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Introduction: The Frameworks and the Future Scholar

Randall McClure and James P. Purdy

framework (noun): a simplified description of a complex entity or process; the underlying structure; a structure supporting or containing something; in object-oriented systems, a set of classes that embodies an abstract design for solutions to a number of related problems ("Framework" 2015)

Ten years ago, we would not be offering a book about frameworks. In fact, we might even have struggled to define the term as it relates to teaching and learning, whether the subject matter was writing, information literacy, or something else for that matter. As readers of this volume may likely know, however, there has been a sea change in education at all levels over the past decade given, as the definition above words it, the growth of “a number of related problems.” These problems stem from concerns over the corporatization of both content and assessment, the challenges created from ongoing budget shortfalls, and the demands on an educational system and the skills of its students that are fully immersed in a world where technology reigns supreme.

Perhaps as a response to these problems, our conversations in education circles have seemed to shift some with each passing year, and we no longer appear to focus our discussions so much on standards, outcomes, and assessments. Instead, the popular terminology today includes words such as habits, threshold concepts, and dispositions, all part of a larger framework, one designed, albeit and perhaps purposefully, abstractly. As such, this framework approach may be just what our educational system has needed—a letting loose of the idea of a single solution, instead opting for an approach that embraces the idea of myriad solutions best suited
for a progressively digital, information-saturated, globally complex, and increasingly dynamic world.

This is not to say that learning outcomes, standards, and assessments of teaching and learning are no longer important. This will likely never be the case. In fact and in truth, composing outcomes and measuring the effectiveness of our teaching and student learning are here to stay, and rightfully so.

This swinging of the pendulum, then, we argue, is different. What seems, to us, to have been lost over the past few decades across the education landscape in the United States—in the push to get students to where we want them to be competitively and testing them ad nauseam to prove it—is a lack of understanding or an unwillingness to pause long enough to really know our students and, instead of focusing only on where we want them to be, capturing where they are. In *The New Digital Scholar: Exploring and Enriching the Research and Writing Practices of NextGen Students*, we and our contributors focused on where students are, as, to use Marc Prensky’s (2001) popularized term, *digital natives*; how their digital behaviors influence the ways in which students research (and more broadly find information) and write in their personal, academic, and soon-to-be professional lives; and how we as teachers and librarians can work with these behaviors and the technologies available to us in order to strengthen students’ information literacy and writing skills. Focusing largely on the first-year writing course and the corresponding library instruction that often occurs with it, the book provides both a character sketch of the new digital scholar—what we called the NextGen student—and a series of course and programmatic recommendations for writing teachers and academic librarians, as well as for writing program and other higher education administrators.

We widened the focus of our lens in *The Next Digital Scholar: A Fresh Approach to the Common Core State Standards in Research and Writing*, as we looked at K–12 librarians and teachers, particularly English language arts teachers, working with the generation of digital learners to follow, those in the K–12 school environment where standards and outcomes were/are the focus. Written at the peak of the adoption of Common Core State Standards (hereafter CCSS) and published before the first round of Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (hereafter PARCC) tests, *The Next Digital Scholar* attempted to flip the script, moving from students and technologies to the CCSS and letting students’ digital information behaviors drive the discussion.
Though the CCSS appear to be losing some traction as of this writing, with three early adopters now rejecting the standards and several other states either reviewing or revising their participation in the CCSS, PARCC, or both (Ujifusa 2015; Vander Hart 2015), the CCSS remain perhaps the strongest symbol in recent memory of the focus on what students should be able to do across all subjects in order to be “college and career ready.” Instead of endorsing or criticizing the CCSS, as it was and remains popular to do, we and our contributors opted to help teachers and librarians get students there, particularly with respect to their researching and writing in a culture gone largely digital; to turn standards into practices; and to make the practices themselves real in ways that did not radicalize what teachers were doing, but connected students’ research-writing behaviors with their teachers’ practices in ways that were more in line with where students are and in ways that were CCSS-friendly.

And where students are is where we are in this book, *The Future Scholar: Researching and Teaching the Frameworks for Writing and Information Literacy*. We and our contributors see in the frameworks movement—particularly within higher education—striking similarities among what teachers, researchers, and academic librarians believe about the literate person in both the here and now and the future. Like the definition of *framework* offered at the beginning of the Introduction, today’s student is seen as not just complex, but also faced with a digital, information-saturated world, one that requires multifaceted processes and solutions to successfully navigate an increasingly global information-based economy. Without habits of mind and dispositions as part of a framework structured for a digital world, we contend that the student of today will struggle to become the scholar of the future.

*The Future Scholar* relies on two documents to situate its argument. The first is the 2011 *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* (hereafter WPA Framework) authored in collaboration by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and National Writing Project (NWP). The second is the Association of College and Research Libraries’ *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (hereafter ACRL Framework) published in 2015.

The ACRL Framework, which acknowledges the “rapidly changing higher education environment, along with the dynamic and often uncertain information ecosystem in which all of us work and live” (ACRL 2015, “Introduction”) includes the ACRL’s new definition of information literacy,
six literacy “frames”—covering, in the document authors’ words from the “Introduction” to the third draft of the document released in November 2014, a wide “spectrum of abilities, practices, and habits of mind”—and a contemporary discussion of digital tools. The ACRL Framework’s predecessor, the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, developed by the ACRL in the late 1990s and formally adopted in 2000, has been the go-to document when discussing information literacy learning; however, the standards or outcomes it espouses are back-ended, indicating what information-literate students as citizens should be able to do, without suggesting ways in which such standards or outcomes can be achieved within learning environments. As such, the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education have been widely endorsed, but not, we believe, widely implemented. The ACRL Framework stands to change this.

Like the ACRL Framework, the WPA Framework also considers “the rhetorical and twenty-first-century skills as well as habits of mind and experiences that are critical for college success” (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 2011, 1). Whereas the ACRL Framework focuses on information literacy in the overall undergraduate experience, the WPA Framework focuses on writing and considers students at the point of entering college. Still, the concepts, frames, habits, and skills they articulate are largely the same—ones designed to enhance students’ abilities to identify, research, read, write, create, and re-create texts within a diverse, digital, and rapidly changing information-based academy and global society.

Consider, for example, the following map (Table I.1) of select “threshold concepts” in the ACRL Framework to some of the “habits of mind” taken from the WPA Framework.

Table I.1 Map of ACRL Threshold Concepts and WPA Habits of Mind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Concepts in the ACRL Framework</th>
<th>Habits of Mind in the WPA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority is constructed and contextual</td>
<td>Openness, flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information creation as a process</td>
<td>Creativity, metacognition, flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information has value</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research as inquiry</td>
<td>Curiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship is a conversation</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching is strategic</td>
<td>Persistence, creativity, flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drilling down, the ACRL Framework creates frames for its threshold concepts, noting “knowledge practices” and “dispositions” for each concept (ACRL 2015). These knowledge practices and dispositions are, using another term, simply well-defined habits, ones quite similar to those the WPA Framework ties to its own set of writing, reading, and researching skills and practices under the catch term of experiences (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 2011). While it is true that some of the skills in the ACRL Framework and the WPA Framework are truly specific to library studies and writing studies, respectively, there clearly exists a confluence of 21st-century skills within these two documents. To best equip teachers, librarians, and curriculum designers to prepare students to successfully navigate and contribute to an information-rich digital landscape, we believe these Frameworks should be considered together.

Now, we realize that some of our readers are already implementing the Frameworks in ways that not only connect with their current students, but also stand to resonate with students who will enter our classrooms in the years to come, students who “will grow up with a highly sophisticated media and computer environment,” “will be more Internet savvy and expert than their Gen Y forerunners,” and will learn in an environment where “[h]igher levels of technology will make significant inroads in academics” (Schroer n.d.). As the contributors to The Future Scholar demonstrate, there is clearly some recognition of the Frameworks’ value and some curricular innovation that can be tied to them, but the rapid pace of change in both the technological habits and skills of today’s—and tomorrow’s—students will only continue to make the Frameworks important to our work, as they allow the flexibility for finding solutions that future problems will pose to teachers and librarians.

Responding effectively to the needs of the future scholar will take more than Frameworks, however. One argument we made in both The New Digital Scholar and The Next Digital Scholar is that librarians, teachers, curriculum designers, writing studies scholars, and writing program administrators at presecondary, secondary, and postsecondary levels must increasingly collaborate in addressing the educational needs of today’s and tomorrow’s students. While we conceded then and we still do now that we are not the first to make such a call, what we see in both Frameworks is, perhaps in its clearest form to date, shared understanding of where students are and what skills they both have and need to acquire. The language describing them is different—the WPA Framework opts for “habits of mind” (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 2011) while the ACRL Framework
prefers “dispositions” (ACRL 2015)—and there is little indication in either document that one group considered the work of the other in composing its own Framework. Still, we believe that readers of The Future Scholar, much like we were, will be pleasantly surprised at just how similar and friendly the two documents are when read side-by-side. As we have also argued in the past, we believe that we are bearing witness to changes inside higher education, which we see as a collective and positive response to the ways in which students are learning, particularly in how they are navigating and composing in digital spaces.

We believe so much in the value of and need for shared understanding between academic librarians and teachers invested in writing across the disciplines, both in the United States and around the world, that we dedicate a significant portion of the book to fostering it. To this end, Part 1 of The Future Scholar offers analyses of the Frameworks from the viewpoints of teachers and librarians working in a range of educational contexts.

Leading off the book and setting the stage for the chapters to follow, Kristine Johnson and Sarah Kolk provide readers with a close comparison of the two Frameworks in the opening chapter, “Frameworks in Conversation: Habits of Mind, Curriculum, and Assessment.” In doing so, Johnson and Kolk brand much of the book. They write:

When we discovered how much the Framework documents have in common, our response was both excitement and disappointment—excitement that our professional communities arrived at strikingly similar conclusions about habits of mind and disappointment that our work still seems to happen in silos. Habits of mind provide a compelling point of contact between our disciplines, and this point holds the potential to reinvigorate library–writing program collaborations. Habits of mind further offer an alternative to an educational culture dominated by measurable standards and outcomes, helping writing teachers and librarians characterize the writers and researchers they hope to develop. We believe that library–writing program collaborations may look different when they begin with shared habits of mind rather than shared standards and outcomes.

A dialogue between Kolk, who is an academic librarian, and Johnson, a writing program administrator, Chapter 1 shares similarities between the
Frameworks that should lead not only to increased understanding, but also to increased cooperation in the difficult task of teaching research-writing in the digital age.

Whereas Johnson and Kolk give us the 10,000-foot view of the Frameworks, Lindsay Bush and Jillian Mason bring the analysis of the Frameworks closer to the ground in Chapter 2. In “Infusing the Inquiry Cycle with Continuous Curiosity,” Bush and Mason focus on the research part of the research-writing process and examine what each Framework has to say regarding curiosity, a habit/disposition that both Frameworks view as critical to the future scholar’s skill set. “Considering the overlap and the subtle but noteworthy differences between inquiry and curiosity reveals the ways they could enhance and strengthen each other in the right thinking and learning environment or could even contradict and stunt each other under certain conditions,” write Bush and Mason. They continue, “It is essential for faculty and instructional librarians to collaborate to identify teaching strategies that highlight, utilize, and nurture both without inadvertently undermining either.” This critical, balanced perspective of the Frameworks (as opposed to some sort of naive or blind acceptance) found in Mason and Bush’s analysis of curiosity is consistent throughout the book.

One unique feature of The Future Scholar is the attention our contributors give to different educational contexts and populations of students. Much like considerations of researching and writing must now be global in nature, considerations of the literate student must extend around the globe as well, our contributors offer. In Chapter 3, “Have Frameworks, Will Travel: Extending the Frameworks into Transnational Higher Education,” A. M. Salaz and Teresa MacGregor take readers abroad as they examine the apparent gap in the Frameworks regarding transnationalization. Noting that both the ACRL and WPA Frameworks “remain highly nationalistic,” Salaz and MacGregor discuss how the Frameworks account for and, in many cases, fail to account for those working in transnational higher education, particularly those working in the steadily increasing number of American colleges and universities with campuses abroad. As part of this discussion and in keeping with the other chapters in the book, Salaz and MacGregor also help those working domestically to have, what they see as, a more “balanced” perspective of documents like the Frameworks.

Returning the discussion to higher education on the ground in the United States, Lilian W. Mina and Janice R. Walker consider the Frameworks with respect to another population of students not often attended to in the research and scholarship in both library science and writing
studies: the international student. Though the international student has been a recognized population in American colleges and universities for some time, Mina and Walker write in Chapter 4, “International Students as Future Scholars: Information Literacy Skills, Self-Assessment, and Needs,” that we remain at the “beginning in identifying what information literacy skills international students in US universities still need.” By analyzing survey data of international students and comparing the results to other findings in their Learning Information Literacy Across the Curriculum (LILAC) project in light of the habits and dispositions articulated in the Frameworks, Mina and Walker contend that future versions of both documents should be more inclusive and more intentional about the diverse populations of students, including internationals, now common to our colleges and universities.

Whereas Chapters 1 and 2 put the Frameworks in conversation with each other and Chapters 3 and 4 extend those conversations to international contexts and populations, Chapter 5 moves in another direction. In “Grounding Habits of Mind and Conceptual Understandings in Disciplinary Practices: Putting the Frameworks and Decoding the Disciplines in Conversation,” Andrea Baer takes the dialogue between the two Frameworks documents and adds in another voice, one found in David Pace and Joan Middendorf’s model for instructional design. Pace and Middendorf’s (2004) model, offered in their Decoding the Disciplines, shows off a framework of its own, according to Baer, one that she finds quite complementary to both the ACRL Framework and WPA Framework in both theory and design. Moreover, by engaging the Frameworks and Decoding in a new conversation, Baer offers readers the first of several avenues to the Frameworks’ practical applications, to “translating [the] broader conceptual ideas [of the Frameworks] into everyday teaching strategies,” the subject of both Parts 2 and 3 of The Future Scholar.

Seeing the close connections between the Frameworks is vitally important to researching and teaching the future scholar, and so is understanding the many classroom applications for writing across the curriculum that stand to benefit from application of the Frameworks. To this end, the contributors to Parts 2 and 3 of The Future Scholar put the Frameworks into action within two areas of the curriculum where information literacy and writing intersect: first-year writing and writing in the disciplines.

Part 2 offers three chapters dedicated to the application of the Frameworks in the first-year writing course. To offer a foundation for the
chapters to follow in Part 2 (and Part 3), Michelle Albert and Caroline Sinkinson, in Chapter 6’s “Composing Information Literacy through Pedagogical Partnerships,” offer their “new” information literacy curriculum for undergraduate writing courses, the result of a “deep investigation” of the WPA and ACRL Frameworks. Whereas Chapter 6 looks at the sum of undergraduate writing curricula, Chapter 7 looks at the first-year writing course, specifically at teachers and teacher-training. In “We Are All Writer-Researchers: Connecting the Frameworks to Reimagine Teacher and Student Identities,” Janet G. Auten and Alison B. Thomas argue that first-year writing teachers themselves must adopt the awareness and habits of the Frameworks, and they describe some narrative writing assignments to help teachers, particularly preservice teachers, prepare for teaching first-year writing from a Frameworks perspective. Unlike many other views on the Frameworks and most of the chapters in the book, Auten and Thomas focus on the impact of the Frameworks on teacher preparation as they believe it to be the real broker of change in the education of the future scholar.

Having looked at a new information literacy curriculum for undergraduate writing in Chapter 6 and teacher training for first-year writing in Chapter 7, we conclude Part 2 with the true focus of the Frameworks: students. And much like the habits of curiosity and creativity common to both Frameworks, Emily A. Wierszewski, in “Finding Their Voices: Comics and Synthesis in First-Year Research Writing,” offers readers of Chapter 8 perhaps the book’s most creative pedagogical application of the Frameworks through her alternative research comic assignment. “Comics require students to experiment with ways to participate in their research, including connecting research to their lives and attempting to evaluate and question published authorities,” Wierszewski explains. She continues, “Perhaps most important, comics show students that their voices are valued in research-writing and the inquiry process, even if they haven’t quite found those voices yet.” In Chapter 8, Wierszewski not only offers details of the assignment, but also connects it to key concepts found in both Frameworks, offering readers an appropriate close to Part 2 at where the rubber meets the road, in the particulars of the research-writing assignment.

Next, Part 3 widens the lens some, by considering applications of the Frameworks in disciplines outside writing studies where research-writing plays a valuable role. In Chapter 9, “Bridging the Gap through Frameworks: Secondary School Science and Writing Center Interactions to Form Good Habits of Mind,” Pamela B. Childers and Michael J. Lowry
provide a detailed account of a long-standing partnership between a secondary science teacher and a writing center director and how at the heart of the curriculum designed through the partnership there resides the habits, dispositions, and threshold concepts found in the Frameworks. Specifically, Childers and Lowry focus “on the role of reading, writing, and critical thinking in a ninth-grade ‘Introduction to Scientific Thinking: Research and Design’ course, where students build upon their research knowledge through scaffolding activities that encourage [habits such as] curiosity, openness, engagement, persistence, responsibility and metacognition” in order to help them “think as scientists … similar to the ACRL Framework [goal of students’] ‘developing their own authoritative voices in a particular area and [recognizing] the responsibility this entails.’” In addition to providing details on the research and writing activities in the course, Childers and Lowry discuss the role of peer writing tutors in the course and throughout their school, a place where the elements of the Frameworks have been at work for some time.

Felicia Kalker, author of “Digital/Critical: Reimagining Digital Information Literacy Assignments around the ACRL Framework,” continues Part 3’s exploration into the use of the Frameworks in courses and programs different from undergraduate writing. In Chapter 10, Kalker provides a case study of the Digital/Critical curriculum in the Sonoma State University Library. As its name suggests, this curriculum reflects the influence of digital forms of communication and information and the role of critical thinking in the curriculum, two items to which the Frameworks pay much attention. While the chapter is focused more on the ACRL Framework given the home of the curriculum inside the academic library, Kalker gestures to both the teaching of writing and the WPA Framework, suggesting that these ACRL-WPA connections are the dominant theme of the book, even in a discussion such as Kalker’s that is clearly attached to one of the two Frameworks.

While the ACRL Framework has its disciplinary home in library science and the WPA Framework in writing studies/English Education, both are documents designed with attention to multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary applications. To close out Part 3, whose theme is the value of the Frameworks up and down as well as across the curriculum, Sohui Lee and Russell Carpenter, in Chapter 11, discuss the work of two multiliteracy centers grounded in the Frameworks in “Future Pedagogies of Applied Creative Thinking in Multiliteracy Centers: How Creative Thinking ‘Opens the Ways’ for Better Habits of Mind.” Through an explicit
focus on the habit of creativity common to their work as multiliteracy center directors, Lee and Carpenter “argue that multiliteracy centers may benefit from having both information literacy and writing process knowledge practices introduced in their pedagogy and programs,” and they conclude that “[m]ultiliteracy spaces are potential sites of innovative and creative teaching and learning, which we can foreground through connections drawn to the WPA and ACRL Frameworks.” This “potential” that Lee and Carpenter note for the Frameworks to impact the work of multiliteracy centers makes for a powerful endorsement not just of these two documents, but of framework-rooted approaches in general. As such, we cannot think of a more fitting conclusion to the discussion on applications of the Frameworks offered in Parts 2 and 3.

As we suggested in the opening pages of this Introduction, we do not believe that the Frameworks have, at their heart, a keen interest in assessment, especially as we have come to know it over the past few decades. Still, a discussion of the Frameworks seems, to us, incomplete without a discussion of how assessment fits into a Frameworks-based design and approach to writing and information literacy. For this reason, we include in Part 4 two chapters that examine the function of assessment in environments structured on the Frameworks. First, Chapter 12, “Assessing the Affective,” by Heather James and Rebecca Nowacek, offers an evidence tracking tool designed to assess affective dimensions of the Frameworks through an analysis of undergraduate student writing. Second, Angela Messenger, Hillary Fuhrman, Joseph Palardy, and Tod Porter, in Chapter 13, “Adapting the VALUE Rubrics to Build a ROAD to Curriculum Mapping,” explain the Repository Of Assessment Documents (ROAD) system at Youngstown State University, one that relies on VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) rubrics to measure student learning outcomes stemming from the Frameworks. Both chapters show that the Frameworks can and, we argue, should lead to a better understanding of student learning. Though we believe this understanding is best and most authentically formed through the metacognitive design inherent to student work as influenced by the Frameworks—something that the authors of these final two chapters also recognize—the tools and strategies offered in Part 4 should help teachers, librarians, and curriculum designers scaffold research-writing projects in ways that lead to capturing and measuring student learning.

In closing, it is our hope that this collection, with an eye toward the future, will assist not just those readers coming to the Frameworks
discussion for the first time but also those already working with the Frameworks in libraries, first-year writing programs, and research-writing projects at any level and in any course, program, curriculum, or discipline. The Frameworks should remind and reinforce in all of us the importance of developing the good habits in researching, reading, and writing—in the approach to literacy—that the future scholar must have. We believe that, over the coming years, teachers and librarians will bring the Frameworks to life in new and exciting ways and, in doing so, make the connections between the Frameworks that prepare the future scholar to be a citizen of a global world gone digital. We hope that this book aids in this process.
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Analyzing the Framework Documents
Introduction

Writing programs and academic libraries seem to be natural collaborators. In practical terms, introductory postsecondary writing courses provide an efficient venue for information literacy instruction, reaching large numbers of students just as they are entering the university and writing research papers. And in philosophical terms, writing teachers and librarians share the assumption that writing and research are interrelated, recursive processes that make meaning and depend on critical thinking. Although college writing programs and academic libraries share a commitment to information literacy, the nature of this commitment has not always been well theorized. Alison Thomas and Alex Hodges (2015) argue that the intellectual work of writing programs and libraries still “seems to exist in silos” (80). Certainly scholarship in both fields provides examples of excellent local collaborations, but in the last two decades, perhaps the two professional groups have coevolved more than they have collaborated.

If it is the case that writing programs and libraries exist in intellectual silos, one important point of contact came in 2000, when the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) issued complementary standards and outcomes for student learning. The CWPA (2000) published the Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, which included explicitly rhetorical outcomes, such as asking students to consider the needs of different audiences and the demands of different rhetorical situations; the statement also asked that students “understand a writing assignment as a series of
tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources” (2). Around the same time, the ACRL (2000) outlined standards for information literacy, articulating the need for information in particular contexts, evaluating sources critically, and using information to accomplish a specific purpose. Framed as learning outcomes, the ACRL standards renewed interest in research instruction and gave rise to integrated and credit-bearing information literacy instruction. Writing teachers and librarians found common ground in these outcomes-based documents, recognizing that finding, retrieving, analyzing, and using information are rhetorical acts (D’Angelo and Maid 2004; Elmborg 2003; Sult and Mills 2006). Around this time, Rolf Norgaard (2003) called on writing studies to better theorize information literacy within writing instruction and to lead collaborations between writing programs and libraries. He noted that the progression in writing studies from linear, current-traditional rhetoric to process pedagogy helped writing teachers redefine writing as a recursive, problem-solving activity. In exactly the same way, Norgaard (2003) argues, information literacy should be reconceived “as a recursive process that is one important dimension of the way we all make and negotiate meaning” (128). Conversations surrounding the WPA outcomes and the ACRL standards emphasized rhetoricity and recursivity, but they were focused primarily on skills and behaviors—locating, evaluating, and using information as part of making meaning.

Since that time and particularly over the last five years, conversations about writing and information literacy have shifted from skills and outcomes to habits of mind and threshold concepts. Recent policy statements by writing program administrators and academic librarians illustrate similar intellectual shifts, yet the two professional communities have made these shifts without explicit reference to one another. The 2011 Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing (hereafter WPA Framework) outlines eight habits of mind—curiosity, openness, engagement, persistence, creativity, responsibility, flexibility, and metacognition—that are fostered through experiences with reading, writing, and critical analysis (Council of Writing Program Administrators [CWPA], National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE], and National Writing Project [NWP] 2011). The 2015 Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (hereafter ACRL Framework) outlines six threshold concepts of information literacy and corresponding personal and intellectual dispositions, including openness, tolerance for ambiguity, respect, and intellectual curiosity. Thomas and Hodges (2015) note that habits of mind—and particularly the habit
of metacognition—hold the potential to revive several latent connections between writing studies and information literacy: writing and research as process, scholarship as conversation, and academic discourse as a liminal space (80–81). Learning how to implement the ACRL Framework, they contend, requires close collaboration between librarians and writing teachers because the challenges and opportunities of fostering and assessing metacognition are significant.

The product of collaboration between an instructional librarian and a writing program administrator, this chapter aims to put the WPA Framework and the ACRL Framework in conversation with one another. When we discovered how much the Framework documents have in common, our response was both excitement and disappointment—excitement that our professional communities arrived at strikingly similar conclusions about habits of mind and disappointment that our work still seems to happen in silos. Habits of mind provide a compelling point of contact between our disciplines, and this point holds the potential to reinvigorate library–writing program collaborations. Habits of mind further offer an alternative to an educational culture dominated by measurable standards and outcomes, helping writing teachers and librarians characterize the writers and researchers they hope to develop. We believe that library–writing program collaborations may look different when they begin with shared habits of mind rather than shared standards and outcomes, and in this chapter, we address three interconnected questions about habits of mind, writing, and information literacy: 1) how do habits of mind in writing studies and information literacy intersect, 2) how may shared habits of mind prompt more effective information literacy and writing curricula, and 3) how then should libraries and writing programs assess habits of mind and intellectual dispositions? Moving from theoretical foundations to curricular activities and assessment strategies, we address each question in turn by examining the theoretical issues at stake and by outlining practices that hold the potential to create more cohesive curricula and more meaningful, ethical assessment.

Ways of Knowing, Ways of Being

In the WPA Framework and the ACRL Framework, writing teachers and academic librarians, respectively, articulate habituated ways of knowing and ways of being associated with expertise in writing and information literacy. The ACRL Framework claims that educational reform in
information literacy hinges on threshold concepts from the knowledge domain of librarians, and the Framework taskforce emphasized the role of emotions, attitudes, and dispositions in research and information seeking. The WPA Framework similarly shifts conversations about education toward habits of mind and experiences and away from standards and standardized assessment. Before considering how habits of mind shape curriculum and assessment, we examine the shared ways of knowing and ways of being across information literacy and writing studies—the shared vision of writer and researcher identity projected in these two Frameworks.

The ACRL Framework aligns several personal and intellectual dispositions with six threshold concepts in information literacy: authority as constructed and contextual, information creation as a process, information as having value, research as inquiry, scholarship as conversation, and searching as strategic exploration. Although the document addresses several threshold concepts and dispositions, two overarching themes emerge. First is the idea that knowledge is contextual and constructed; as students apprehend this threshold concept, they need to practice responsibility to engage past and present scholarly conversations, openness to acknowledge that the scholarly consensus is changeable, and flexibility to define authority based on context and process. Second is the idea that research is a complex, recursive process of inquiry; students reaching this threshold need flexibility to adapt their scope of inquiry based on new information; creativity and persistence to try multiple search tools and engage in the messy, time-consuming process of research; and curiosity to ask and answer genuinely perplexing questions. Ultimately, these ways of knowing and ways of being enable students both to consume and to create information in digital, collaborative information ecosystems.

Scholars in writing studies have articulated habits of mind that enable success in postsecondary writing and, most recently, five disciplinary threshold concepts: 1) writing is a social and rhetorical activity, 2) writing speaks to situations through recognizable forms, 3) writing enacts and creates identities and ideologies, 4) all writers have more to learn, and 5) writing is (also always) a cognitive activity (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 2015). The WPA Framework predates these threshold concepts, and writing teachers have not yet aligned threshold concepts with specific habits of mind. However, clear connections exist between these ways of knowing and ways of being. Inherent in the concept that “writing is a social and rhetorical activity” are the habits of responsibility and openness. For students to understand writing as a social and rhetorical activity, they must foster a social and
ethical obligation to other writers and readers. Closely connected to the concept that “all writers have more to learn” are the habits of persistence, flexibility, and engagement. Writers who develop these habits of mind may more readily accept the reality that writing abilities must be learned over and over, in response to new contexts and challenges (Rose 2015, 59–60). When writers evaluate their own work and their own processes, they must engage in the hard work of constructing ideas, developing processes, and refining products.

*Habits of mind*—a term we use synonymously with the term *dispositions* from the ACRL Framework—represent a fruitful way for writing teachers and librarians to collaborate around shared interests. According to Arthur Costa and Bena Kallick (2008), focusing on habits of mind means being interested “in how students behave when they don’t know an answer… in enhancing the ways students produce knowledge rather than how they merely reproduce it” (16; emphasis in original). Both writing teachers and librarians want to position students as knowledge producers across various media, and they want students to ask genuinely perplexing questions for which they do not have ready answers. Focusing on habits of mind may also be a critical part of developing research identity, which James P. Purdy and Joyce Walker (2013) define as a “confluence of skills, knowledge, attitudes, and practices that combine when an individual engages in research activities” (9). When writing teachers and librarians foreground habits of mind in their work, they create space in which to see students as always-developing researchers and writers who bring habits, processes, and values into the library and the classroom.

The ACRL Framework and the WPA Framework project a cohesive vision of the habits of mind that support successful researchers and writers—a vision Purdy and Walker (2013) note is absent in many linear, mechanistic first-year writing and research texts. Taken together, the Framework documents describe student writers and researchers whose actions and behaviors stem from habits of mind such as curiosity, openness, flexibility, persistence, and engagement. When students practice the habits of curiosity and openness, they can ask questions without clear answers and engage in open, genuine inquiry. Flexibility enables writers and researchers to use appropriate words and information for each audience and rhetorical situation; furthermore, flexible students may be better equipped to apprehend the critical idea—the threshold concept shared by writing studies and information literacy—that authority, quality, and genre are socially constructed and highly contextual. Persistence and engagement allow students
to experience and appreciate the untidy, complex processes of writing and research. With persistence and engagement, students may persist through dead-end searches and shifting rhetorical situations to engage not only the words and ideas of others but also their own questions and processes.

By projecting a vision of writing and information literacy focused on habits of mind, the ACRL Framework and the WPA Framework both underscore the importance of two areas of inquiry. First, these documents encourage writing teachers and librarians to address the personal and the affective—to think about the persons involved in writing and information literacy. Academic librarians have long acknowledged library anxiety (Mellon 1986), and writing teachers have long recognized and even measured writing apprehension (Daly and Miller 1975). And in a recent Project Information Literacy report, Alison Head and Michael Eisenberg (2009) outline the many sources of “deep-seated frustrations” tied to finding, accessing, and writing about sources in course-related research (4). Habits of mind encourage librarians and writing teachers to acknowledge what is difficult and frustrating about writing and research—and to envision student researchers as whole persons with affective, dispositional, and intellectual concerns. Validating students’ feelings of anxiety, uncertainty, and even irritation may help them develop the habits of mind to manage these feelings in more flexible, productive ways.

Second, the Framework documents encourage writing teachers and librarians to continue exploring the potential of metacognition. Metacognition represents an especially rich area of inquiry because it may be the linchpin of the other habits of mind: the ACRL Framework identifies metacognition as the disposition that enables metaliteracy (ACRL 2015), and the WPA Framework describes metacognition as the habit of mind that allows students to reflect not only upon their own thinking, but also upon the “cultural processes used to structure knowledge” (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 2011, 1). Dylan Dryer (2015) explains that metacognition actually enables other habits of mind such as flexibility; writing teachers emphasize metacognition, reflection, and self-assessment precisely because they “hope to ensure that writers receiving instruction in one context are also equipped to fend off the cognitive entrenchment of repetition and overgeneralization” (73). When student writers and researchers understand how they were successful (or not), why they were successful, and the qualities of that success, they gain expertise. They become self-directed and able to assess the effectiveness of both their information seeking and knowledge production.
Although the ACRL Framework and the WPA Framework project a shared vision of student researchers and writers, the documents differ in noteworthy ways. The ACRL Framework addresses issues of citation and knowledge production, which are clearly related to written products, yet it is primarily concerned with the processes and attitudes associated with locating and evaluating information. And while the document implies that writing is often the product of research, it also frames the art of locating information as an end in itself. The WPA Framework includes information literacy in its description of the habits of mind and experiences that enable success in college writing, but research-based writing may be only one element of a college writing course. Just as academic librarians are invested in the research process and its cognitive and affective demands, writing teachers are invested in the writing process and its demands—demands that may or may not include primary or secondary research. It is our argument, however, that the differences between the ACRL Framework and the WPA Framework are a matter of emphasis rather than a matter of theoretical grounding. The vision of writers and researchers projected in these documents is grounded in similar assumptions about knowledge, learning, and meaning, and these assumptions give writing teachers and librarians many avenues for collaboration.

**Habits of Mind in the Curriculum**

Librarians and writing teachers agree that one-shot library instruction—particularly in the context of a traditional research paper—is neither an effective way to teach information literacy nor a theoretically sound practice (Artman, Friscaro-Pawlowski, and Monge 2010). Although much of the scholarship on curricular collaborations between libraries and writing programs draws from local practices, several broader themes and best practices have emerged. John Eliason and Kelly O’Brien Jenks (2013) identify these themes in recent scholarship: the need to break boundaries between teaching writing and teaching information literacy; the value of dialogue between writing teachers and librarians; and the importance of collaborative assignment design, reflective practice, and challenging student assumptions about research (77–79). Collaborative assignment design has emerged as a best practice, and at many institutions, librarians and writing teachers have developed cotaught research units, assignments graded by writing teachers and/or librarians, and activities to support research-based writing (Bowles-Terry, Davis, and Holliday 2010; Holliday and Fagerheim
Other best practices center on constructivist pedagogy, which builds on the knowledge and values students bring to the classroom (Bowles-Terry, Davis, and Holliday 2010; Purdy and Walker 2013). Because writing and research are recursive, complex processes, writing teachers and librarians agree that these activities cannot be taught with behaviorist methods for identifying the correct sources, seeking information in the correct order, and relaying knowledge in the correct format.

Centering writing and information literacy curricula on standards and outcomes has been tremendously generative, and indeed the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (CWPA 2000) and the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards (2000) served as a critical point of contact between libraries and writing programs. As conversations about writing and information literacy shift to habits of mind, writing teachers and librarians should now address this question: What does that curriculum look like when it is focused on what kinds of researchers and writers students will become? Focusing on habits of mind should prompt various curricular innovations, but we are especially interested in the potential for habits of mind to blur symbolic and real boundaries between writing and information literacy. Although rhetorical and technical skills are often taught in isolation (as in one-shot library instruction), Eliason and Jenks (2013) argue the two must be approached holistically: “All of these capacities together constitute hallmarks of the sort of sophisticated scholarship and effective communication skills that educators want their students to demonstrate” (78). When writing teachers and librarians are united by a commitment to shared habits of mind, they can create a curricular context in which writing and information literacy are parts of an interconnected whole and different enactments of the same intellectual dispositions.

We believe that centering curricular collaborations on habits of mind highlights the value of three practices: 1) aligning information literacy with rhetorical invention, 2) creating difficulty for students to navigate, and 3) integrating reflection throughout the research and writing processes in ways that connect writing and information literacy. Before outlining these practices, we must note one caveat: While shaping assignments and activities around habits of mind indeed frames habits of mind as aims or goals, we strongly resist defining habits of mind as outcomes. Neither the WPA Framework nor the ACRL Framework suggest that habits of mind should become curricular outcomes, and simply to equate habits of mind with outcomes overlooks important personal and ethical dimensions. We affirm the value of offering students experiences and opportunities through
which to foster personal and intellectual dispositions, but we reject any requirement to master particular habits of mind.

First, writing textbooks regularly provide students with heuristics for invention, and indeed practicing rhetorical invention requires and fosters habits of mind such as flexibility, openness, and engagement. If students are to become flexible researchers who are open to new ideas, then information must be a meaningful factor during the process of invention and inquiry. Heidi LM Jacobs and Dale Jacobs (2009) describe a library–writing program collaboration that emphasizes critical thinking about different kinds of information even before students locate or evaluate sources: newspapers, monographs, statistical data, blogs, interviews, scholarly journals, popular magazines (78). These workshops “reminded students that before they begin looking for resources using library tools, they first had to consider what information they needed and then consider what the best sources for their information needs might be” (78). Librarians provide a critical perspective during invention; their disciplinary knowledge helps students understand how information choices (and even the accessibility of information) open, close, and shape inquiry. Aligning discussions of information literacy with invention gives students the opportunity to practice flexibility and openness, and it signals that both information literacy and writing exist to enable inquiry and construct new knowledge.

Second, writing teachers and librarians understand that many habits of mind must be fostered through difficulty and complexity, that research and writing are exciting and rewarding in part because they are challenging. Until students encounter dead-end searches, conflicting information, and ill-formed research questions, they do not need to employ the flexibility to find new research paths and the persistence to engage difficult information. In a Project Information Literacy study, Alison J. Head and Michael Eisenberg (2011) suggest that college students are actually quite persistent, flexible, and engaged when conducting everyday life research. Head and Eisenberg found that “by far, not all of the searches college students conduct in their daily lives are one-offs to satisfy a passing curiosity, settle a bar bet, or to find something to do that night.” College students far more frequently engage in lengthy (even multiple-day) searches involving “decision-making to resolve a specific problem with real-life consequences.” Although students may be persistent, flexible researchers in some sectors of their lives, writing teachers and librarians should consider how to help students enact these habits in their academic research and writing—a context
where research questions are located in scholarly discourse communities and where research consequences may be less concrete.

In the context of academic writing and research, writing teachers and librarians can help students enact and develop the habits of flexibility and persistence when they deliberately prolong what Carol Collier Kuhlthau (2004, 47) names the “prefocus exploration stage” of research. Students in this stage have selected broad topics and have begun to locate and evaluate information, but they have not formulated a specific focus. The prefocus exploration stage is particularly rich for fostering habits of mind such as flexibility, openness, and persistence for two reasons: first, simply being in this stage requires what Kuhlthau calls an “invitational stance” toward new ideas and information (47). Students who leave the invitational period too soon risk pursuing ill-formed research questions or unproductive topics. And second, students in this stage predictably experience doubt, confusion, and certainty about their research topics (47). Kuhlthau argues that these emotions create a “zone of intervention” (206) for teachers and librarians; the emotions create conditions in which students can develop flexibility and persistence by intellectually and affectively engaging the process of research and writing.

By developing assignments and activities in which the process is the main focus or even the product itself, librarians and writing teachers can immerse students in a difficult, complex process of inquiry that requires persistence and flexibility. Students who are not yet intrinsically motivated to pursue a research question have the opportunity to practice these habits simply by performing a research process that requires analysis and reflection. For example, exploratory essays ask students to narrate the process of answering a research question. Students summarize and evaluate each piece of information, and, rather than drawing conclusions, they must continue refining their question by asking new questions prompted by new information (Ramage, Bean, and Johnson 2015, 144–167). Meeting students when they are exploring and feeling doubt means engaging the thought process of research and the mechanics of research; students who deeply engage ideas may search in more flexible, generative ways, and students who search persistently may pursue new areas of inquiry.

Third and finally, librarians and writing teachers have several strategies for fostering metacognition, including research/process logs, think-aloud assessments, and reflective essays (Peary and Ernick 2004; Thomas and Hodges 2015). Certainly, students should reflect throughout their writing and research processes, but when habits of mind—specifically
metacognition—shape curricula, reflection should be timed and structured to present writing and information literacy as one cohesive activity. First, summative reflections should address writing processes and research processes. Although students regularly write final reflections for writing teachers, they might also write reflections for librarians. Making librarians the audience of final reflections signals that research processes are also open to critique and future development, and it affords librarians the same pedagogical benefits that writing teachers have long received from student reflections. Second, reflection prompts should explicitly integrate writing and information literacy, perhaps by asking these kinds of questions:

- How has your research changed your thinking about your topic?
- How has your research influenced your writing process?
- How does your writing process influence your research practices?
- What would be different in your writing if you had not located a particular source?
- Does your final product answer the question you originally posed, and if not, what factors influenced your shift?

When reflection activities frame research and writing as an interconnected whole, they encourage students to practice metacognition in similarly holistic ways. When students cannot, for example, reflect on their writing process without reflecting on how they engaged with information, they have the opportunity to view writing and information literacy as activities that support the same goal—to make knowledge and meaning—and enact the same habits of mind.

Assessing Habits of Mind

Assessment is pedagogically and institutionally important. It helps writing teachers and librarians understand what students have learned and how well they have learned it, and it often guides future teaching. Assessment also allows programs to demonstrate their institutional value and promote their work. When the focus of education is standards and outcomes, assessment has a relatively straightforward role: it measures the degree to which students have met (and instructors have helped them meet) the outcomes of an activity, course, or program. Introducing habits of mind into the educational landscape makes assessment more complex, in part because habits of mind inherently challenge an educational culture focused on
standardized assessment that measures a narrow range of rhetorical skills (Johnson 2013). Although we have resisted allowing habits of mind to become outcomes, we acknowledge that when libraries and writing programs claim to foster habits of mind, they must be responsible for those claims.

Habits of mind shift attention from products to persons, which presents several pragmatic challenges around assessment. Habits of mind are dynamic and often ethereal, located in changing persons rather than in static products. When the scope of assessment includes habits of mind, writing teachers and librarians must confront at least two pragmatic challenges: 1) the gap between habits of mind and academic skills, and 2) the relationship between direct and indirect measures. First, assessing habits of mind within the context of writing and information literacy requires writing teachers and librarians to be attentive to the way that skills and habits of mind interact—or do not interact. Kristine Hansen (2012) notes that college writing students may “cultivate more curiosity, openness, engagement, and creativity … yet still not improve their writing and reading a great deal” (541). Skills and habits of mind may develop unevenly and in unequal measure, and distinguishing between the two may be difficult. If students fail to employ a particular habit of mind, might that failure actually stem from skills that need further development? Second, assessing habits of mind raises questions about direct versus indirect measures. We may attempt to view habits of mind directly by evaluating student writing (such as measuring responsibility through citation analysis) or indirectly by asking students to reflect on their writing and research processes. Direct assessment seems to provide objectivity, but its focus is often products rather than persons; indirect assessment allows access to persons, but it may produce evidence that resists quantitative conclusions.

Because students carry assumptions about the personal and intellectual qualities they should embody and employ, habits of mind also present ethical challenges around assessment. One important ethical question is that of mere performance: Are writing teachers and librarians interested in how well students can demonstrate particular habits of mind, how well they can reflect on them, or the extent to which they actually embody them? Ellysa Stern Cahoy and Robert Schroeder (2012) argue that academic librarians should address this ethical question by assessing internal dispositions as clearly observable behaviors. For example, persistence and motivation can be operationalized in this way: “Each time a student … is confronted with obstacles during research, after he or she has tried to tackle
the problem alone, he or she will show persistence by choosing to contact a person (librarian, instructor, classmate or friend) in order to overcome the research obstacle and continue researching” (77). Operationalizing habits of mind as behaviors addresses some ethical issues because it narrows the scope of assessment to how well students demonstrate habits of mind. Yet basic questions about validity remain: Are we measuring what we intend to measure? Are there one-to-one relationships between internal dispositions and external behaviors, and can students merely perform behaviors just as they perform other values?

Writing teachers and librarians who shape curricula around habits of mind must confront these pragmatic and ethical questions, and we offer three guiding principles for writing and information literacy assessment that respects students, preserves the spirit of habits of mind, and meets the institutional demands faced by libraries and writing programs. First, assessment prompts and activities designed to elicit particular habits of mind must be fundamentally meaningful for students—for the persons implicated in assessment. Foundational writing assessment principles emphasize the importance of assigning students meaningful, authentic activities. Peggy O’Neill, Cindy Moore, and Brian Huot (2009) explain that when student writing is used for the purpose of assessment, it “should not only be written for a particular rhetorical purpose and audience but should be embedded within the course, as a regular assignment—not required as an extra assignment for evaluation purposes” (123). William Condon (2009) further argues that assessment prompts should be designed to produce “writing that matters, first, to the test-takers, then to their institutions” (152). The idea that assessment activities should be meaningful and authentic takes on even greater significance in the context of habits of mind, where the scope of assessment includes persons. If students are to employ curiosity and persistence and engagement, then they must do so in rhetorically authentic and personally meaningful contexts.

Second, when librarians and writing teachers include habits of mind in assessment, they must also have conversations about the nature of these habits. The WPA Framework and the ACRL Framework advance several habits of mind without much explanation, and Judith Summerfield and Philip M. Anderson (2012) criticize the WPA Framework for not making explicit its “underlying psychological, linguistic, cultural, philosophical, and pedagogical constructions” (547). When librarians and writing teachers hold students accountable for habits of mind—if they evaluate work based on how well it enacts or demonstrate a habit of mind—they must
decide which habits best accord with their institutional missions, student populations, and curricular goals. And because writing teachers, librarians, and other institutional stakeholders often have widely different conceptions of each habit, they must characterize and operationalize them through dialogue and collaboration. Bob Broad (2003) offers dynamic criteria mapping (DCM) as a “streamlined form of qualitative inquiry that yields a detailed, complex, and useful portrait” of the values within a teaching community (13). Information gathered through DCM is valuable for developing scoring guidelines (although Broad does not advocate creating rubrics), teaching materials, and professional development materials. By collaboratively defining habits of mind, writing teachers and librarians are better equipped to help students understand what it means to develop a habit of mind, and they are better equipped to interpret assessment evidence.

Third and finally, because assessing habits of mind often relies on metacognition or reflection, librarians and writing teachers must recognize the limitations and ethical implications of self-assessment. Viewing and then assessing habits of mind through reflection depends on metacognitive and communicative ability—the extent to which students are able to think, talk, or write about their habits of mind. Metacognition further asks students to participate in their own discipline, surveillance, and regulation (Schendel and O’Neill 1999, 207). When librarians and writing teachers ask students to reflect on their writing, research, or thinking, they must leave space for students to be critical, even if that space produces unfavorable assessment evidence. Susan Latta and Janice Lauer (2000) note that self-assessment may give students “the opportunity to clarify for themselves the differences between their understandings of academic expectations with their own, an opportunity for students to genuinely engage with the academic institution on their own terms and to offer them a possible forum for critique” (30). Asking students to report and reflect on their habits of mind also means giving them the space to question the value of particular habits of mind. At the same time, simply asking students to reflect on their writing, researching, and thinking offers them the opportunity to practice and develop metacognition; performing the assessment activity fosters metacognition as a habit of mind.

The pragmatic and ethical challenges of assessing habits of mind ultimately call writing teachers and academic librarians to explore the relationship between habits of mind and outcomes. In this chapter, we have addressed one way the relationship between habits of mind and outcomes may become distorted: when they are viewed as equivalent or pedagogically interchangeable. The relationship may also become distorted if
writing teachers and librarians allow one simply to replace the other. When the ACRL Framework was first drafted and introduced, many academic librarians worried that threshold concepts and habits of mind would replace outcomes (and would in turn overlook the focus of assessment and of decision making at many institutions). We would argue that theoretically, pedagogically, and especially in the context of assessment, habits of mind and outcomes should be complementary. Writing teachers have been considering for the last several years how the WPA Outcomes Statement and the WPA Framework can complement one another. Further, the reality that students develop habits of mind without also developing academic skills, writing instructors have noted, highlights the continued importance of outcomes (Hansen 2012, 541). Habits of mind and outcomes capture different elements of writing and information literacy, and meaningful assessment should use the potential of one to address the limitations of the other. When habits of mind and outcomes complement one another in the curriculum and in assessment, teachers, librarians, and institutional stakeholders gain a fuller understanding of writing and information literacy.

Conclusion

Placing the ACRL Framework and the WPA Framework in conversation encourages writing teachers and academic librarians to build new connections between writing and information literacy. Rolf Norgaard (2004) argues that ties between libraries and writing programs “have for too long depended merely on institutional good will and personal friendships, not on sustained theory building and self-reflective practice” (225–226), and he calls for stronger theoretical links between writing and information literacy. The ACRL WPA Frameworks highlight new or latent theoretical connections between these communities: shared, habituated ways of knowing and being that enable students to become effective researchers and writers. By focusing on dispositions and habits of mind, the Framework documents call attention to the values, practices, and identities that persons enact in the research and writing process. They further highlight the reality that skills cannot be separated from persons—from the habits of mind that support thoughtful, intelligent action. Out of this shared attention to persons emerges a vision of student researchers and writers who are curious, engaged, flexible, persistent, and metacognitive. When students develop these habits of mind, they may become critical, productive participants in public and scholarly conversations.
Theoretical conversations about habituated ways of knowing and ways of being prompt subsequent conversations about curriculum and assessment. We first suggested that the ACRL Framework and WPA Framework allow writing teachers and academic librarians to collapse boundaries between writing and information literacy and to construct more cohesive research-based writing instruction. When fostering habits of mind becomes a curricular priority, activities and assignments should connect information literacy to inquiry, prolong exploration to engage students in complexity, and incorporate reflection for multiple purposes and audiences. We also suggested that the Framework documents prompt writing teachers and librarians to confront ethical and pragmatic questions about assessment generally and outcomes-based assessment in particular. Assessing habits of mind calls for assessment activities that are meaningful for students, and it further foregrounds questions about the issue of mere performance, the challenge of characterizing and operationalizing habits of mind, and the limitations of using metacognition to elicit and then assess other habits of mind.

We have aimed in this chapter to heed the call from Norgaard (2004) to build theoretical and pedagogical connections between writing and information literacy that transcend local considerations. Yet as we were drafting this chapter, our conversations about habits of mind, curriculum, and assessment quickly and consistently returned to our own local realities: the recent library reorganization, reaccreditation visits, mentoring programs for writing instructors, and the particularities of our institutional mission. Local issues are crucially important because habits of mind always exist in local contexts and in the lives and minds of individual students. At the same time, our conversations taught us the value of thinking in broad principles, beyond the local. Centering library–writing program collaborations on habits of mind requires both disciplinary and local conversations. As we teach future scholars and foster in them the habits of curiosity, flexibility, persistence, and metacognition, we must also continue conversations about how habits of mind may shape the future of our institutions and disciplines.
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