Can't Get No Respect:
Helping Faculty to Understand
the Educational Power
of Information Literacy

William B. Badke

SUMMARY. While there is much discussion today about information literacy, proper implementation of it within university campuses is still a struggle, often due to the fact that librarians and teaching faculty have different "cultures" that create different priorities. Librarians focus more on process and faculty more on content, though the two are not mutually exclusive. Past attempts by librarians to collaborate with faculty to produce information literate students have had limited success. A bolder plan–to imbed information literacy credit courses within existing departments–shows promise to avoid cultural conflict while creating a proper climate for collaboration. *[Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <docdelivery@haworthpress.com> Website: <http://www.HaworthPress.com> © 2005 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]*

William B. Badke is Associate Librarian, Trinity Western University, for Associated Canadian Theological Schools and Information Literacy, 7600 Glover Road, Langley, BC, Canada V2Y 1Y1 (E-mail: badke@twu.ca).

INTRODUCTION

Information literacy appears to be on a roll. With new sets of standards and best practices released by ACRL,[1] and with accrediting bodies looking seriously at incorporating those standards into their criteria,[2] it seems that the longsuffering voices in the wilderness who have fought against great odds to introduce info lit into the curriculum have been rewarded. In fact, studies in the past ten years have shown that most faculty rate library research instruction as very important.[3]

Yet the struggle continues, with librarians still finding minimal support–in finance, personnel, and teaching venues–for credible information literacy programs. We continue to do one-shot generic and subject-specific sessions, as well as offering point-of-need guidance at the reference desk, recognizing that such "training" does not even begin to make a student literate within the world of information. Christine Bruce, commenting on information literacy discourse, writes: "It has been evident that little of the literature is appearing in mainstream higher education journals or discipline-based journals, suggesting that the transformation of the information literacy agenda from a library-centered issue to a mainstream educational issue is only beginning."[4]

The problem, many academic librarians insist, is obstreperous faculty. Faculty are perceived as giving lip service to the need for a student body properly schooled in research skills, offering only limited opportunity for students in their courses to develop those skills, and standing by the long-held false assumption that students develop their abilities simply by being sent to the library to use its resources. In fact, even when faculty do give librarians an hour of their teaching time, they often do not attend class themselves, despite the fact that many a faculty member is less aware of the new technologies than the average student.[5]

Academic librarians are the Rodney Dangerfields of the academic world–they can't get no respect. I recently remarked on this fact to a police officer friend of mine, pointing out that he and I were alike when it came to lack of respect given our vocations. He smiled and said, "No, we're not alike. I have a gun and pepper spray." That leaves librarians in a category to themselves. A seemingly endless line of surveys have shown consistently that faculty members do not see librarians as true

faculty, often have little understanding of the skills of librarians and cannot even distinguish between professionals and non-professionals in the libraries of their own institutions.[6]

Librarians, for their part, regularly report that faculty do not know the library's resources, and send students to do research on ambiguous assignments requiring the use of materials that the library does not have.[7] Faculty are regarded as emperors to themselves, eccentric and lacking understanding of most anything outside of their narrow circles of interest. The extent of librarian frustration with faculty is often unspoken, but when words are uttered, they are telling, as in a recently overheard comment from an academic librarian to about 50 of her peers: "Librarians have to be professionals. Faculty don't." Her words were greeted by all with understanding and approval.

We thus exist in a context that is typified, to cite a Canadian expression, by "two solitudes." Faculty do not respect the roles of librarians, and librarians view faculty as arrogantly ignorant of the functioning of the library, its personnel and its tools. Such a context does not bode at all well for information literacy, since it is generally the librarians who first see the need for improving student information skills but the faculty and administration who hold the keys to implementing effective training.

How, then, can librarians, lacking respect, move faculty to understand the educational power of the sort of information literacy profound enough actually to take us beyond the inadequate abilities we now see in our students year after year?

THE ROLE OF FACULTY CULTURE

The value of Larry Hardesty's 1995 study of faculty culture to this issue can scarcely be over-estimated. Hardesty demonstrated that at the heart of librarian-faculty misunderstanding is the interplay of two distinct cultures. Whereas librarians typify a "managerial culture" of goals, collegiality and a concern for the broader educational needs of the student, faculty culture emphasizes "research, content and specialization," with a "de-emphasis on teaching, process and undergraduates."[8] A supreme value among faculty is professional autonomy, whose corollary is academic freedom. Faculty, as well, according to Hardesty, typically face a chronic shortage of time to fulfill their tasks and are resistant to change.[9] Librarians, seeking to meet broad student informational needs and develop skills that go beyond the bounds of any particular subject discipline, are thus viewed by faculty as intruders. Hardesty writes:

> In other words, faculty members who hold on to the values of faculty culture (a feeling of lack of time; emphasis on content, professional autonomy and academic freedom; de-emphasis on the applied and the process of learning; and resistance to change) are not interested in "bright ideas" from librarians about bibliographic instruction.[10]

Baker pointed out what may well be a related complication of faculty culture–the fact that faculty in discipline-related focus groups that were looking at goals for information literacy assignments tended not to see the issue in terms of broader skills for lifelong learning and the marketplace, but framed "the student library assignment decision around narrower and more directly impactive pedagogical and educational questions, such as familiarity with the literature in a specific discipline."[11] That is, faculty thought in terms of content, and specifically content within their own disciplines, rather than in terms of process and skill development that could be transferable to a wider range of subjects.

Leckie and Fullerton used the language of pedagogical discourse to explain the distinctiveness of faculty and librarian perceptions of their roles. Their conclusion was that, "Faculty are participating in discourses that serve to protect their disciplines, preserve their own disciplinary expertise and academic freedom, and uphold self-motivated, individualistic learning. Librarians are employing the pedagogical discourses related to meeting user needs, teaching important generic skills and providing efficient service."[12] They further pointed out that faculty pedagogy seeks to maintain control of the classroom, thus making it difficult for librarians to encroach into faculty held territory.[13]

Kempcke, publishing in 2002, argued that things may have changed since Hardesty. Many institutions are re-evaluating core curriculum, and the recent ACRL "Competency Standards for Higher Education,"[14] have put pressure on academia to take information literacy seriously. He writes: "No longer are we in business just to support teaching. In a sense, the tables have been turned. Undergraduate teaching needs to support the library and its instructional mission of IL. The library is not auxiliary to campus programs; it is one of them."[15] These words may well ring true in the future, but there appears to be little evidence in recent literature of movement from the entrenchment in faculty culture that Hardesty described.

Is faculty culture an obstacle to making student bodies information literate? Faculty would certainly deny any such accusation, arguing that

their work of teaching the content and critical thinking skills inherent to their disciplines is information literacy at its best. Information literacy, however, as defined by ACRL and many other groups is anchored not just in content with a little critical thinking thrown in, but in process. Librarians, who generally focus more on process, find themselves hard pressed to convince faculty that knowledge of content (and even ability to think critically within content) is insufficient to make most people truly information literate.

Discipline-specific content skills, even when they come with critical thinking, are only a beginning when it comes to information literacy. Somehow the student must gain transferable strategic ability. To use an analogy, we might train a person how to steer a car, how to use the brakes, and so on, but we have not taught a person how to drive a car until these knowledge subsets are synthesized. Information literacy requires the ability to strategize research and information use regardless of what content may be encountered.

COLLABORATION AS A MOTHERHOOD ISSUE

How does any institution of higher learning achieve the goals of information literacy? The answer that always first comes to mind is "collaboration"–librarians, teaching faculty, and administrators working together for one glorious common goal. The introduction to the ACRL Standards document, for example, asserts: "Incorporating information literacy across curricula, in all programs and services, and throughout the administrative life of the university, requires the collaborative efforts of faculty, librarians, and administrators."[16]

Yet we have just seen that the priorities of librarians and teaching faculty are different, so much so that faculty members commonly resist the efforts of librarians to inject info lit into the classroom. True, collaboration does accomplish its purposes in some circumstances. Banks, Carder and Pracht have reported increased collegiality that resulted from luncheon electronic resource training sessions for faculty.[17] Mestre has offered 29 "Ways to Begin a Collaboration,"[18] and Holtze has suggested "100 Ways to Reach your Faculty."[19] Most librarians have sympathetic faculty who support their IL efforts.

But all of this points out the essence of the problem. If collaboration were happening on a broad basis, why would we need faculty luncheons, or 29 ways to begin a collaboration, or 100 ways to reach your

faculty? The fact is, and the vast literature confirms it, effective collaboration simply is not the norm.

But we keep trying. Leckie and Fullerton, after chronicling the gulf between librarian and teaching faculty pedagogical priorities, assert that "librarians have an important role to play by supporting faculty in developing and broadening their own information literacy, and by assisting faculty who then feel comfortable incorporating information literacy into their teaching."[20] It appears that optimism reigns eternal, despite the clear evidence that the gulf continues intact. Are there grounds for hope that we can bridge the gap or bypass it in some way so that the goals of information literacy may be achieved?

Several paths to collaboration have been navigated. All are precarious.

LIBRARIAN AS FRIENDSHIP EVANGELIST

Having grown up in an Evangelical Christian environment, I am well aware of a now waning brand of evangelism in which the earnest Christian befriended a likely prospect with the intent to woo that person, then make a pitch that would lead to a conversion. If the prospect was resistant, a new "friend" would be sought and the old one dropped. Such an approach, not typical to modern Evangelicals, most of whom find it repugnant, reeks of hypocrisy or at least manipulation.

For any friendship evangelist, whether seeking new members for the Kingdom or an opportunity to win a faculty member to the need for information literacy training in the classroom, the goal is to make converts of those who would normally resist other types of advances. The evangelist plies them with coffee, spends time with them, flatters them, and so on. Why, one could probably think of 100 ways to reach a prospect.[21] If you believe this is a caricature of many librarian approaches to faculty, ask yourself this: Would we be going to all this effort to win faculty if our ultimate purpose were not to convince them that they need to get on board with information literacy?

The profound disadvantage of wheedling our way into the good graces of faculty in order to make a pitch about information literacy is that we come at it from a position of weakness. We become dependent on the good will of faculty, who do not have to listen to us or cut us any favors.

Winning favor from a position of weakness can lead to small victories, even the occasional big one, but you have no guarantee that your

carefully prepared prospect won't turn around and bite you or simply not deliver on whatever assurances you were able to attain. Even when we do win the occasional faculty member as a supporter of our cause, it is only one faculty member among many.

LIBRARIAN AS TACTICIAN

Ken Kempcke argues that subservience is both counterproductive and a denial of our real power. He writes: "We cannot be relegated to second-rate partners in the educational process. We need bravery, not humility. Strength in our alliances. Power over our organizational environment. Not just participation, but command in campus leadership."[22]

As his handbook, Kempcke uses Sun Tsu's *The Art of War*, not as a guide to fighting battles with the academy but as a source for developing strategies that will make tactical gains. Librarians, he affirms, are now in the driver's seat because the ACRL standards on information literacy are leading to curricular reform on university campuses. As information experts, we must seize opportunities that come our way, without any sense that we are inferiors in the academy.

Rather than urging us to win favor from a position of weakness, Kemcke calls on librarians to be tacticians:

> My advice is to find a niche, to infiltrate a soft spot in the battlement–one that provides the best area to devote resources and is the most likely theatre for success. Whatever post you station, communicate its importance and defend it aggressively. Identify the right leaders to follow or befriend. Target those in your way.[23]

Heady language indeed. While still using strategies to win a hearing, Kemcke comes at it from a position of strength. After all the years of being Rodney Dangerfield, is it possible that the tide has turned? Kemcke is confident it has. He writes: "At a time when other faculty are demoralized by what their students turn in as 'research,' we remain at a higher stratum, ready and willing to sweep down with comprehensive and awe-inspiring assistance. We are formidable and skilled warriors against the forces of ignorance."[24]

But Kemcke is over-optimistic. The reality is that the tide may be turning slowly, but there is little evidence that we are about to make gains where it truly counts–in courses, personnel and funding to do the task of information literacy as it should be done. There are no large

movements to implement anything like comprehensive programs we require to reach all of our students. The accrediting bodies may be rumbling in the distance about the need for information literacy in the curriculum, but the continuing experience of most academic librarians is that information literacy is only a small blip on the radar of most professors and their academic administrators. Faculty culture remains a tough nut to crack.

Kempcke's notion of a tactical approach to collaboration has some highly attractive features, but it can just as easily backfire if it turns out that we lack the clout to complete our mission. If we do not have the newly found respect he envisions, we are likely to be swatted down like bothersome flies. He is clearly aware of the problem as he stresses: "Our attacks should be designed to enlighten our colleagues as to the importance of IL in a student's life. Our goal should be to enable, not manipulate."[25] Still, no tactics will be well received if our status as librarians has not changed dramatically, as he so confidently asserts.

SHOW THEM WHAT WE CAN DO

Librarians now have an unlikely ally–the increasingly complex information systems that hold the key to most of the storehouse of the world's knowledge. Leora Baron writes: "The challenges facing today's information seeker do not even resemble the challenges of only a few years ago. The new information landscape requires competence and skills not only to locate or access information, but to make informed, discriminating choices."[26]

Since librarians are information specialists, aware of the latest nuances of the newest databases, we have a large door open to impress faculty with our expertise. The amount of opportunity today for librarians to offer support and information literacy upgrading to faculty is phenomenal. Faculty are gradually beginning to understand that their students are often more database savvy than they are. Even more significantly, faculty are recognizing that the very tools that are their stock in trade–journals, library catalogs and indexes–have not only gone electronic but have become so complex that their own research could well be hampered by their lack of knowledge of the finer details of new information systems.

Librarians to the rescue. We have the means, if we are careful at it, to astound faculty with our understanding of these systems and thus im-

press upon them the need to make information literacy a priority for their students. Owusu-Ansah writes:

> The environment created by these changes in the quantity of information and the resources for accessing them present a new challenge for the academic library. It represents the backdrop against which the academic library's contribution, redefined by necessity, should be demonstrated . . . To do less would be to short-change contemporary civilization.[27]

Beyond helping faculty learn how to navigate the complexities of new information tools, we are in a position to put ourselves forward as information experts who can help them with many aspects of their research. This may smack of a tactical maneuver but actually represents a genuine contribution from a position of strength, a contribution that no one but an information professional can make. If the eyes of faculty are opened to what we can do for them, we have a much better chance of convincing them that their students need to benefit from our expertise as well. We are, after all, affirming the very thing that faculty most value–their ability to serve their own disciplines well.

Yet this approach, as promising as it may appear, still depends on faculty making the second step to take what they've seen in us and translate that into a plan to enable us to reach their students. This is rarely taken unless we pursue our contacts vigorously and continue to market our opportunities with the same vigor year after year.

IS THERE HOPE?

All of the approaches we have cited–lobbying from weakness, confidently wielding tactics, or showing them what we can do–carry with them the reality that the task of bringing real information literacy to campus is a thing of much work and small victories. The weak can be stepped on or ignored, the tactician can be shown to lack the power to have influence. Even showing faculty what we can do demands that they, in turn, make the jump to allowing us access to their students. Our educational setting works against us. We are locked within an environment in which discipline-specific instruction is the norm, professors cling to their turf, and the powers that be will release neither personnel, funding, nor curriculum space to enable a wider information literacy enterprise to take root.

We could wait for accrediting bodies to determine what is needed and put teeth into demands that we produce information literate students, but a look at recent changes in accreditation standards is less than encouraging. Most use the term "information literacy," but describe its implementation with vague criteria such as, "evidence of information literacy incorporated into the curriculum" (MSACS), "ensure that the use of the library and information resources is integrated into the learning process" (NASC), and so on.[28] Such statements are already being met minimally in most institutions, or can be argued to have been met, though they do not amount to real information literacy. It is thus doubtful that we can count on Big Brother to bring in a big stick, at least not in the short term.

Unless academic librarians put an innovative step forward, it appears that we are doomed to repeat the past decades, ever trying to convince faculty that genuine information literacy is a crucial educational value, ever being looked on ourselves as people who should stay off the protective lawns of academia. We need a breakthrough, something bolder and more convincing than all the weedling, strategizing and self-promotion we have been doing.

A WAY FORWARD

To find a new path, we must consider the resources we have to offer, the nature of the task to be done, and the means to make it happen. Obviously, going down old paths, even deviously tactical ones, is not going to move us a substantial distance ahead. Fresh thinking is needed.

First let us consider our personal resources. The average reference librarian, beyond providing access to the physical collections and technological tools, has an expertise that must not be discounted. Mary Biggs has described it well:

> We are information professionals, which is to say, society authorities on the generation, nature, promotion and use of recorded information and ideas–and society's preeminent defenders of their integrity and right to be exposed. These are remarkable charges and carry with them the responsibility to teach.[29]

We may or may not be subject specialists as are historians or chemists, but we are process specialists who have both the philosophical foundations and the skills to acquire, evaluate and put to use informa-

tion coming from most any discipline. Who else but a reference librarian could, in a single shift on the desk, help a student identify larvae drawings taken from life in a nearby pond, locate a photograph on the Internet with only minimal clues as to its content, help a professor locate missing details in a muddled citation, find a copy of the legal judgment against Galileo, and come up with twenty years of detailed statistics on pig populations in Canada region by region?

This gift of ours is not just a skill. It is a trained art that involves understanding of how information operates, ability to use the tools to find it almost magically, and critical thinking to evaluate it by methods that have become instinctive. We have a nose for information, like the nose of a bloodhound.

All of this begs the question of whether we are, or are not, subject specialists. Perhaps we should be seen as masters of a subject area that is *information itself*. Perhaps information, its discovery and proper use, should be viewed as its own subject.

What is our task in the enterprise of information literacy? At one time the answer seemed easy–Our task is to help our students learn how to use a library so they can write their research papers. Now, with so many information sources available even in the middle of the desert to a patron with a computer and an Internet link, the answer is less clear.

If we put the question instead into the context of more ultimate goals, it takes on a new face. We could continue to limit our vista to helping students to research their papers, but the new accessibility of information resources, of which the physical library is only a part, opens the door for us to look beyond what the student needs for the here and now, and ask a deeper question: *What do our students need in order to navigate the new world of information for the rest of their lives?* Perhaps one of the main reasons why we have so long battled with faculty over the need for students to know how to do research is that our goals were too small. We've been insisting that students need better research skills so that they can write better papers, and faculty have been retorting that the existing research papers are not all that bad, so students must be learning the skills on their own.

Ensuring that students have the tools for lifelong learning is a much bigger prospect, one which would appear to be a given but which usually finds little place in the curriculum. Surely, if it is true that we cannot teach students all they need for the rest of their lives, sending them out as graduates who can meet the basic ACRL standards for information literacy would appear to be a basic requirement for a good education.

If this is the objective, then the means to achieve it takes focus. Clearly one-shot and point-of-need training, while helpful in themselves, cannot hope to make a lifelong skilled researcher who can cross subject disciplines in the intelligent quest for the right information. Subject specialized instruction does not generally create skills that are transferable to other realms of study.

How, then, can true information literacy instruction be accomplished without being too subject specific or too generic, without invading faculty space but at the same time not being too peripheral?

Perhaps the most promising and relatively new approach is *to embed credit-bearing information literacy courses within departments*. The intention is to give such courses homes within subject disciplines, where they can be informed by the content that students with majors require while at the same time having the flexibility to include a broader philosophy of information as well as the skills to do informational research beyond a single subject. Such courses can begin as electives, gain popularity, and then move toward becoming part of the core, either because departmental faculty see the light or because accrediting bodies eventually demand it.

Several scholars have argued that information literacy at a high level needs to be the right of every student, regardless of what inroads (or lack of them) librarians have made into resistant faculty culture. Owusu-Ansah writing on the need to provide a structure for the development of institution-wide information literacy asks: "Why not then have independent courses for the provision of such a structure? What should be done with the students in courses with uncooperative faculty? Are they not to receive the crucial skills that library instruction can provide?"[30]

To create a broadly based generic information literacy curriculum that is designated with a LIBR or UNIV tag is to take it out of the hands of faculty who, despite their autonomous culture, need and likely want to take some ownership of a program of information literacy in the curriculum. Students learning information skills do, after all, require content. True, there are several large generic programs that seem to be succeeding, but careful scrutiny would show that this is only because of very strong support from senior academic administration and a great deal of zealous effort from the librarians who teach them.

If we believe that information literacy is best done when content is a factor, then the most relevant contexts for credit courses are surely the departments in which students take their majors. Such departments, to

be sure, are part of the turf of the faculty, but they are not the sort of central all-sacred turf that is found in the classroom. The distinction might be illustrated by the difference between my own backyard and the neighborhood park down the block. I may tolerate some strangers in the park, as long as they behave themselves, but I don't want them jumping my fence and helping themselves to my barbecue or swimming pool.

A strategy at my own institution may illustrate how this embedding a credit information literacy course within a department can be accomplished. Our head librarian and I had long wanted to develop a three-credit information literacy course on our campus. We decided this was going to happen only if we offered the course to the institution for "free" (meaning that the library would absorb the cost of its donated librarian time within its existing budget) and if we could find a department head who could be made an enthusiastic supporter. We chose the Communications Department, both because its head had already seen the value of information literacy, and because Communications, by its very definition, deals directly with many varieties of information and information systems.

The department head greeted the idea of a new elective course within his department with enthusiasm. Other faculty in the department raised no objections and saw some potential value in such a course. Armed with a strong proposal and syllabus, we presented it to our Undergraduate Academic Committee. There was a surprisingly positive response to the idea of using credit hours to teach students how to "do research," but there were also some detractors among well-respected faculty who raised a legitimate objection. "This is a university," they argued. "We don't need yet another skills course, regardless of how fine an idea it is that our students learn how to do research."

We agreed with them. True, there is a skills element in information literacy, just as there is in many courses, but there is also a philosophy that emerges from points 3 and 5 of the ACRL standards: "The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system"; and, "The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally."[31] Bound up in those statements alone is enough "theory of" and "philosophy of" to satisfy most academics.

The Committee approved the course. It has now been taught twice, with a high level of popularity and increasing student numbers. After the first run-through it was listed as an elective in every stream within the Communications Department program. While still not within the core of the program, at least it has a place.[32] True, the library has had to donate my time, and we lack the resources at this point to expand the advance of such courses into academia, but it is a good beginning on which we can build.

A number of objections will be raised to embedding information literacy courses within departments. First, most university curricula are full, and introducing a new course is a hard sell. This is a given, but it is also a given that curricula do change over time, especially when they receive impetus from enthusiastic supporters or the demands of accreditation.

A second, and more difficult, challenge comes from that fact that there is simply not the resource base in most institutions to launch such an initiative. How many librarians will it take to move from teaching one elective course in one department to offering many elective courses in many departments to including these courses in the core curriculum of departments so that multiple sections are needed for each course? The answer is quite simply, "A lot of librarians, most of whom are currently not available."

But this is exactly the heart of the issue–we are looking at a new paradigm for the electronic information age. Many studies have shown that both the gate counts and reference interviews in academic libraries are diminishing. Students can now retrieve much of their research information without ever darkening our doors. Could it be that we are on the brink of a new paradigm for reference librarians, in which the reference desk as a location has diminishing importance and librarians are no longer defined by location but by their ability to facilitate proper use of information whatever its source and wherever the location of the patron? If we are, indeed, the information professionals on campus, then the transition from helping a student solve a point-of-need research problem at the reference desk to teaching a class full of students the rudiments of information literacy is not as large a shift as we might think.

Still, the prospect of funding and staffing what is, essentially, its own cross-departmental department, creates daunting challenges. We will definitely need more staff, and the costs will be high. But new initiatives in higher education are driven by the needs that demand them. Do we

want information literate students? Yes. Have current efforts through one-shot sessions and sporadic intrusions into faculty territory succeeded in creating information literate students? No. Thus, if the job is not being done, and accrediting bodies (slowly to be sure) will at some point put teeth into demands for information literacy training, something will eventually give. At that point, personnel must be put in place and money must be available.

We need to remember that the strategy proposed will be incremental. You start with one or two elective courses, each in its own department, get support to increase the number of such courses, then look at the possibility of making them part of departmental cores. Such process will take several years. No initiative is projected to succeed overnight, thus we have time to develop our infrastructure.

Third, the implication that librarians should take the primary role in developing and teaching such courses may be seen as ignoring the necessary subject orientation of departments. Perhaps faculty could be co-opted either to teach these courses or to team teach them with librarians. This suggestion carries with it two assumptions: first, that librarians do not have subject knowledge and second, that information literacy training needs the input of faculty to be done properly.

Nothing in our proposal precludes the possibility of team teaching, though there must be one bedrock assumption–When it comes to the philosophy and skills of information literacy, librarians trump faculty. Teaching faculty within a department should certainly be involved in planning info lit courses and may well team teach within them. But librarians, many of whom have at least masters level knowledge of specific disciplines, must take the leadership role, because our purpose is to foster information literacy, not just to promote the subject needs of the discipline. Such courses would use examples and emphases related to the disciplines in which they were embedded, but their primary goal would be to teach students how information works, how research should be strategized, and how the resulting information should be handled. Unless there is a strong emphasis on transferability of skills and knowledge to other disciplines, we have not moved beyond the subject-specific classroom intrusion approach.

CONCLUSION

We began our discussion by going over the much-trodden ground of librarian-faculty collaboration encouraged in order to impress faculty

with the value of information literacy training. Though collaboration appears to be foundational to making such training operational, the barriers of faculty culture continue to make info lit an unnecessary intrusion onto faculty turf. Clearly, after decades of trying to put information literacy into the mainstream of our institutions, we have seen more failures than successes.

How, then, do we impress faculty, and academic administration, with the need for extensive training of students that will represent more than lip service to the emerging standards of information literacy? The answer is not to continue invading faculty turf, but, through a combination of showing them what we have to offer and injecting credit-bearing courses into departments, to demonstrate that information skills can be taught at a much higher level, resulting in benefits to faculty members' own disciplines.

Rather than threatening faculty autonomy or carrying out our own generic programs at the fringes of academia, the real path forward is found in strategy to place information literacy within departments where they can foster departmental goals. Faculty can have input and in turn can be impressed with what we have to offer as they see such courses unfold. They are allowed to keep all of the turf that means the most to them, while at the same time seeing their students improve in their understanding of information needs and abilities within their primary disciplines.

True, it will take time. We may have to develop courses one at a time as resources come available, moving them gradually from elective to core status as department faculty and administrators see their value. This will demand new resources that will come only as we prove the worth of such training, and both accrediting bodies and academic administrators mandate this approach.

A side benefit addresses the problem of respect: If, indeed, librarians become colleagues in the teaching enterprise, then they will be faculty colleagues indeed. Some librarians may resist such a notion, stressing that they are already professionals deserving of respect, but the fact is that the world is changing. Our patrons are not coming as often to us, but we have a new opportunity to go to them. In the process, the perception of our role may well change dramatically, and academia will learn what we have long known about ourselves–that we are the true information professionals on campus.[33] Perhaps one day the word "librarian" will be spoken with awe.

NOTES

1. Available: http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilcomstan.html and http://www.earlham.edu/~libr/Plan.htm.

2. See http://www.ala.org/acrl/il/accreditation.html.

3. See, for example, Anita Canon, "Faculty Survey on Library Research Instruction," *RQ* 33, no. 4 (Summer 1994): 527-528; Gloria J. Lecki and Anne Fullerton, "Information Literacy in Science and Engineering Undergraduate Education: Faculty Attitudes and Pedagogical Practices," *College and Research Libraries* 60, no. 1 (1999): 23.

4. Christine Bruce, "Faculty-Librarian Partnerships in Australian Higher Education: Critical Dimensions," *Reference Services Review* 29, no. 2 (2001): 113.

5. Leckie and Fullerton, "Information Literacy," 23, reported a non-attendance rate of 44%. This type of rate is confirmed by several other studies.

6. See the historical analysis and survey results of Robert I. Ivey, "Teaching Faculty Perceptions of Academic Librarians at Memphis State University," *College and Research Libraries* 55, no. 1 (January 1994): 69-82. We resist, however, giving in to fellow librarian Mark Plaiss's depressing assertion that librarians, because they give information away and lack an academic philosophy for their role, are not academics, nor professionals, but should see themselves on the level of trade school graduates. Mark Plaiss, "Wheat-Paste Librarians and the Jesse Shera Band," *American Libraries* 27, no. 3 (March 1996): 29-30.

7. An extensive survey of academic librarians done in 2001 revealed that "eighty-six percent . . . believe faculty are not adequately equipped to use libraries today; 93% believe faculty are not prepared to help students use libraries today." *The Role of Librarians in a Digital Age: Preliminary Findings.* Jones e-global library. Accessed: http://www.e-globallibrary.com [13 February 2003].

8. Larry Hardesty, "Faculty Culture and Bibliographic Instruction: An Exploratory Analysis," *Library Trends* 44, no. 2 (Fall 1995): 348-351.

9. Ibid., 351-354.

10. Ibid., 356.

11. Robert K. Baker, "Faculty Perceptions Towards Student Library Use in a Large Urban Community College," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 23, no. 3 (May 1997): 179.

12. Gloria Leckie and Anne Fullerton, "The Roles of Academic Librarians in Fostering a Pedagogy for Information Literacy." 9th ACRL Conference, Detroit, Michigan, April 8-11, 1999. Accessed: http://www.ala.org/acrl/leckie.pdf [March 25, 2003].

13. Ibid.

14. http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilcomstan.html.

15. Ken Kempcke, "The Art of War for Librarians: Academic Culture, Curriculum Reform, and Wisdom from Sun Tzu," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 2, no. 4 (2002): 529-551.

16. Association of College and Research Libraries "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." Available: http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilintro.html.

17. Julie Banks, Linda Carter, and Carl Pracht, "Library Luncheon and Update: Teaching Faculty about New Technology," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 2 (March 1996): 128-130.

18. Lori Mestre, "Collaborating with Faculty: Ideas and Selected Bibliography." Accessed: http://www.library.umass.edu/instruction/faculty/collabideas.html [March 25, 2002].

19. Terri L. Holtze, "100 Ways to Reach your Faculty," *Different Voices, Common Quest: Adult Literacy and Outreach in Libraries*: An OLOS Preconference at the American Library Association Annual Meeting Atlanta, Georgia, June 13-14, 2002. Accessed: http://www.ala.org/olos/voices/reach_faculty.pdf [March 26, 2003].

20. Leckie and Fullerton, "Roles of Academic Librarians," 8.

21. Holtze, "100 Ways."

22. Kempcke, "The Art of War," 47.

23. Ibid., 545; similar sentiments are voiced by Andrea Glover in Katherin B. Chiste, Andrea Glover, and Glenna Westwood, "Infiltration and Entrenchment: Capturing and Securing Information Literacy Territory in Academe." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 26, no. 3 (May 2000): 206-208.

24. Ibid., 541.

25. Ibid., 538.

26. Leora Baron, "Information-Driven Teaching and Learning," *Advocate Online: Thriving in Academe*. August 2001. Accessed: http://www.nea.org/he/advo01/advo0108/feature.html [March 22, 2003].

27. Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, "The Academic Library in the Enterprise of Colleges and Universities: Toward a New Paradigm." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 27, no. 4 (July 2001): 284.

28. For a description of the latest accrediting standards related to information literacy, see ACRL Information Literacy, "Accreditation." Accessed: http://www.ala.org/acrl/il/accreditation.html [March 24, 2003].

29. Mary Biggs, "Librarians as Educators: Assessing our Self-Image," *Public and Access Services Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (1995): 49.

30. Owusu-Ansah, 290. See also, Kempcke, 547.

31. Accessed: http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilstandardlo.html [March 25, 2003].

32. This concept is not new. I have suggested it in my article, "All We Need Is a Fast Horse: Riding Info Lit into the Academy," in *Musings, Meanderings, and Monsters, Too: Essays on Academic Librarianship*, ed. Martin Raish (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2003) [pagination not yet available]. There are scattered examples of such department-based courses in several institutions. See, for example, UNL 206 Information and the Sciences (The University at Albany). Accessed: http://library.albany.edu/science/Syllabus.htm [March 26, 2003]; the initiative in masters level Counselor Education at California State University, Northridge. Accessed: http://www.csun.edu/edpsy/ACES/index.html [March 26, 2003]; Music 261: Music Research Techniques. University of Hawaii at Manoa. Accessed: http://www.sinclair.hawaii.edu/muse/music261.html#syllabus [March 26, 2003]; and COMM 200: Research in the Information Age. Trinity Western University. Accessed: http://www.acts.twu.ca/lbr/commsyll.htm [March 29, 2003].

33. Patrick Noon, discussing the struggle of libraries to achieve credibility and resources, writes: "Properly managed, user education can be that part of our service that actually sells the rest of the service; that activity brings the sources and services that are available to the attention of those who most need them, rather than expecting our users somehow to absorb this information by osmosis as soon as they join the institution." Patrick Noon, "Finding a Strategic Role for Information Skills in Academic Libraries," in *Information Skills in Academic Libraries*. SEDA Paper 82, 1994. Accessed: http://www.lgu.ac.uk/deliberations/seda-pubs/Noon.html [March 29, 2003].