behaviors. Educating a faculty member who is not aware of and not convinced that a different approach will benefit their students, can strike fear in the heart of even veterans to instruction. Furthermore, responding differently than your colleagues could violate a set of accepted norms within a group of librarians at a university, which creates a problematic situation for librarians who are newer to the profession.

The actual response communicated to the professor, however, belies much more about the professional values guiding the librarian. Going along with such requests from faculty could indicate that a librarian feels unable to powerfully articulate to the professor the value of taking a different approach with an assignment. Perhaps the response reveals that the librarian has concluded that any face-time with students is better than the risk of upsetting the professor. There is a great fear in pointing out flaws in an instructor's assignment or problematic request. That instructor could just say "no," or, worse, mistakenly conclude that working with the librarian is too complex, a waste of time, or unnecessary.

But the responsibility does not lie with the professor to approach the librarian with a fully formed idea. Professors often recognize that students need research help or secretly wonder if an assignment is really feasible given the library's resources. They know that the library may be able to help; but have little idea how. And so, a request for a tour of the library is made, assuming that this will achieve the desired outcomes, while knowing that many students will tune out and not see how it is relevant to the assignment. On some level, they may know it is a highly ineffective approach, but they do not know what are effective approaches to building students' information literacy skills. Often, they do not even know the right questions to ask. For these professors, opening a conversation will be welcomed.

Requests also come from professors who just need to fill a class session because of a conflict with a professional conference or may be primarily motivated by the feeling that they have to "send them to the library" to fulfill departmental expectations, without any recognition of the importance for students' research skills. In these instances, even the most measured attempt at engaging the professor will likely be met with a negative response. Nevertheless, a librarian must attempt to engage the professor beyond a simple affirmative response.

Recognizing that a professor's lack of understanding of how librarians can contribute to student learning does nothing to reduce the feeling that the librarian's teaching expertise is being disregarded, dismissed, and disrespected when a professor makes such aforementioned requests (Christiansen *et al.*, 2004; Leckie and Fullerton, 1999; Ivey, 1994; Divay *et al.*, 1987). An additional challenge is that librarians' collaborative culture can

differ from the professor: “Libraries encourage a culture of sharing, cooperation and collaboration, for the ultimate purpose of assisting students in their educational pursuits [...] By contrast faculty culture is generally more isolated and proprietary.” (Christiansen *et al.*, 2004, p. 18.) Furthermore, the existing research assessing librarian/faculty relationships reveal the variety of issues that librarians face when establishing partnerships with faculty. Faculty describe being unaware of how librarians can support their students; may not consider librarians as full partners but instead, as professionals; and viewing their relationships with librarians with less importance than librarians do (Phelps and Campbell, 2012; McGuinness, 2006; Hrycaj and Russo, 2007; Ivey, 1994). When considered all together, librarians have many reasons to take an approach with faculty that aims to build awareness that collaborative work is available. A service approach that fulfills an uninformed request may prove to perpetuate faculty’s ignorance. A professional value system that places the creation of an optimal learning opportunity for students above the worry of being professionally rejected disallows a simple affirmative response to requests from professors.

As the implications of the research described above is considered, the onus is indeed placed on the librarian to find a way to communicate the substance of her negative reply to a professor. Recognizing that the fear of the faculty turning on us is minimal and realizing that there is such a thing as unproductive time with students, opens an entire new world of responses. That is, when a request to “do the library lecture” is received, new responses can be used:

I have an idea that is a bit different and would engage students differently.

What exactly do you want your student to learn/understand/do?

I see what you’re trying to do with this assignment, but I also see possible problems.

Any other response is simply fulfilling the request, which, in all likelihood, would not improve the students’ information literacy skills. There are librarians who deeply value a customer-service-oriented professional practice and see all aspects of librarianship as a service, placing teaching with other services in the library (circulation, interlibrary loan, etc.). However, in order to be an effective teacher, the instruction librarian cannot take such a service-centered orientation. If partnering with faculty is commonly agreed upon as essential to robust and effective teaching, then a service orientation that compromises this perspective is not instruction. Further, if instruction librarians continue to treat what we do as a service, then we will continue to be treated as service providers. The “customer is always right” attitude is not an effective teaching or collaborative philosophy. This attitude will perpetuate an uneven relationship and not adhere the most important point in Ivey’s (2003) behaviors for successful collaboration: mutual respect, tolerance and trust. Also, if instruction librarians fail to engage faculty in a collaborative manner, no amount of marketing or superficial outreach will help to create the partnerships we so desire. When a problematic request is fulfilled, it only ensures that librarians will receive more requests like it.

In tandem with a shift from the service-centered orientation to collaborative instruction, librarians must also rid themselves of the belief that if we only market, sell, or advertise our expertise better; faculty would understand how much we have to offer. Increasing awareness of what a library offers is always a worthwhile endeavor, yet often focuses on the services of the library. The purpose of academic libraries has

always been to support the curricular and research needs of a university or college. As such, instruction programs in libraries are academic programs of the institutions where they reside. While we may market these programs, it is the quality of relationships that individual librarians have with their faculty is the major driver of an instruction program's success.

Ultimately, a librarian's response is determined by her professional value system as well as who is on the receiving end of the inquiry. When a librarian's professional value system is centered on being partners in the teaching/learning endeavor, her actions fundamentally change. Below is one example of how this professional value system was demonstrated to faculty.

If you do not like what is being said, change the conversation

At California State University, San Marcos (CSUSM), individual librarian efforts came together in a series of presentations to new faculty. Each fall, new faculty attend the New Faculty Institute (NFI), a multi-day workshop organized by the CSUSM Faculty Center to orient them to the university. This includes presentations on general information about the campus, human resources information, along with the tenure process. In the past, the library's role in the NFI has been to "sell" the instruction program in a 30-minute session. While this may have been effective in the past, we found that it did not address the common misconceptions of what the library and librarians do with faculty and students. In fall 2012, the organizers changed the format of the NFI to include multiple Friday workshops through the academic year. The librarians requested two sessions, for a total of two hours of contact time.

Our first goal was to point out the common misperceptions and assumptions faculty often have about how their students conduct and complete their research assignments. While brainstorming, we started with a list of our annoyances that come from dealing with uninformed faculty. While this may seem like an unproductive exercise, it helped us to identify all the things we had ever wanted to say to faculty, but hadn't for fear of a negative reaction. We were then able to change the message to what we could do to improve the learning experience for students, with the hope that this would leave faculty open to receiving the messages.

The first presentation, entitled "Creating research assignments that work," focused on the common assumptions faculty hold about college students. Specific points were:

- *Faculty's mental models are different than students.* Students still do not understand that a discipline is not punishment, and a journal is more than a daily diary. We reminded faculty what it was like to be newly exposed to the academy and scholarship.
- *Students do not understand when you say "do not use the internet".* Librarians see this time and again in the assignments of students who come in for help. Students think that this means that they cannot use the databases or the catalog to access the appropriate sources for their paper; while we understand that faculty want their students to use tools beyond Google™. Faculty need to be clear in the requirements for sources.
- *Many students know how to use Wikipedia appropriately.* Most of what students are learning prior to college is that Wikipedia is not an appropriate source to use in their research paper. However, many of them can describe that they use that as

a starting point, by looking for main topic areas, keywords and the sources in each of the entries and to not use it as a source in their bibliographies.

- *Be explicit in your expectations.* Faculty need to be clear in both the instructions and rationale for an assignment. Students do not understand how to tackle an assignment that only says “write a 5-7 page paper on a topic of your choice.” It is too vague for them to be able to accomplish successfully. Librarians may understand why faculty have the requirements they do, but students do not. For example, when a faculty requires students to use three books and ten scholarly sources, librarians will direct students to use those books in the early stages of research for background research; and use the scholarly sources as evidence to support their thesis. But without this kind of instruction, students may never pick this up on their own. Lastly, students do not understand why a psychology professor requires the use of APA while their writing professor likes MLA.
- *We are a teaching university not a research university.* While this is specific to our institution, it is helpful to remind new faculty about the purpose of their new library. In our case, many of our new faculty are coming directly from graduate programs at research institutions, whereas we are primarily a teaching institution. Our collection supports the curriculum of the university, not necessarily the research needs of faculty. Of equal importance to point out to faculty, is to describe the roles of instruction librarians at CSUSM. Librarians at their previous institution may have had different roles.
- *A library tour is useless for everyone involved.* Because so many of our resources are offered online, a tour of the physical library is not the best use of time anymore. In these instances, librarians want to talk more about what the faculty need their students to do. This is a great opener to discourage the creation of artificial assignments.
- *Seniors and graduate students are still novices in your field.* Even after the many classes students take in their major, they may not know the main journals or who the premier researchers are in their field, or how to apply theory to real-life situations. They do not have the depth of disciplinary knowledge that faculty acquire throughout their years of research and teaching. For each research assignment students do, they may have to relearn many of the basics of the topic. Acknowledging the importance of this step in the research process can help students to move forward in developing their own expertise.
- *Do not expect students who have been in a library session/done research before to know how to do research.* We have all spoken to professors who say that even though their students said they’d been to a library session before, their research papers were dismal. It’s helpful to remind students and faculty, alike, that each time they conduct research, they’re practicing for the next time. No one is going to be an expert after one session, and even if students get the basics, they may not be able to apply it to a new situation. Further, even within disciplines different research databases or search strategies may be necessary.
- *Do not expect them to know they can come to the library for help.* Many faculty do not even know this. This was a reminder to faculty that whether or not they decided to work with a librarian on an assignment, they could remind their students that help from a librarian is readily available.

At the conclusion of our presentation, the new faculty related that they, too, have held many of these assumptions, and it was helpful to be able to discuss them with other faculty.

Our second session came later in the fall semester, when faculty were starting to plan for their spring classes. We wanted to catch them after they had graded the research assignments from the fall, in an attempt to offer advice on changes to make for the spring. This session, titled “The good, the bad and the ugly: research assignments that work,” offered examples of assignments that were thought were particularly successful, or particularly terrible. We chose the assignments we highlighted based on the collaborative work that each librarian did with a faculty member. Each example came with a commentary on why students had trouble completely them, along with advice on how to make changes to make it more meaningful for the students:

- *Assignment no. 1: “Find an article, only available in print, with 5 authors, and cite it in APA style.”* We used this assignment to illustrate the usefulness in learning outcomes when developing research assignments. In this case, the professor wanted students to become familiar with APA style, even though they would not be writing a research assignment that semester. This assignment included finding items that even the librarians had trouble locating. We recommended that instead of having students find their own sources, that they be given a list of items to then write citations for.
- *Assignment no. 2: Given abstracts and an example lit review, students compose a lit review during a lab or library instruction session.* This has been a successful result of collaboration between multiple librarians and their subject faculty. Groups of students receive a packet of articles, and then write summaries and synthesize the articles into a mini-literature review. With this assignment, the professors have reported that the quality of students’ final projects have been much higher since we implemented this activity. In all instances of this instruction and assignment, librarians and professors worked closely together over multiple meetings to develop this assignment from scratch.
- *Assignment no. 3: Go observe x, then write and analyze what you saw.* This assignment is an example of both a good and an ugly. We have examples of this working very well, but also of other students struggling to get through it. This assignment can suffer from the aforementioned issue of students still being novices in a discipline, but can be improved when expectations are very explicit. Many times students cannot identify a phenomenon in the wild or in the research literature that they only recently have been introduced to without a huge amount of support and guidance from the faculty.
- *Assignment no. 4: Observe a courtroom trial, identify and analyze legal issues.* This is an example of a successful iteration of what’s described above. In this instance, the librarian worked with the faculty to identify where students have the most trouble with this assignment and address the questions before the students have them. What resulted is an instruction session and a robust subject guide that students refer to throughout the research assignment.
- *Assignment no. 5: Support your viewpoint about a piece of legislation with a specific variety of resources.* Due to the successful collaboration between the professor and librarian, the quality of student work has risen dramatically

through the years. The professor has developed an explicitly written assignment and learning outcomes, and the librarian helps the students to walk through the process to the final paper.

Not at your
service

87

This session was a touch more difficult due to the fact that we wanted to be careful not to offend anyone or be too antagonistic, while still demonstrating our expertise in student learning. We were also careful to choose examples of assignments that we wanted to discourage faculty from duplicating, while encouraging them to collaborate with us. Overall, the responses from faculty were positive. They recognized many of the problems that we presented, and we were able to engage in meaningful dialogue about these issues.

Developing an actionable value system

While the example of working with the New Faculty Institute may be unique to our campus, there are concrete steps than an individual librarian can take to put this change in motion in their own work. Within library literature there exists a number of articles about developing relationships with faculty, however, authors refer to a “service model” rather than emphasize developing meaningful relationships (Frank *et al.*, 2001; Leckie and Fullerton, 1999). The authors advocate taking these recommendations one step further to develop professional value system that places primacy on meaningful collaboration and partnership in order to provide learning opportunities and environments for students. This provides the foundation from which a librarian can respond differently to any conversation opener from faculty that is problematic. In many ways, a professional values system minimizes how much our gut reaction affects the response we articulate, or the concern about violating the norms among one’s colleagues.

Articulate your teaching philosophy

Writing out one’s teaching philosophy is a common exercise in higher education. At some universities, librarians with faculty status may include such statements in their tenure dossiers. Even without such a requirement, the task of articulating the philosophy and values that guide one’s professional practice provides an opportunity for reflection that may not be available in the midst of keeping up with one’s instructional commitments. In the same way organizations draft missions, values, and a vision, so can an individual librarian.

Craft and clarify your professional “policies”

This recommendation is the application of the aforementioned teaching philosophy. While an information literacy program can have their own formal and informal policies regarding instruction, an individual librarian can have their own professional “policies” based on their values. Determining what one will or will not do prior to being contacted by a professor provides a clear course of action when faced with conversation openers that indicate that there is much work to be done before a mutual understanding can be reached. Some librarians may want to fulfill a faculty member’s request to do a full literature review for them, while others may find that far out of their professional scope. Teaching a class of students who do not have a research assignment can be an exercise in frustration for everyone involved, while some

librarians treat it as an opportunity to explore new means of engaging students. What you are willing and able to do matters less than having a clear philosophy and rationale behind it. Having specific parameters can be immensely helpful when determining a course of action in an awkward or intimidating situation.

Develop and practice responses

Changing the conversation on the fly is extraordinarily challenging. In the same way speeches and presentations are practiced, so can responses to common inquiries and requests. Preparing and practicing a personal “Frequently Asked Questions” for challenging conversations can minimize conversational paralysis during tense interactions. It also reduces the inclination to parrot back formal policies and procedures, and provides some structure, while preserving spontaneity when speaking with faculty.

Get up, stand up

Librarians are professionals with valuable expertise, and faculty recognize and respect this expertise and authority (Manuel *et al.*, 2005; 147; Divay *et al.*, 1987, p. 32). However, Albitz (2007) asserts: “Because higher education places librarians in a subordinate role within the institutional hierarchy, even if they have faculty status equal to teaching faculty, they may not believe they are empowered to take the lead in instituting an information literacy program” (p. 107). At the same time, the structure of academe creates “[. . .] a dichotomy between a librarian within an academic institution but not institutionalized, not dependent at core upon the academic structure, and a professor totally dependent and totally supportive of the academic structure” (Natoli, 1982). While it could be argued that the information literacy instruction has indeed become far more formally integrated into academe since this observation was made 30 years ago, the ghost of this dichotomy seems to haunt many contemporary librarians when they interact with their faculty colleagues.

Instruction librarians do recognize their expertise and professional responsibility to advocate that their expertise significantly contributes to students’ success, even if that means not fulfilling professor requests. A value system that is reflective of this provides guidance as a librarian initiates and develops a relationship with disciplinary faculty. One’s values are essential when faced with a situation that may require questioning, contradicting, or disagreeing with a faculty member about what would be best for students. Without some sort of guiding principles, a librarian can become an automaton that serves the needs of faculty.

It is true that faculty must give a librarian “permission” to come into their classroom. Our work in the classroom can be “completely determined by the desires, fantasies, identities, opinions and relations to power of our faculty counterparts [. . .]” (Eisenhower and Smith, 2009, p. 315). Even though it is disciplinary faculty that initiate the context for library instruction, that does not diminish the necessity of librarians taking equal, and if necessary, primary agency in the construction of the learning environment for students. Establishing this agency may require a response and a subsequent conversation that are far different from what the faculty may be expecting, but far closer to what quality, collaborative teaching can be.

A professor’s reaction, in some instances, will not be what one would consider positive. They may have needed someone to fill class time while they were away for a

conference. They may feel strongly that the assignment cannot be changed. They may hear that there is more work to be done, which can be overwhelming for anyone. However, a professor that is contacting a librarian seeking assistance and guidance in crafting a rich learning experience for their students will most likely enthusiastically engage. Librarians and instructors have the same desired outcomes for students. However, it is the librarian that has the greater task in articulating how they can contribute to the creation of powerful learning opportunities for students. The act of departing from a simple affirmative response to a professor's problematic request will allow instruction librarians to finally arrive as full collaborators and partners in the teaching and learning endeavor.

References

- Albitz, R. (2007), "The what and the who of information literacy and critical thinking in higher education", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 97-109.
- Association of College & Research Libraries (2006a), "Characteristics of programs of information literacy that illustrate best practices: a guideline", available at: www.ala.org/acrl/standards/characteristics (accessed 20 June 2012).
- Association of College & Research Libraries (2006b), "Information literacy competency standards for higher education", available at: <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency> (accessed 20 June 2012).
- Association of College & Research Libraries (2008), "Standards for proficiencies for instruction librarians and coordinators: a practical guide", available at: www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/standards/profstandards.pdf (accessed 20 June 2012).
- Christiansen, L., Stomblor, M. and Thaxton, L. (2004), "A report on librarian-faculty relations from a sociological perspective", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 116-21.
- Divay, G., Ducas, A. and Michaud-Oystryk, N. (1987), "Faculty perceptions of librarians at the University of Manitoba", *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 48, pp. 27-35.
- Eisenhower, C. and Smith, D. (2009), "The library as a 'stuck place': critical pedagogy in the corporate university", in Accardi, M.T., Drabinski, E. and Kumbier, A. (Eds), *Critical Library Instruction: Theories and Methods*, Library Juice, Duluth, MN.
- Farber, E. (1999), "Faculty-librarian cooperation: a personal retrospective", *Reference Services Review*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 229-34.
- Frank, D.G., Raschke, G.K., Wood, J. and Yang, J.Z. (2001), "Information consulting: the key to success in academic libraries", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 90-6.
- Hrycaj, P. and Russo, M. (2007), "Reflections on surveys of faculty attitudes toward collaboration with librarians", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 692-6.
- Ivey, R. (2003), "Information literacy: how do librarians and academics work in partnership to deliver effective learning programs?", *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 100-13.
- Ivey, R.T. (1994), "Teaching faculty perceptions of academic librarians at Memphis State University", *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 55 No. 1, pp. 69-82.
- Leckie, G.T. and Fullerton, A. (1999), "Information literacy in science and engineering undergraduate education: faculty attitudes and pedagogical practices", *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 60 No. 1, pp. 9-29.
- Manuel, K., Beck, S.E. and Molloy, M. (2005), "An ethnographic study of attitudes influencing collaboration in library instruction", *The Reference Librarian*, Vol. 43 Nos 89-90, pp. 139-61.

- McGuinness, C. (2006), "What faculty think-exploring the barriers to information literacy development in undergraduate education", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 573-82.
- Natoli, J.P. (1982), "Toward an existential future", *The Reference Librarian*, Vol. 1 Nos 1-2, pp. 105-11.
- Phelps, S.F. and Campbell, N. (2012), "Commitment and trust in librarian-faculty relationships: a systematic review of the literature", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 13-19.
- Raspa, D. and Ward, D. (2000), *The Collaborative Imperative: Librarians and Faculty Working Together in the Information Universe*, American Library Association, Chicago, IL.

About the authors

Yvonne Nalani Meulemans is Human Development/Kinesiology/Nursing/Psychology Librarian and has been Information Literacy Program Coordinator. She has been at California State University, San Marcos since 2002. Yvonne Nalani Meulemans is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: ymeulema@csusm.edu

Allison Carr is Social Sciences Librarian/Library Faculty at California State University, San Marcos. She received an MLIS from San Jose State University and a BA in History from the University of California, Santa Barbara. She is on a mission to help students become responsible information consumers.