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As institutions become more learning-centered, there will be an increased need to collaborate across organizational boundaries. Partnerships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians are one such method to encourage and demonstrate a seamless learning environment on campus. This study utilized a case study methodology to explore how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning. Augustana College, a small private, Midwestern institution was chosen as the site for this study, and 18 participants (8 librarians, 5 student affairs professionals, 4 members of senior administration, 1 other) comprised the participants. The Stage Model for Collaboration in Higher Education (Kezar & Lester, 2009) was used as the theoretical framework. The findings indicated that although student affairs professionals and academic librarians shared a common definition of student learning, the professions were operationally invisible to each other prior to the opening of a shared library/student union facility. This hybrid facility acted as a catalyst for collaboration between the two units, but was not a panacea. The lack of knowledge of each other’s profession was a barrier to increased collaboration and formal information-sharing initiatives and relationship-building measures were needed to increase collaboration. Evidence suggests that that by working together, academic librarians and student affairs professionals are better able to support students, while advancing departmental goals through programming, employment, and outreach initiatives. Librarians provide a bridge to faculty that may validate the student affairs mission on campus and pave the way for increased learning partnerships campus-wide. Similarly, student affairs professionals act as a bridge to the student body, which may enforce
and enhance the relevance of libraries for today’s student. Additional implications for practice and research are included.
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ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Numerous people have supported me through the journey to “get my letters.” First, I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Kenneth Borland. As I prepared for preliminary exams and my dissertation proposal, Ken saw me more often in his office than he saw his own daughter at home. He is one of the most insightful and thoughtful people I have ever worked with. Ken encouraged me to think creatively, sometimes at the 500,000 foot level and sometimes at the 50 foot level. Ken took great pride in ushering me through this process, and I am honored to be his first Ph.D. advisee to graduate at BGSU.

I also want to thank my other committee members – Dr. Maureen Wilson, Dr. Mike Coomes, and Dean Sara Bushong. Each has contributed to this research and pushed me to go further. In addition to serving on my committee, I had the pleasure of working with Dean Bushong throughout my time at BGSU. Soon after arriving on campus, I met with Sara and expressed my interest in learning more about academic libraries. She and Kari Johnson helped me connect with the Friends of University Libraries, attend library conferences, and ultimately manage the National Student Affairs Archives (NSAA). They welcomed my quirky ideas and helped me live out the mission of this research by practicing collaboration between student affairs and libraries on a daily basis. This experience was invaluable for my dissertation and my future career.

I want to thank Augustana College for graciously allowing me to use their institution as the site for this project. All of the 18 participants were eager to participate and I truly appreciate the time they took to share their story. Special thanks to Carla Tracy and Ken Brill who helped me connect with participants, navigate the campus culture, locate documents, and provide thoughtful insight into this work.
I am forever grateful for the friendship and support I received from my colleagues at Bowling Green. I had an amazing cohort of scholars that pushed me to do better and grow as a researcher and person. I cannot thank each of you enough for the support, guidance, and friendship I gained from this experience -- Abi Kennedy, Jo Campbell, LaDonna Moore, Katie Stygles, Phoebe Ofori-Atta, and Mark Zeno. I want to extend a special thanks to Jo Campbell for her knowledge of APA formatting, eye for proofreading, and overall awesomeness! I also want to give a special shout out to Abi Kennedy who was at my side from our interview days.

One of the greatest strengths of the BGSU program is the sense of community and support from a network of colleagues. I want to thank Jacob Clemens for his advice, Kelly Jo Larson for providing me with a guideline for my proposal, Deanna Vatan for the support during difficult times, and Matt Cooney, Jeremy Doughty, and Cari Urabe for their stories and friendship. Many other current BGSU students, staff, faculty, and alums supported me in this journey – thanks to Krystal Allen, Kerry Klima, Steve Kremer, Lee Roberts, Jude Leary, Yifei Li, Yihui Li, Lakeshia Dowling, Mike Freyaldenhoven, Mary Mercer, Dr. Sara Abercrombie, Dr. Nick Bowman, Dr. Patrick Pauken, Dr. Dafina-Lazurus Stewart, Jill Carr and many more.

In addition, I want to recognize the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA), and BGSU Higher Education and Student Affairs department for providing me with a grant to assist with this project. NACA is the reason I am in the field, and my involvement with the association has provided me with many mentors and friends. I will never forget when Cindy Beals looked at me and asked, “When are you going to come over to the dark side?” Her encouragement along with Michelle Whited’s mentorship got me hooked on student affairs and I am forever indebted to them. In addition, I want to thank my current supervisor, Gayle Spencer, who has supported me to the finish line. Each day she reminded me “a good dissertation is a done dissertation.”
I have been lucky to have the support from my family and friends throughout this process. Upon his passing, my uncle Bob left me a gift that provided me with the financial independence to pursue a Ph.D. Although I desperately wish he was here to watch me receive this degree, his gift motivated me to begin this process, and I am grateful. I also want to thank my best friend, Jessie Arnold and her mother, Jean Hanson for their help with transcription, and for providing me with free lodging while I collected data in Rock Island.

Ultimately, this dissertation would have never have been conceived without the influence of some very “cool” librarians. Thank you to Amanda Binder for opening my eyes to library partnerships, Sarah Sagmoen for making it a reality, and Dean Jane Tredwell for supporting our ideas. I also want to express my gratitude to the scholars who came before me. Their research paved the way for this inquiry.

My two biggest advocates throughout this process have been my mother, Dorothy Hoag, and my partner, Marc Klingshirn. My mom has always believed in my ability, even when I did not. Her support throughout the Ph.D. program is immeasurable, which included everything from making me dinner, caring for my dog Beau, and being a listening ear. Marc is the love of my life, and I could not imagine doing this without him by my side. As someone that already had his Ph.D., he knew what I was going through and was able to anticipate what I needed. I cannot thank him enough. Finally, my dog Beau has been literally at my side throughout this process. He would sit under my desk as I worked, and would let me know when we needed to break and go for a walk. He shares this degree with me.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background of the Problem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration to Advance Student Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Affairs Professionals and Academic Librarians in Collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of the Problem and Purpose</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical Framework: Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitions and Key Terms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope of the Study</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Learning and Collaboration Guiding Documents</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seamless Learning Environment</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration Models</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits of Collaboration</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges to Collaboration in Higher Education</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical specialization</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational structures</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competition.......................................................................................... 28
Feelings of inferiority............................................................................. 29
Cultural differences.............................................................................. 29
Mental models...................................................................................... 31

Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Collaborations............................... 33
National Study on Academic and Student Affairs Collaboration............ 33
Boyer Partnership Assessment Project (BPAP)........................................... 35
Good practices.................................................................................... 35
Student outcomes.............................................................................. 36

Collective Case Study of Highly Collaborative Campuses......................... 36

Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education ................................ 38
Mission, Vision, and Educational Philosophy....................................... 39
Values.............................................................................................. 39
Social Networks................................................................................ 41
Integrating Structures...................................................................... 43
Rewards............................................................................................. 45
External Pressure............................................................................... 46
Learning about Collaboration............................................................. 48
Sense of Priority from People in Senior Positions.................................. 49

Academic Library-Student Affairs Collaborations.................................... 50
Librarians as Faculty.......................................................................... 51
First-Year Programs and Orientation.................................................. 52
Career Development.......................................................................... 54
Co-curricular Programming................................................................. 55
Multicultural Student Services.......................................................... 57
Academic Integrity............................................................................. 59
Evaluation and Summary of Literature............................................ 60

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY............................................................. 62
Social Constructivist Paradigm......................................................... 63
Role of the Researcher..................................................................... 64
Experiences....................................................................................... 64
Assumptions...................................................................................... 67
Case Study Methodology................................................................. 68
Sampling............................................................................................ 68
Case Selection.................................................................................... 69
Description of Case Context............................................................. 70
Student affairs................................................................................... 71
Library............................................................................................... 72
Center for Student Life...................................................................... 72
Participants....................................................................................... 73
Data Collection Strategies............................................................... 75
Engagement with Augustana............................................................. 76
Interviews.......................................................................................... 76
Observations...................................................................................... 78
Document Analysis.......................................................................... 79
Data Analysis.................................................................................... 80
Data Management & Memoing .......................................................................................... 81
Case Description............................................................................................................. 82
Open and Axial Coding..................................................................................................... 82
Theoretical Proposition .................................................................................................... 83
Trustworthiness ................................................................................................................ 83
Credibility .......................................................................................................................... 84
Transferability ................................................................................................................... 85
Dependability ................................................................................................................... 85
Confirmability ..................................................................................................................... 86
Ethical Considerations ...................................................................................................... 86
Limitations and Delimitations ............................................................................................ 87
Summary .............................................................................................................................. 89

CHAPTER IV. PARTICIPANT & ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILES ........................................... 91
Christine Aden, Head of Circulation .................................................................................. 93
Steven C. Bahls, President .................................................................................................. 95
Kent W. Barnds, Vice President of Enrollment, Communications, Planning, and Executive Vice President ............................................................................................................................ 97
Katey Bignall, Assistant Director of Student Life and Leadership/Coordinator for Greek Life ......................................................................................................................................................... 99
Stefanie Bluemle, Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor ............... 101
Kenneth “Ken” Brill, Associate Dean & Vice-President, Student Life, Leadership and Engagement ................................................................................................................................................... 104
Dr. Evelyn Campbell, Dean and Vice President of Student Life ....................................... 108
Samantha Crisp, Special Collections Librarian.......................................................... 110
Constance “Connie” Ghinazzi, Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant
Professor.................................................................................................................. 112
Virginia Johnson, Director of the Reading/Writing Center................................. 115
Dr. Pareena Lawrence, Provost and Dean of the College................................. 117
Amanda Makula, Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor...... 119
Patricia Santoyo-Marín, Director of Multicultural Student Life and Assistant Dean
of Students................................................................................................................ 121
Alisha Smith, Assistant Director of Residential Life........................................... 123
Mary Tatro, Technical Services Librarian and Assistant Professor....................... 125
Jane Tiedge, Coordinator for International Student Life...................................... 126
Carla Tracy, Director of the Library................................................................. 129
Rachel Weiss, Research and Instruction Librarian and Instructor....................... 132
Tredway Library................................................................................................... 134
Division of Student Life....................................................................................... 136
Summary ................................................................................................................ 136

CHAPTER V: CENTER FOR STUDENT LIFE ........................................................ 138
Student Center Task Force......................................................................................... 139
External Factors........................................................................................................ 141
Birth of the Fusion Concept...................................................................................... 143
“The Big Weed”....................................................................................................... 148
Construction and Beyond......................................................................................... 150
Themes...................................................................................................................... 154
Symbol of Seamless Learning........................................................................ 154
Unified and Strengthened the Student Experience......................................... 157
Encouraged Collaboration.............................................................................. 160
Enhanced the Library Mission and Collection............................................... 162
Difficulty Collaborating with Dining Services............................................... 163
Lack of Physical Space................................................................................... 165
Collaborative Partnerships.............................................................................. 167
Programmatic Partnerships............................................................................. 168
Facility Management Partnerships................................................................. 170
Future Collaborative Partnerships.................................................................. 172
Summary........................................................................................................ 174

CHAPTER VI: MENTAL MODELS.................................................................................... 175
Mental Models of Student Learning.................................................................. 175
Mental Models of the Professions of Librarianship and Student Affairs......... 178
Summary........................................................................................................ 181

CHAPTER VII: STRATEGIES AND BARRIERS............................................................... 183
Barriers............................................................................................................ 183
Lack of Time.................................................................................................. 183
Lack of Professional Knowledge and Interaction......................................... 186
   Lack of knowledge.................................................................................... 186
   Lack of prior interaction and relationship building.............................. 188
   Organizational silos................................................................................. 189
Individual Resistance to Collaboration......................................................... 190
Literature Review....................................................................................................... 224

Collaboration and Student Learning................................................................. 225

Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education........................................... 227

Student Affairs and Academic Library Partnerships........................................... 229

Methodology......................................................................................................... 230

Case Context....................................................................................................... 231

Research Questions.......................................................................................... 231

Participants...................................................................................................... 232

Data Collection and Analysis......................................................................... 232

Trustworthiness............................................................................................... 233

Summary of Findings......................................................................................... 233

Strategies and Barriers................................................................................... 233

Shared Facility................................................................................................. 235

Mental Models................................................................................................. 237

Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education........................................ 237

Discussion: Working Together to Advance Student Learning....................... 238

Insight into Students....................................................................................... 238

Better Support for the “Whole Student”.......................................................... 240

Linking the Two Bridges.................................................................................. 242

Programming.................................................................................................. 243

Professional Development and Resources...................................................... 245

Building as a Service...................................................................................... 246

Recommendations for Augustana...................................................................... 248
Formalized Information Sharing and Informal Networks........................................ 248
CSL Steering Committee and Commitment to On-Going Collaboration.................. 250
Programming........................................................................................................ 252
Shared Student Employment.................................................................................. 252
Evaluate Trimesters and Prioritize Time for Collaboration.................................. 253
Implications for Practice........................................................................................ 255
Connect to Institutional Guiding Documents and Campus Needs.......................... 256
Identify Advocates.................................................................................................. 257
Integrating Structures............................................................................................ 259
Graduate Preparation............................................................................................... 260
Implications for the Literature................................................................................ 260
Implications for the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education.............. 262
Implications for Future Research.......................................................................... 264
Summary.................................................................................................................. 266
Conclusion................................................................................................................ 268
REFERENCES.......................................................................................................... 270
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.................................................................. 292
APPENDIX B: OBSERVATION PROTOCOL............................................................. 294
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT..................................................................... 295
APPENDIX D: HSRB APPROVAL LETTER............................................................... 297
APPENDIX E: PARTICIPANT ORGANIZATIONAL CHART................................... 298
APPENDIX F: AUGUSTANA’S AGORA: A CONCEPT............................................. 299
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participant Information</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strategies and Barriers to Collaboration between Academic Librarians and</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Affairs Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Effects of a Shared Facility on Collaborative Relationships</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speed Networking Questions</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Affairs and Academic Libraries Collaborative Programmatic Initiatives</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHE)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Architectural Sketch of the Fourth Floor of the Center for Student Life</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Entrance to the Center for Student Life on the Fifth Floor</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exterior of the Center for Student Life on the Library Side and Second Floor</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stage Model of Collaboration between Student Affairs Professionals and</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Benefits of Collaboration between Student Affairs and Libraries</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Throughout the last two decades, numerous higher education scholars and professional organizations have called for collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs. Researchers have encouraged institutions to foster seamless learning environments that bridge organizational barriers and connect students’ in-class learning with co-curricular experiences (Kuh, 1996). Despite these calls for reform, collaboration has remained challenging on many campuses.

Recently, scholars have investigated collaborative initiatives between faculty and student affairs and between faculty and librarians, but little research has examined collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. In order to enhance collaboration across divisional lines, further research is needed on collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. This study seeks to fill this gap by exploring how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning.

Background of the Problem

Higher education has experienced calls for reform to meet future societal needs. *An American Imperative: Higher Expectation for Higher Education*, a report developed by the Wingspread Group (1993) stated, “The American imperative for the 21st century is that society must hold higher education to much higher expectations or risk national decline” (p. 1). Similarly, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU, 2002) produced *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College* which challenged “all stakeholders to unite for collective action, creating a coherent educational system designed to help all students achieve the greater expectations that are the hallmark of our time” (para. 6).
More recently, The AACU’s National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP, 2007) issued a report that outlined the outcomes needed for a 21st century education. The report highlighted the shifting nature of today’s workforce and changing global dynamics and advocated for the creation of “intentional learners” who are able to learn and apply knowledge across boundaries. The Council recommended that each institution, “create an intellectual commons where faculty and staff work together to connect the essential outcomes with the content and practices of their educational programs, including general education, departmental majors, the co-curriculum, and assessments” (AACU, 2007, p. 51). Increased collaboration is needed to meet the changing needs of modern society and to advance undergraduate education.

Collaboration to Advance Student Learning

Student affairs professional associations have responded to these calls for reform by encouraging collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs to advance student learning (American Association of Higher Education [AAHE], American College Personnel Association [ACPA], & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators [NASPA], 1998; ACPA, 1994; Keeling, 2004, 2006). Reports such as the Student Learning Imperative (ACPA, 1994) and Powerful Partnerships (AAHE et al., 1998) have explicitly made this case. “Only when everyone on campus, particularly academic affairs and student affairs staff, shares the responsibility for student learning will we be able to make significant progress in improving it” (para. 1). Recent research has supported this proposition. In Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, and Whitt’s (2005) study on student success, they found that colleges with high levels of collaboration were more likely to have high levels of student engagement. The authors concluded that higher education leaders must collaborate across functional lines to improve student success.
Collaborations between academic and student affairs have also been shown to enhance a variety of student outcomes including learning, development, adjustment to the institution and academic/career decision-making (Nesheim, Guentzel, Kellogg, McDonald, Wells, & Whitt, 2007). Terenzini and Pascarella (1994) eloquently summed up the need for a new philosophy focused on campus collaboration for student learning,

Organizationally and operationally, we've lost sight of the forest . . . . A whole new mindset is needed to capitalize on the interrelatedness of the in-and out-of-class influences on student learning and the functional interconnectedness of academic and student affairs divisions. (p. 32)

The responsibility for student learning must be shared across the institution and collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals furthers this mission.

**Student Affairs Professionals and Academic Librarians in Collaboration**

At first glance, a partnership between student affairs and academic libraries seems unlikely due to the contradicting perceptions of each field. Librarians have been narrowly characterized as solitary “passive gatekeepers” and guardians of books (Jackson, 2000, p. 95; Mills & Bannister, 2001) and conversely, student affairs staff have been seen as outgoing and labeled anti-intellectual (Ahren, 2008; Schroeder, 1999a, Smith, 1982). From these stereotypical images, it seems unlikely for these two groups to interact let alone collaborate to advance student learning. Yet, once the stereotypes are shed, there is ample evidence to suggest that student affairs professionals and academic librarians are perfect partners to enhance student learning on campuses nationwide.

The fields of student affairs and academic librarianship have been staunch advocates for campus collaboration for generations. This is witnessed in the literature and professional
directives of both professions. Forrest (2005) analyzed the standards and ethical edicts of both
the Association of College Research Libraries (ACRL) and the American College Personnel
Association (ACPA), professional organizations of librarians and student affairs professionals,
respectively. She discovered both associations are grounded in collaboration to enhance student
learning. Although the professional standards of ACRL and ACPA have been updated since
Forrest’s publication, commitment to campus partnerships is still strong throughout the
organizations’ principles and guiding documents. This is evidenced by ACRL’s principle that
encourages libraries to “partner in the educational mission of the institution to develop and
support information-literate learners who can discover, access, and use information effectively
for academic success, research, and lifelong learning” (ACRL, 2011a, p. 9). Similarly, ACPA’s
mission states that it “supports and fosters college student learning through the generation and
dissemination of knowledge, which informs policies, practices and programs for student affairs
professionals and the higher education community” (ACPA, 2012, para. 1).

Further evidence of student affairs’ commitment to promoting student learning through
collaboration is demonstrated by ACPA and NASPA’s Professional Competency Areas for
Student Affairs Educators (2015). This document identifies 10 competency areas for student
affairs professionals. The authors indicated that collaboration was a connection point that was
weaved throughout the 10 competencies. The decision to emphasize collaboration was based
upon a study by Sriram (2014) which found that collaboration with academic affairs was
repeatedly emphasized in the student affairs literature. In addition, one competency, Student
Learning and Development, focused on professionals’ understanding “the concepts and
principles of student development and learning theory” (ACPA & NASPA, 2015, p. 32). Both
professions recognize their individual roles in student learning and the need for outreach to further this mission.

In addition, librarians and student affairs practitioners share many of the same goals and attributes. Both have the primary goal of supporting student learning. Each advocate for all students and function outside the traditional classroom (Forrest, 2005; Love, 2007). Each profession is evolving in the face of changing technology and student demands (Swartz, Carlisle, & Uyeki, 2007). Love (2009) noted that both professions also “aim to equip students with tools and resources needed to succeed in their studies and with their evolving personal, social, emotional, and academic endeavors” (p. 21).

A majority of the literature from both fields has focused on collaboration with faculty to enhance student learning (Donham & Green, 2004; Kezar, 2009; Whitt, Nesheim, Guentzel, Kellogg McDonald, & Wells, 2008), yet scarce literature is available on the collaboration of student affairs and academic libraries. Within the past decade, anecdotal accounts have emerged in literature (Hinchliffe & Wong, 2012; Hoag & Sagmoen, 2012; Swartz et al., 2007) that have described valuable partnerships between student affairs and academic libraries, yet there is an absence of empirical studies.

**Statement of the Problem and Purpose**

Although ample research exists on collaboration in higher education, there has been no systematic scientific inquiry on how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning. The purpose of this single instrumental case study is to explore how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning at one private liberal arts institution. A better understanding of collaborative relationships between these two groups can provide insight into future collaborations. The
results of this study may be used to create or enhance collaborative ventures between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. Additionally, the findings of this study could provide a starting point for the creation of professional development programs and strategies aimed at enhancing collaboration.

**Theoretical Framework: Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education**

The Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHE) (Kezar, 2005b; Kezar & Lester, 2009) is used as the theoretical framework for this study. The model emerged from a multi-institution qualitative study that investigated how higher education institutions shift from an individualistic culture to a more collaborative one. The model employed for this study is comprised of three stages (building commitment, commitment, and sustaining commitment) and eight organizational features that are necessary to develop an organizational context for collaboration. The eight features include: (1) mission, vision, and educational philosophy, (2) values, (3) social networks, (4) integrating structures, (5) rewards, (6) external pressure, (7) learning about collaboration, and (8) sense of priority from people in senior positions (Kezar, 2005b; Kezar & Lester, 2009).

SMCHE’s first stage, *building commitment*, employs four of the organizational features: external pressure, values, learning about collaboration, and networks. During this stage, an organization uses information from a variety of sources to encourage members to commit to collaboration. Organizational change agents discuss the inherent benefits of collaboration and use messaging from external groups to show the need for a culture of collaboration. A set of values emerge as the guiding framework.
Commitment, the second stage, is an organization’s shift from “commitment to action” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 222). In this stage, leaders demonstrate support for collaborative efforts by instituting rewards and generating a sense of priority for collaboration. Organizational features that are crucial in this stage include mission, rewards, and social networks.

In the final stage, sustaining, changes are formalized into the organizational context. This could include the creation of centers, a change in the budget allocation process, or an overhaul in technology infrastructure to support collaboration. Rewards and social networks continue to play a role in this stage by motivating members.

Throughout the model, relationships and social networks emerged as an important vehicle for change (Kezar, 2005b; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Kezar and Lester (2009) described the model as a “heuristic device . . . the model suggests the way that these elements tended to play out on most campuses” (p. 228). For this study, I will examine the data through the framework of the eight features to understand the context for collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. I will elaborate further on the features in the literature review.

Research Questions

The transcendent research question for this study is:

- How do student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning?

The research sub-questions include:

- What strategies are utilized to facilitate collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals? What were the barriers to collaboration?
- How has the existence of a shared facility affected collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians?
How do the mental models of each profession at the institution influence collaborative relationships regarding student learning?

Significance of the Study

Campus collaborative efforts have been increasing (Kezar, 2002), but difficulties with forming and maintaining collaborations are still prevalent (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Research has shown that collaboration can result in numerous organizational benefits for higher education such as enhanced cognitive complexity (Benismon & Neuman, 1993), innovation (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Kuh et al., 2005), organizational learning (Senge, 2006), improved service delivery (Wohlstetter, Malloy, Hentschke, & Smith, 2004), cost efficiency (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Kezar & Lester, 2009), and student success (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Kuh et al., 2005; Nesheim et al., 2007; Schroeder, 1999b). In addition, successful partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs have resulted in greater student learning outcomes such as critical thinking, commitment to learning, self-awareness, and cultural understanding (Nesheim et al., 2007). This array of benefits justifies a continued focus on collaboration.

Academic librarians and student affairs professionals have begun to engage in formal collaborative partnerships. In recent years, the ACRL has encouraged collaborative relationships with student affairs through publications (Hinchliffe & Wong, 2012) and conference offerings (ACRL, 2013). This momentum for collaboration designed to enhance student and organizational learning should be supported by an empirical analysis. Collaboration with academic librarians has received little attention in student affairs journals. This research has the ability to expose student affairs practitioners to collaborative ventures with academic librarians.

Although the number of collaborative initiatives between student affairs and academic libraries is growing, they are still few in number. Forrest (2005) hypothesized that the main
reason for few collaborations among librarians and student affairs professionals is a lack of awareness about each other’s roles and responsibilities within the university environment. Prior research also showed that relationships are a key element in facilitating campus collaborations (Kezar, 2005b), yet relationships between student affairs and academic librarians have been unexplored. A national survey of senior student affairs professionals’ perceptions of collaboration indicated that personal attitudes had the largest effect on successful collaborations, yet these attitudes remain largely uncharted (Kezar, 2002). Ultimately, empirical evidence is needed to better understand the relationships, strategies, and barriers for collaborations between student affairs professionals and academic librarians.

**Definitions and Key Terms**

*Academic library:* An academic library is both an organizational unit and facility within a college or university. The organization unit of an academic library is typically comprised of certified librarians, library support staff, and information technology professionals. As a facility, an academic library is an “intellectual commons” that promotes engagement with ideas to enhance learning (ACRL, 2011a, p. 9). Kuh and Gonyea (2003) artfully described library facilities as the “physical manifestation of the core values and activities of academic life” (p. 256). In this study, *academic library* will describe both library facilities and the organizational department of Augustana’s Tredway Library. The terms *Tredway Library* and *academic library facility* will be used to describe the facility, whereas *academic library department* will represent the organizational structure.

*Academic librarian:* Academic librarians are employed in a college or university library and have completed a certified master’s degree program in library science (MLS) or masters of library and information science (MLIS) (ACRL, 2011b). The job duties of academic librarians
vary by position and institution but often include “developing collections, providing bibliographic access to all library materials, and interpreting these materials to members of the college and university community” (ACRL, 2011c, para. 3). For the purposes of this study, academic librarians will be defined as certified MLS/MLIS librarians working in the Tredway Library.

Collaboration: Kezar (2003b) defined collaboration as “individuals and groups working together toward a common purpose with equal voice and responsibility” (p. 138). In a collaborative relationship, individuals are able to co-construct a vision without a focus on the final product (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000). For this study, collaboration will refer to a specific initiative or a relationship between student affairs professionals and academic librarians, therefore I will use the terms collaborative initiative and collaborative relationships. Additionally, the terms collaboration and partnership will be used interchangeably.

Learning paradigm, learning-centered: These terms refer to the philosophy of holistic undergraduate education focused on student learning as opposed to teaching. A learning paradigm puts the student at the forefront, with the goal of “producing learning with every student by whatever means works best” (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p. 13, emphasis in original).

Mental models: Mental models are “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (Senge, 2006, p. 8). Mental models can be shared within organizations or groups of individuals and have the ability to affect organization effectiveness. Illuminating mental models begins with meaningful conversations about personal assumptions and exposing thought processes.

Seamless learning environments: Seamless learning environments purposely integrate students’ in-and out-of-classroom learning experiences (Kuh, 1996). Faculty and staff
collaborate to design curriculum and co-curriculum that utilize effective teaching practices and set high student expectations. Students are encouraged to draw connections between course content and “apply what they are learning in class to their lives outside the classroom” (Kuh, 1996, p. 136).

Student affairs: Student affairs is an organizational unit within a college or university that offers programs and services outside the traditional classroom to support student learning and success. Student affairs units vary in composition and title between institutions. In this study, the term student affairs is used to represent Augustana’s Division of Student Life which is comprised of The Dean of Students Office, Residential Life, Public Safety, Office of Student Life and Leadership, Office of Multicultural Student Life, Office of International Student Life, Student Counseling Center, Athletics, and Intramural Sports and Recreational Sports.

As a profession, student affairs is an interdisciplinary field that draws upon psychology, anthropology, business, sociology, philosophy, and history (Manning & Muñoz, 2011). The field of student affairs has “situated learning at the epicenter of the cocurriculum, with development and service as its foundation” (Magolda & Baxter Magolda, 2011, p. xviii).

Student affairs professionals: Student affairs professionals are members within the organizational structure of student affairs. Student affairs professionals are “educators who use a range of approaches, including programming, advising, environmental management, administration, and policymaking to achieve educational goals” (Manning & Muñoz, 2011, p. 273). For the purposes of this study, student affairs professionals will be defined as all non-student staff members employed in the Division of Student Life at Augustana College.
Student learning: In this study, student learning will be defined broadly as a “comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development” (Keeling, 2004, p. 2).

Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to student affairs professionals, academic librarians, and senior administration at Augustana College. In 2013, Augustana opened a joint facility that houses the academic library and various student affairs units. The creation and opening of this facility has sparked communication and collaboration regarding student learning which will serve as the case for this research. An instrumental case-study approach will be utilized to conduct an in-depth analysis of student learning collaborations between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. Although individuals positioned in other areas of campus (i.e., faculty, administrators, academic advisors, students) may be able to provide insight on such relationships, data collection was primarily focused on academic librarians, student affairs professionals, and senior administrators.

Summary

Collaboration is an ever-increasing imperative in higher education. Internal and external stakeholders have demanded higher education reform and called for a united focus on student learning. Research has indicated the specific need for divisions of student affairs and academic affairs to work together to create a seamless learning environment. Although many collaborative efforts have begun, greater strides are needed. Partnerships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians have been virtually unexplored in the literature, but may have the potential to provide benefits for both stakeholders and to advance student learning.
In this study, I explore how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning. In the following chapter, I have examined literature on student learning, collaboration, and mental models. In addition, the chapter contains an analysis of prior empirical studies on student affairs and academic affairs collaborations such as a national study on academic and student affairs collaboration, the Boyer Partnership Assessment Project (BPAP), and a collective case study of highly collaborative universities that resulted in the SMCHE, the theoretical framework for this study. Finally, existing examples of academic library and student affairs collaborations will be explored.

Chapter III outlines the methods used to conduct this study and provides supporting literature for the methodology, sampling techniques, data collection strategies, and analysis. This chapter also includes a preliminary description of the site used for study along with ethical considerations and the study’s limitations and delimitations. Chapter IV provides a detailed profile for each participant along with a profile of the Tredway Library and Division of Student Life as an organizational unit. Chapter V details the history of the Center for Student Life and presents the findings on the facility’s strengths, challenges, and collaborative partnerships. Chapter VI outlines the findings of mental models of both student affairs professionals and academic librarians regarding student learning and each other’s profession. Chapter VII discusses the barriers and strategies for collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians as they aim to collaborate to advance student learning. In Chapter VIII, I utilize the SMCHE as a lens to view the study’s data through each of the eight features and provide discussion on applying the model to student affairs/library partnerships. Finally, Chapter IX presents a discussion and implications on the findings.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I begin by reviewing research on student learning and seamless learning environments. Second, I examine collaboration, including its benefits and challenges for higher education. Next, I provide an overview of mental models and their impact on collaboration regarding student learning followed by literature on student affairs and academic affairs collaboration. Subsequently, I will provide an in-depth description of the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHE) that will be used as the theoretical framework for this research. Each of the eight features of the model will be discussed along with complementary literature. Finally, I will review existing student affairs-academic library collaborations that have appeared in scholarly literature.

The scope of this literature review focused on articles from 1990 to present day. Select seminal pieces prior to this timeframe were included to provide a historical foundation. Empirical studies were the focal point for literature regarding collaboration and student affairs-academic affairs collaborations. Due to a lack of empirical research regarding collaborations between academic librarians and student affairs professionals, anecdotal evidence comprised the bulk of literature on student affairs-academic library collaborations.

The literature on collaboration is limited to articles on internal collaborations within an organization. Although there is a growing base of literature on partnerships between higher education and external entities such as business, K-12 education, and non-profit organizations, this study is focused on internal collaborations between student affairs and academic libraries. The literature presented here primarily comes from within the higher education sector, although research from business and organizational management is used to provide an overview of collaboration.
The literature on specific collaborative initiatives has been narrowed to collaborations between student affairs and academic libraries. There is a wide collection of resources on successful collaborative endeavors regarding learning communities, first-year programs, service learning, and inter-disciplinary teaching between campus constituents, but only those involving both student affairs professionals and academic librarians were included. Similarly, library science literature contains additional studies on learning commons initiatives. The learning commons concept often combines academic advising and student tutoring into a central library location. Although learning commons innovations seek to enhance student learning, these initiatives typically exist within academic affairs units and infrequently engage student affairs entities on more than a cursory level. Therefore, these programs and activities are outside the scope of this review.

**Student Learning**

Higher education scholars have called for a shift from a teaching paradigm to one focused on student learning (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Keeling, 2004; Keeling, Underhille, & Wall, 2007; Love & Love, 1995, Terenzini & Pascarella, 1994). Although, “Virtually all colleges claim to be committed to student learning” (Kuh et al., 2005, p. 65) what constitutes student learning is often debated. Barr and Tagg (1995) argued that historically, universities have been stuck in a traditional teaching paradigm, a philosophy that presupposes higher education’s purpose is “to provide instruction” (p. 13) as opposed to producing learning.

To say that the purpose of colleges is to provide instruction is like saying that General Motors’ business is to operate assembly lines or that the purpose of medical care is to fill hospital beds. We now see that our mission is not instruction but rather that of producing
learning with every student by whatever means works best (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p. 13, emphasis in original).

As universities shift to become more learning-centered organizations, student learning must be defined in a broad context. As defined in Chapter I, student learning will be understood as a “comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development (Keeling, 2004, p. 2). Holistic student learning acknowledges that intellectual development is integrated with social and emotional influences, and suggests a need for collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs to advance learning (Love & Love, 1995).

Researchers have shown that learning does not take place in a vacuum; students learn best when they are able to integrate their knowledge across numerous in- and out-of-classroom experiences (Love & Love, 1995; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Love and Love (1995) described that historically, faculty have been charged with fostering students’ intellectual development in the classroom and student affairs professionals have focused on enhancing social, moral, and emotional development through co-curricular activities. This bifurcated approach to student learning is not consistent with current research on how students learn, which indicates that students learn best when their learning experiences are integrated (Ewell, 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). In their meta-analysis of collegiate student outcomes, Pascarella and Terenzini, (2005) concluded that the research clearly indicated that students learn across time and place and “develop academically and cognitively outside the classroom as well as inside it, and psychosocial changes can originate in or be enhanced by experiences inside the classroom as well as outside it” (p. 646). Student affairs professional organizations responded to the wealth of research on integrated learning experiences by producing an array of documents
encouraging integrated student learning and collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs.

**Student Learning and Collaboration Guiding Documents**

In 1993, ACPA formed a task force of leading researchers in the field of student affairs to investigate student learning. Their work resulted in *The Student Learning Imperative* (SLI) (ACPA, 1994) that encouraged student affairs staff to form partnerships with academic affairs in order to increase student learning. The SLI challenged student affairs professionals to “make ‘seamless’ what are often perceived by students to be disjointed, unconnected experiences by bridging organizational boundaries and forging collaborative partnerships with faculty and others to enhance student learning” (para. 16). The document was designed to encourage discourse about how student affairs professionals can intentionally further learning and individual development (ACPA, 1994). The SLI signaled a philosophical shift in student affairs toward a student learning focus. By 2001, a qualitative study of 16 senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) found a majority of participants (13) described their work in the context of student learning (Hartley, 2001).

In 1998, AAHE, ACPA, and NASPA created a joint report entitled, *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning* (1998). The document laid out ten principles of learning and encouraged active collaboration of academic affairs and student affairs. Due to both the *Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1994) and *Powerful Partnerships*, (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) student affairs practitioners reexamined their role in student learning and began looking for further guidance to build solid collaborations with academic affairs. This desire led to a joint initiative between the two leading professional organizations in student affairs, ACPA and NASPA, to provide further analysis and begin assembling a
framework for action. *Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (Keeling, 2004) solidified this need for increased student learning focused partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs, and *Learning Reconsidered 2: A Practical Guide to Implementing a Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (Keeling, 2006) provided a road map to achieve that goal.

While all of these formative documents focus on collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs, academic libraries are not specifically addressed except in a cursory way in the *Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1994). A majority of the above documents focus on collaboration with faculty, but are not limited to outreach specifically to faculty members. *Powerful Partnerships* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) and *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) encouraged collaborative efforts with a variety of professionals in the realm of academic affairs. Some librarians have taken note of the student learning movement and advocated for its integration into librarianship (Walter, 2009; Walter & Eodice, 2007).

**Seamless Learning Environment**

Many of the guiding documents presented above advocate for the creation of seamless learning environments. The idea of seamless learning traces its roots to *The Aims of Education*, an essay written by mathematician Alfred North Whitehead in 1929. Whitehead (1929) noted that the many facets of education such as curricular and co-curricular experiences exist on a “seamless coat of learning” (p. 8). More recently, Kuh (1996) stated, “the word seamless suggests that what was once believed to be separate, distinct parts are now one piece, bound together so as to appear whole or continuous” (p. 136).

Seamless learning environments purposely integrate students’ in- and out-of-classroom learning experiences and meld the curricular and co-curricular environments (Kuh, 1996).
Students are encouraged to draw connections between course content and “apply what they are learning in class to their lives outside the classroom” (Kuh, 1996, p. 136). Kuh conceptualized a seamless learning environment to transcend organizational boundaries:

In seamless learning environments, students are encouraged to take advantage of learning resources that exist both inside and outside the classroom, faculty and staff use effective instructional practices and students are asked to use their life experiences to make meaning of material introduced in classes. (p. 136)

He highlighted six guiding principles for creating a seamless environment (a) generate enthusiasm for institutional renewal, (b) create a common vision of learning, (c) develop a common language, (d) foster collaboration and cross-cultural dialogue, (e) examine the influence of student cultures and learning, and (f) focus on systematic change. Collaboration across campus boundaries is the primary vehicle to enact seamless learning environments.

**Collaboration**

Collaboration is a paradox: Innately we know that working together can provide stronger results, and there have been numerous internal and external champions for collaboration in higher education, but it has remained challenging (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Evolutionary psychologists contend that humans have an innate desire for social interdependence that translates into a “tendency to tightly bond with those we work with in small groups as we head to a common goal” (Rising, 2012, p. 8). Numerous external higher education agencies, professional associations, and higher education scholars have championed collaboration as an effective strategy to achieve a wide variety of educational goals, yet collaboration remains challenging on many campuses (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Doz (1996) estimated that approximately 50% of collaborations fail. Research has shown that a negative collaborative
venture can thwart future attempts whereas; a successful collaboration is likely to spawn numerous new collaborations (Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

Wood and Gray (1991) reviewed collaboration literature from a variety of disciplines to develop a comprehensive definition for collaboration, “Collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (p. 146). Kezar (2003b) drew upon Wood and Gray’s (1991) work to provide a succinct definition of collaboration that will guide this study; collaboration is “individuals and groups working together toward a common purpose with equal voice and responsibility” (p. 138). Collaboration and partnership imply a relationship-building process with shared values and goals that differ from coordination and cooperation, which are limited to information sharing and task management (Kezar, 2009).

Collaboration literature suggests that collaborative partnerships should not focus on a final product, but be geared toward mutually constructing vision and goals (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Raspa & Ward, 2000; Schroeder, 2003; Stein & Short, 2001; Swartz et al., 2007). Collaboration takes time and commitment from all involved. Collaborators must be committed to “systematic development of the partnership” through open communication, challenging personal assumptions, and shared planning (Schroeder, 1999b, p. 8). Collaboration has shown to be most successful when there is a common reference point, institutional problem, or triggering event (Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Kezar & Lester, 2009; Schroeder, 2003). In this study, the common reference point is a shared student affairs/academic library facility and college-wide commitment to advancing student learning across the curriculum and co-curriculum.
**Collaboration Models**

Much of the early work on collaboration was conducted in the business sector. Ring and van de Ven (1994) created a process framework for understanding how inter-organizational relationships emerge, grow, and dissolve. The framework contained three stages (negotiation, commitment, and execution) that repeated in a cyclical fashion. Although the authors focused their research at the organizational level, they acknowledged the importance of individual relationships in collaborative enterprises. They noted that collaborations are affected by individual actions such as trust and personal expectations of efficiency and equity. This model was originally designed for external collaborations, but Ring and van de Ven (1994) believed their model would be applicable to internal collaborations within “multidivisional organizations” such as higher education (p. 113).

Kanter (1994) described collaboration as an art and compared the formation of collaborative partnerships to romantic relationships evolving in five stages (1) courtship–where collaborators meet and determine their compatibility (2) engagement–the shared vision becomes public and official parameters are laid out (3) setting up housekeeping–collaborators discover differences in operation and attempt to resolve them (4) learning to collaborate–structures and processes are developed to enhance collaboration and finally (5) changing within–which causes each entity to have internal change based upon the collaborative relationship. Kanter (1994) coined the term “collaborative advantage” to refer to businesses that had strategically designed collaborations; “Successful alliances build and improve a collaborative advantage by first acknowledging and then effectively managing the human aspects of their alliances” (pp. 97-98).

The Mohrman, Cohen, and Mohrman (MCM) (1995) model took a different approach and focused on the organizational context of collaboration. Mohrman et al. (1995) argued that
collaboration was largely unsuccessful because leaders imposed a collectivist vision on an organizational structure designed for individualistic work. Thus, for successful collaboration to emerge, organizational structures and cultures need to be redesigned. The model emphasized six core concepts for creating a collaborative environment: (1) strategy, (2) tasks or work of the organization, (3) structure, (4) processes, (5) rewards, and (6) people. The model was a developmental model and provided the starting point for the creation of the features in the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHE) discussed later in the chapter (see pages 38-49) (Kezar, 2005b, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009).

Although not commonly classified as a collaboration model, Senge’s (2006) influential text *The Fifth Discipline*, identified collaboration as a primary component to creating a learning organization. Learning organizations are organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together. (p. 3)

Senge (2006) argued that learning must be embedded throughout all levels of an organization in order to adapt and grow with the changing nature of a post-modern world.

Senge (2006) laid forth five disciplines for businesses to master to increase their effectiveness and advance toward the learning organization ethos: (a) personal mastery, (b) mental models, (c) shared vision, (d) team learning, (e) systems thinking. Personal mastery, the first discipline, is focused on individual development. Senge (2006) explained, “Organizations learn only through individuals who learn” (p. 129) and those who possess high levels of personal mastery are constantly learning and inspiring organizations to learn. The second discipline,
mental models, discussed in detail later in this chapter, directs individuals and organizations to be introspective and examine deeply held assumptions that influence behavior and may stifle progress. The next discipline, shared vision, encourages organizations to collectively determine their future and work to enroll members in a joint commitment. Team learning, the fourth discipline “is the process of aligning and developing capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire” (Senge, 2006, p. 218). Lastly, the fifth discipline, systems thinking, integrates each of the prior disciplines and requires organizations to understand the interconnectedness of actions and complexity of situations. The five disciplines are dependent on internal collaboration to create learning organizations.

One collaboration model also exists within the librarianship literature. Raspa and Ward (2000) argued that collaboration for librarians’ hinges on both listening and relationship building and created the Five P’s of Collaboration—Passion, Persistence, Playfulness, Promotion, and Project, to guide librarian-faculty collaboration. Passion encourages individuals to determine their strengths and pursue partnerships aligned with those assets. The second P asks the question, “Are you willing to persist in the face of opposition—subtle and clear—from colleagues, institutional structures, and/or administrative inertia” (p. 8)? The authors encouraged librarians to take advantage of a variety of collaborative projects and persist when challenged. The next quality, playfulness, required collaborators to be “passionately engaged” (p. 9) in the present and suspend judgment. Finally, Raspa and Ward encouraged collaborations to be focused on a project with partners willing to engage in active promotion of the initiative.

**Benefits of Collaboration**

Developing sustainable collaborations between academic libraries and student affairs entities has the potential to create endless benefits by enhancing higher education organizational
structures and deepening student learning. Collaboration has proven advantages including enhanced cognitive complexity (Benismon & Neumann, 1993), innovation (Benismon & Neumann, 1993; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Kuh et al., 2005), organizational learning (Senge, 2006), improved service delivery (Wohlstetter et al., 2004), increased employee satisfaction (Steffes & Keeling, 2006), and cost efficiency (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs have been shown to improve student satisfaction, increase student-faculty interaction, improve academic achievement, achieve learning outcomes, heighten student success, and increase persistence (Kuh et al., 2005; Nesheim et al., 2007; Schroeder, 1999b). As faculty and staff demonstrate greater parallels between in- and out-of-classroom experiences, students will be able to enhance critical thinking skills and form greater educational connections in the form of a “seamless learning community” (Kezar, 2009; Kuh, 1996; Love, 2009).

Anecdotal case studies have shown that both student affairs and academic libraries have benefited from increased student contact, often with student populations outside their traditional scope (Hoag & Sagmoen, 2012; Hollister, 2005; Love, 2009). Empirical research has previously established a statistically significant relationship between one successful collaboration and additional successes (Kezar, 2001). Recent anecdotal case studies on academic library-student affairs specific partnerships have also shown that one successful collaboration can lead to numerous new collaborative initiatives (Hoag & Sagmoen, 2012; Hollister, 2005; Love, 2009; Scott & Price-Verduce, 2012).

The academic library of the 21st century plays an active role in student development; student affairs partnerships will allow libraries to break from the prior perception of an
information depository and capture their new philosophy (Hollister, 2005). Walter and Eodice (2007) described the mutual benefit for library-student affairs collaborations:

The academic mission associated with information literacy instruction can contribute to student services initiatives that seek to address persistence of the whole student; at the same time, what those in student affairs have learned from student development theory can inform the work of information professionals. (p. 221)

Challenges to Collaboration in Higher Education

There are numerous benefits for collaboration and specifically between academic libraries and student affairs, but it is also necessary to outline the challenges that have inhibited collaboration in higher education. In this section, I will describe the historical developments that led to specialization and outline current organizational structures that act as barriers. Additionally, the impact of competition on collaboration, feelings of inferiority by professionals, and cultural differences within higher education will be explored.

Historical specialization. Institutions of American higher education have over a 100 year history of segmentation and vertical hierarchical structures (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000). This has led to increased specialization in all areas of the academy that has resulted in historical, organizational, and cultural challenges to collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs units. During the mid-nineteenth century, American higher education shifted from a liberal arts approach to a German research university model (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Love & Love, 1995; Thelin, 2011). Although early American universities focused on “development of the whole person” including intellectual, social, and emotional development, the German model placed intellectual development at the forefront and under the discretion of the faculty (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000, p. 427). This transition also caused increased emphasis on the creation of
research and scholarship in higher education and resulted in faculty specialization (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000, Love & Love, 1995).

Subsequently, the role of student affairs emerged to meet a need in holistic student development and soon gained ownership for the discarded areas of social and emotional development. This historical division between the cognitive and psychosocial aspects of student life have led to different assumptions of student learning and a disconnect on campuses (Kezar, 2001; Whitt, 2011). The divide between academic and student affairs increased as higher education, adapting to ballooning enrollments, diverse populations, and the proliferation of disciplines, created specialized hierarchical organizations (Schroeder, 1999b).

Specialization on college campuses has resulted in fewer shared values, goals, and a lack of a common language (Kezar, 2009). Schroeder (1999b) summarized institutional barriers by stating, “Universities are characterized not by a sense of community, but rather by a constellation of independent principalities and fiefdoms, each disconnected from the others and from any commitment to institutional purpose or transcending values” (p. 9). This structural shift in higher education has made partnerships across campus less viable and led to a reduction in knowledge and interaction between campus constituents such as student affairs professionals and academic librarians (Forrest, 2005; Swartz et al., 2007).

Organizational structures. Higher education organizational structures are often defined as both vertically arranged and loosely coupled (Keeling et al., 2007, p. 22). Weick (1983) defined universities as “highly differentiated and low on integration, with the basic organizational element (faculty) loosely coupled. The high need for independence and accuracy is basically inconsistent and contradictory with organizational needs of common purpose, common reference, and smooth functioning” (p. 24).
Vertical structures, also commonly referred to as organizational *silos*, such as academic colleges, student services, business operations, and athletics, operate in parallel with one another. The proliferation of *silos* has been attributed to ballooning student enrollments, increased diversity of the student body, and exponential expansion of knowledge (Schroeder, 1999b).

Silos are internally focused and tend to concentrate on individual goals instead of promoting institutional purposes (Keeling et al., 2007). Terenzini and Pascarella (1994) noted, “This bureaucratisation of collegiate structures [silos] is a creature of administrative convenience and budgetary expedience. It surely has not evolved from any conception of how students learn, nor is it supported by research evidence” (p. 33).

The evolution of this structure was not without purpose. The loosely coupled nature of higher education promoted creative thinking and autonomy of thought (Keeling et al., 2007). Although both values are still significant, the current structure is at odds with a postmodern focus on assessment and accountability (Keeling et al., 2007, p. 22). Keeling et al. (2007) argued that the vertical structures of higher education must be balanced by horizontal forces to “pull some decision making, governance, and control to the center of the institution” (p. 24). The authors suggested that student learning outcomes have the ability to act as a horizontal force and transcend organizational boundaries. Although, many institutions are held hostage by what Schroeder (1999a) described as the “tyranny of custom” (p. 137) or a commitment to maintaining the status quo and avoiding crossing institutional boundaries.

**Competition.** Institutional governance and funding mechanisms arose to support these decentralized services and spurred competition (Keeling et al., 2007, pp. 22-24). Traditionally, academic and student affairs entities have competed for funding which has limited collaboration (Kezar, 2009). With tightening budgets, libraries and student affairs entities have had to increase
advocacy for diminishing funds. Love (2009) noted that both units “struggle with diminishing financial and human resources, rising student enrollments, and pressures to provide more services to an increasingly diverse student population” (p. 21). This culture of funding competition often results in departments focusing inward to protect their resources, inhibiting collaboration.

**Feelings of inferiority.** Both the librarianship and student affairs professions have struggled with feelings of inferiority on campus. For many years, student affairs practitioners felt they were looked down upon by faculty colleagues and classified as anti-intellectual (Smith, 1982). In the late nineties, leading members of the student affairs profession argued that practitioners set aside feelings of inferiority and develop relationships with academic affairs (Kezar, 2009). Kezar (2009) noted that it was essential to understand this history of tension between academic affairs and student affairs when seeking partnerships. Many institutions, librarians, and student affairs professionals still struggle with such tension.

Similarly, librarians have struggled to be viewed as equals to faculty members. Hardesty (1995) noted that librarians “have never been fully accepted as members of the faculty” and many faculty members are unable to differentiate librarians from support staff (p. 356). Although these feelings of inferiority are typically labeled as a challenge for collaboration with faculty members, the shared history may provide common ground between academic librarians and student affairs professionals.

**Cultural differences.** Successful collaborations across organizational boundaries require individuals to “challenge their own assumptions, perceptions, and myths” about themselves and each other (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000, p. 425); therefore, exposing cultural norms is a necessary
first step to collaboration. Culture can be defined as “the social or normative glue—based on
shared values and beliefs—that holds an organization together” (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. 10).

Scholars have investigated the cultural differences between student affairs professionals
and faculty (Blake, 1979; Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Fried, 1995; Kuh, Siegel, & Thomas, 2001;
Love, Kuh, MacKay, & Hardy, 1993; Schroeder, 1999a; Schroeder, 1999b; Schroeder, 2003).
Fried (1995) likened collaboration between faculty and student affairs as a border crossing for
both constituencies. She stated,

Both student affairs staff members and faculty members are strangers in each others’
land. They don’t speak each others’ language, aren’t familiar with the protocol in each
territory and seem generally uncomfortable in each other’s neighborhoods. Getting to
know each other professionally can be considered a cross-cultural experience for each.
(p. 179)

Engstrom and Tinto (2000) summarized the divergent cultural characteristics of faculty
and student affairs. Traditionally, faculty have had a strong commitment to furthering
knowledge, intellectual honesty, professional autonomy, collegiality, and service to society
(Austin, 1990) whereas student affairs professionals have prized holistic student development,
experiential learning, and celebrating human diversity (Love et al., 1993). Faculty tend to value
autonomy over collaboration, and student affairs professionals value collaboration over
autonomy. Ahren (2008) eloquently surmised that, “the dichotomy between autonomy and
collaboration alone may be the most illustrative of the divide between these two groups” (p. 85).

Blake (1979) described the cultural attributes of faculty and student affairs professionals
as complementary opposites, “In caricature the professorial extreme is almost the mirror image
of the student personnel administrator extreme” (p. 284), and that each culture has a balancing
effect on the other. Although differences have been acknowledged between faculty and student affairs, it does not mean that partnerships are hopeless. Once each side is aware of the cultural differences, productive dialogue on the nature of learning and effective collaborations are possible (Blake, 1979, 1996; Engstrom & Tinto, 2000).

**Mental models.** Similar to cultural differences, competing mental models can be a barrier to collaboration. Mental models are “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (Senge, 2006, p. 8). They can be shared within organizations or groups of individuals and unearthing these operating assumptions is crucial to forming mutual understanding and respect. Mental models can unconsciously guide behavior and “determine what people attend to, what they hold dear, and what they emphasize in their own work with students and others . . . they dictate the relative value one gives to facets of the undergraduate experience” (Kuh et al., 2001, p. 48). In fact, different mental models about the nature of student learning and value of out-of-class activities among academic affairs and student affairs are among the most significant barriers to collaboration (Kezar, 2001; Kuh, 1996; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994; Schroeder, 1999a; Schroeder, 1999b; Schroeder, 2003). Senge (2006) charged leaders with exposing and challenging the mental models within their organization. Bringing these assumptions to a conscious level is imperative for successful collaborations.

Kuh (1996) argued that faculty and student affairs professionals have different ingrained, and often unexplored, mental models regarding student learning and that discovering and addressing these differences is essential to successful collaboration. Kuh, Douglas, Lund, and Ramin-Gyurnek (1994) found that faculty characterize student learning primarily through the lens of the formal curriculum and research, and view student development functions such as
leadership development, orientation, and residential life as less salient to the idea of student learning. Whereas student affairs professionals also view the formal curriculum as essential to student learning, they place higher value on co-curricular elements to define their understanding of what constitutes student learning (Kuh et al., 1994).

The mental models between student affairs and academic affairs may be more similar than in the past. A 1999 study did not support earlier findings that faculty and student affairs professionals had opposite goals, and found that both constituents placed academic goals at the forefront (Papish, 1999). Similarly, Santiago-Vargas (2010) conducted a quantitative study comparing the mental models regarding student learning between academic and student affairs deans. She found academic and student affairs deans had similar understandings of student learning and development goals, but collaboration continued to be limited due to organizational processes and structures. Further examination of mental models and their effect on collaboration is needed to assess their impact.

This study will investigate the mental models of academic librarians and student affairs professionals regarding student learning and each other’s profession. Evidence suggests that student affairs practitioners and academic librarians are unaware of each other’s roles and responsibilities which may result in inaccurate assumptions about each field (Forrest, 2005; Love, 2009; Tag, Buck, & Mautino, 2007; Walter & Eodice, 2007). Tag, Buck, and Mautino (2007) acknowledged that with increased access to information technology and services (e.g., Internet, Google) there is a significant lack of knowledge among both faculty and students about the library, its resources, and librarians themselves. It is likely this ignorance extends to student affairs professionals, but further research is needed. Additionally, Walter and Eodice (2007) noted that student affairs graduate program curricula did not address academic libraries. This
lack of awareness may result in inaccurate mental models and assumptions about each profession and their role in student learning.

**Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Collaborations**

Collaborative activities between student affairs and academic affairs have been a prominent feature in higher education literature during the last twenty years, although few have been based on empirical evidence. Three notable exceptions include a national study on academic and student affairs collaboration (Kezar, 2001; Kezar, 2002; Kezar, 2003a; Kezar, 2003b), the Boyer Partnership Assessment Project (Nesheim et al., 2007; Whitt et al., 2008) and a collective case study of highly collaborative campuses (Kezar, 2005a, 2005b; Kezar, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Next, I will examine each of these studies and their findings.

**National Study on Academic and Student Affairs Collaboration**

In spite of additional calls for collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs, little research on such collaboration was conducted until the start of the 21st century. In conjunction with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), ACPA, and NASPA, a national study on academic and student affairs collaborations was conducted to document academic and student affairs collaborations, identify trends, and develop best practices. The survey, administered to senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) included nine areas: student affairs decision making at the institutional level, rationale for collaboration, types of collaboration, what made for a successful collaboration, structures of collaborations, strategies for successful collaborations, obstacles, outcomes, and institutional demographics (Kezar, 2001; Kezar, 2002; Kezar, 2003).

All survey respondents indicated they were engaged in a form of collaboration between academic and student affairs including approximately 40% who reported three to five successful
collaborations. Participants reported that the most successful collaborations occurred in the areas of first-year programs, orientation, recruitment, and counseling followed by co-curricular activities (e.g., academic advising, service learning, diversity, leadership, conduct, retention plans). An analysis of survey data revealed “statistically significant relationships between success in one form of collaboration (cocurricular or curricular) and success in the other” (Kezar, 2002, p. 42). Student learning was indicated as the most important reason for collaboration, but an environment of collegiality was shown to encourage the greatest number of successful collaborations.

The researchers assessed human, cultural, and structural strategies associated with collaboration. SSAOs perceived human strategies such as “cooperation (73 percent), student affairs staff attitudes (66 percent), common goals (63 percent), and personalities (62 percent)” contributed to successful collaborations (Kezar, 2002, p. 44). Although the participants perceived these human elements as more determinative of collaborative change than structural elements such as incentives, restructuring, financial resources, further analysis revealed a stronger correlation between structural strategies and successful collaborations. Kezar (2002) surmised that student affairs professionals’ focus on human development may cause them to overinflate individual strategies and minimize structural approaches.

Similarly, senior administrative support was perceived as the most important variable for success, but when tested for statistical significance with the number of successful collaborations it was not significant. Qualitative responses highlighted the participants’ perception of the importance of senior-level support in connection to structural strategies such as resource allocation, hiring, and a shift in institutional mission. Perhaps participants viewed senior-level support as a conduit to structural change (Kezar, 2002).
Kezar (2002) discovered that a combination of cultural and structural strategies were the most effective for developing successful collaborations. These strategies included leadership, cross-institutional dialogue, setting expectations, generating enthusiasm, creating a common vision, staff development, and strategic planning. These results remained consistent between institutional type and size with two exceptions (1) senior administrative support was determined to be more effective at institutions with less than 3,000 students, and (2) structural strategies were more impactful at institutions with more than 10,000 students. Kezar (2002) noted that “these two findings are supported by the literature on organizational change, larger organizations tend to need more alterations to the structure, particularly incentives, because it is too difficult to alter the entire culture or reach the whole community” (p. 47).

**Boyer Partnership Assessment Project (BPAP)**

The Boyer Partnership Assessment Project conducted between 2001-2005 utilized qualitative case study methods to examine the outcomes of student affairs and academic affairs collaboration at eighteen institutions (Nesheim et al., 2007; Whitt, 2011; Whitt et al., 2008). Participating institutions were required to have an on-going academic-student affairs collaboration (minimum of 3 years in length). A variety of institutions were selected including public, private, and community colleges. The collaborations were wide-ranging including first-year programs, academic support, service learning, living-learning communities, leadership development, and cultural exploration. The study was coordinated by the Ernest L. Boyer Center and funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE).

**Good practices.** The researchers concluded there were seven overarching principles to strong academic and student affairs partnerships which they deemed *good practices*. The authors intentionally avoided the term *best practices* since the study found that institutional context
strongly influenced appropriate approaches (Whitt, 2011). The good practices for partnership programs included (1) alignment with institutional mission, (2) learning focused, (3) builds on and nurtures relationships, (4) strong understanding of institutional culture, (5) committed to assessment, (6) the ability to use resources efficiently and creatively, and (7) having multiple layers of leadership invested in the partnership. Overall, the researchers concluded, “research on college impact is unequivocal: Student success (learning, development, persistence) is associated with seamless learning environments, environments characterized by coherent educational purposes and comprehensive policies and practices designed to achieve those purposes” (Whitt et al., 2008).

**Student outcomes.** In addition to examining principles of academic and student affairs partnerships, the researchers explored student outcomes of such collaborations. Four categories of student outcomes emerged from the data: acclimation to the institution, engagement, student learning and academic and career decisions (Nesheim et al., 2007). The findings illustrated that successful academic and student affairs partnerships resulted in positive student benefits. Many participants described an enhanced seamless learning environment due to the collaborations and cited advancement in a variety of learning outcomes including critical thinking, commitment to learning, and understanding of self and others. Although it is unclear from the publication if the partnerships studied included academic librarians, this research showed that collaborations between academic affairs and student affairs can foster student learning outcomes.

**Collective Case Study of Highly Collaborative Campuses**

Kezar (2005a, 2006) conducted a collective case study of four highly collaborative campuses in order to create a model to foster collaboration in a higher education environment. She built upon the work of various *a priori* theories from the fields of business and
organizational studies to provide a foundation for the creation of a higher-education-specific model. Specifically, the Mohrman, Cohen, and Mohrman (1995) model (see pages 22-23) was used as a starting point. Mohrman et al. (1995) argued that collaboration is largely unsuccessful because leaders impose a collectivist vision on an organizational structure designed for individualistic work. Thus, for successful collaboration to emerge, organizational structures and cultures need to be redesigned. The model emphasized six core concepts for creating a collaborative environment: strategy, tasks or work of the organization, structure, processes, rewards, and people. MCM was deemed the most comprehensive collaboration model by Kezar and used as a departing point for the study. The purpose of the study was to identify organizational features that facilitated collaboration, to determine which features were the most important, and identify a developmental process (Kezar, 2005b, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009).

The study utilized unique and purposeful sampling techniques to identify highly collaborative institutions. The American Association for Higher Education nominated campuses that fit a variety of sampling criteria including demonstrated restructuring efforts to enhance collaboration, a large number of collaborative initiatives, a reputation for collaboration, and perceived depth and quality of collaborations (Kezar, 2005b, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Each nominated institution went through additional screening to ensure they met the criteria. Only “typical” institutions were chosen; typical institutions were identified as non-elite and “without significant funding to leverage partnerships and collaboration” (Kezar, 2006, p. 813). Four comprehensive universities in separate geographic regions were chosen for the study.

The research project resulted in the identification of eight organizational features that facilitate collaboration and produced the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education
(SMCHE), a development model for collaboration. The model and each feature are discussed in detail in the next section. The features provide the theoretical framework for this study.

**Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education**

Kezar (2005b) originally developed the three-stage model (building commitment, commitment, and sustaining commitment) and key features in 2005 as a result of her study of highly collaborative campuses. Originally, she identified eight features essential to facilitating collaboration in higher education: “(1) mission; (2) integrating structures; (3) campus networks; (4) rewards; (5) a sense of priority from people in senior positions; (6) external pressure; (7) values; and (8) learning” (p. 844). In 2009, Kezar and Lester (2009) co-authored *Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration: A Guide for Campus Leaders*, which elaborated on each feature. Minor changes were made to the initial feature and the fifth feature, “a sense of priority from people in senior positions” was eliminated. The final list of features examined include: (1) mission, vision, and educational philosophy, (2) values, (3) social networks, (4) integrating structures, (5) rewards (6) external pressure, and (7) learning (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 60).

For this study, I will use the seven features from 2009 and add the previously eliminated eighth feature “a sense of priority from people in senior positions” as a heuristic device for data analysis. I have chosen to include the eighth feature because additional research supports the need to examine the role of senior leadership (Kezar, 2002; Kuh & Banta, 2000; Whitt et al., 2008). Although Kezar and Lester (2009) noted the importance of each feature, three were deemed essential to facilitating collaboration: mission and vision, social networks, and integrating structures.
Mission, Vision, and Educational Philosophy

The first feature, mission, vision, and educational philosophy, describes an organization’s purpose and aspirational goals. Mission creates a “shared vision and sense of purpose for members of campus” and vision “is aspirational and expresses where an organization hopes to be in the future (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 61). Kezar (2006) found that highly collaborative campuses linked a philosophy of collaboration to their mission statement and guiding principles, “Many people noted that a philosophy of collaboration that is tied to the mission of the institution made collaboration a systematic process and part of all work in which they engaged” (p. 817). Additionally, of the four campuses studied, three had incorporated a philosophy of collaborative learning that highlighted the social aspect of learning. Campuses enabled collaboration by having a clear universally known mission statement and by aligning collaborative initiatives to the mission and strategic plan (Kezar, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009).

The importance of mission, vision, and educational philosophy is often cited as a principle of effective collaborative initiatives between academic and student affairs. Whitt et al. (2008) found that effective partnerships were a reflection of the institution’s mission and identified it as a good practice for student affairs-academic affairs partnerships. Ahren (2008) noted that collaborative initiatives should be integrated into policies and guiding documents, and Schroder (1999a) urged leaders to “build partnerships around a shared vision of what matters in undergraduate education” (p. 154). Similarly, Grace (2002) and Schuh (1999) emphasized the need for creating a shared vision of student learning to advance collaborations.

Values

“Values are beliefs that guide behaviors and shape underlying assumptions” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 85). Organizational values have been shown to impact operation and success
Three values have been proven more effective for developing collaboration: innovation, egalitarianism, and student-centeredness (Kezar, 2006). Campuses that embrace these three values seem to be able to foster collaboration more easily because they provide a common ground for collaboration (for students), an ethos to experiment (innovation), and an egalitarian ethic that allows people to value other people’s work by eliminating some of the common barriers in an elite culture, such as hierarchies of disciplines, position (faculty, staff, administration), and administrative unit (academic versus student affairs). (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 91)

Shared values instill a sense of purpose in organizational members and define actions. Highly collaborative campuses frequently discussed values and were identified as a foundation for partnerships (Kezar, 2006).

Values are a component of organizational culture. Schein (1985) provided a framework to analyze culture that was comprised of three levels: artifacts, values, and assumptions. At the artifact level are observable features within an organization such as the physical environment, social environment, technology, written and spoken language, overt behavior, and symbols. Values, the second dimension, are not observable features in an organization, but one can use an analysis of artifacts to infer values. Finally, Schein identified assumptions as the third layer of culture. He described assumptions as unconscious beliefs that guide actions such as the nature of truth, reality, and human nature.

Values are a foundational aspect of organization culture and are crucial to transitioning a campus to a collaborative context. Kezar and Eckel (2002) discovered a significant relationship between organizational culture and effective change efforts. In their study, change strategies were most successful when applied through a cultural lens; if a strategy challenged a cultural
norm, it was ineffective. These findings support a need to analyze the cultural elements of collaborations between student affairs professionals and academic librarians to uncover how they collaborate to advance student learning.

Social Networks

Social networks are people intentionally connected “through some form of interdependency such as values, preferences, goals, ideas, or friends” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 99). Networks supporting collaboration were identified as a crucial component for organizational change. Harnessing the power of pre-existing social networks on campus sped up collaborative ventures by creating a critical mass and leveraging institutional knowledge and influence. Highly collaborative campuses also nurtured network building by supporting individuals prone to boundary spanning and networking, planning social and educational events, developing incentives, capitalizing on committee work, altering physical spaces, and opening up meetings to a wider audience (Kezar & Lester, 2009).

Additional research points to the power of social networks to foster collaboration to advance student learning. Whitt et al. (2008) stressed the importance of creating networks through relationships, “In every case, the partnerships programs we studied evolved from informal and formal relationships based on common interests” (p. 242). Boundary spanners, “organizational members in higher education institutions who cross boundaries to enact their roles in the surrounding environment” have been a key influence in promoting collaboration and holistic student learning (Bess & Dee, 2012, p. 95). Kuh et al. (1994) remarked that “institutions with an ethos of learning are blessed with more than a few boundary spanners, people who move among the functional silos, articulating the institution’s mission and vision with language that acknowledges and respects both classrooms and out-of-class learning” (p. 64).
Boundary spanners played a prominent role at highly collaborative campuses by connecting people across organizational boundaries (Kezar, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009; Lawrence, 2007). Often, these people were veteran employees who worked in cross-functional units such as assessment or service learning; however, some campuses found new employees with experience in collaborative initiatives fulfilling these roles. On one campus, almost everyone interviewed discussed the role of two boundary spanners who constantly took people out to lunch to develop new relationships (Kezar, 2006).

Hosting both social and educational networking events was another component to creating strong social networks that enable collaboration (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Kezar, 2005b, 2006; Kezar, & Lester, 2009). Kezar and Lester (2009) reported, “Institutions need to be aware that offering multiple opportunities for network building helps to build the critical mass necessary for collaboration” (p. 105). The types of events varied by campus, but served a united function of bringing together individuals committed to collaboration.

Highly collaborative campuses also utilized physical space in creative ways to encourage social networks (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Schroeder, 1999a). Banta and Kuh (1998) explained that faculty and staff need arenas to share with each other and develop a common language. Many networking events were found at the departmental level, but some institutions also had areas that provided networking opportunities at a more global level such as a faculty development center or human resources. One human resources department described themselves as “a hummingbird, pollinating flowers all over campus with the seeds of collaboration” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 109).

The role of social networks and relationships were found to be more important in a higher education context than the business environment (Kezar, 2006). In fact, social networks were
found to be an essential feature for facilitating collaboration. This is likely due to some of the unique features of higher education such as the influence of peer groups and the importance of prestige (Kezar, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009). In addition, these findings are supported by previous research that found student affairs professionals perceived human strategies (cooperation, attitude, common goals, and personalities) as influential to enhancing collaboration in higher education (Kezar, 2002; Kezar, 2003).

**Integrating Structures**

The feature, integrating structures, describes the creation of new or restructured organizational elements that support collaboration such as cross-functional teams, interdisciplinary centers, enhanced technology, or restructuring. As discussed earlier, the historical specialization and vertical structures in higher education can be a barrier to collaboration. In order to form a collaborative environment, attention must be paid to institutional infrastructure and horizontal integrating structures need to be created.

Kezar (2005a) discovered that “structures are key to sustaining collaboration and to linking work that is usually done in isolation” (p. 54). Structures can range from technology, assessment programs, financial resources, common areas, time, or staff. Engstrom and Tinto (2000) encouraged institutions to establish a senior-level position dedicated to collaboration and learning. All of the four highly collaborative campuses had created a cross-functional unit that encouraged collaborative work.

A common integrating organizational structure is the cross-functional team. Cross-functional teams can be highly effective in differentiated bureaucratic environments (Kezar & Lester, 2009). In a mixed-methods study designed to produce a diagnostic model for cross-functional teams, Denison, Hart, and Kahn (1996) identified multiple outcomes for cross-
functional teams including innovation, efficiency, learning, personal satisfaction, effectiveness, and increased knowledge capacity. Cross-functional teams are most effective when they are given innovative projects (Andrews, 1995).

Similar to cross-functional teams, many librarians already engage in academic liaison relationships with academic departments. Dahl (2007) has urged librarians to expand the traditional academic liaisons structure to non-faculty units. A liaison relationship, as opposed to outreach, infers a higher degree of structure including formal budget allocation and collection development. Dahl (2007) stated that formal liaison relationships allows librarians “to be involved in the initial stages of creating and planning programs and projects, and be in a better position to truly partner in their development” (p. 5). The creation of liaison relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians could act as an integrating structure for collaboration.

The creation of assessment plans and teams can be one form of integrating structures. “Assessment is an integrated activity that is hard to conduct well in institutional silos, so it represents an important area for helping demonstrate the importance of collaborative work” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 128). Others have echoed this sentiment and called for assessment to be collaborative and to ensure assessment is conducted on collaborative ventures (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Steffes & Keeling, 2006; Whitt et al., 2008). Assessment teams on collaborative campuses have been a method to connect people across campus and focus on student learning outcomes. Walter (2009) explained the issues of assessment are similar for student affairs programs and information literacy programs; he concluded academic librarians could learn from the assessment models utilized in student affairs work and apply them to information literacy instruction.
Kezar (2006) identified the “presidential initiative” as a less-permanent integrating structure that permeates campus boundaries. This was seen as a foundation for collaborative work that would eventually lead to the creation of more permanent structures. Another common integrating structure was the use of technology that supported collaboration. Some campuses discovered they needed to alter their accounting or computing systems to allow for joint-appointments or team-taught courses (Kezar & Lester, 2009).

New technologies and social media can also be used to enhance collaboration and increase communication across organization borders. Corporations have used platforms such as webinars, blogs, podcasts, and Second-Life, a virtual world, to facilitate and sustain collaboration. Walter and Eodice (2007) also encouraged the use of new technologies to support collaboration between student affairs and academic libraries. They cited an example at the University of Kansas, which created a campus-wide digital preservation program called HVC\(^2\)-High Velocity Change through High Volume Collaboration. The program allowed regular communication, between the library and student affairs units, to create and catalog instructional programming.

**Rewards**

Kezar and Lester (2009) defined a reward as “something given in return for performance of desired behavior” (p. 147). Traditional reward structures in higher education are designed to be individualistic. Austin (1990) noted that autonomy is a core faculty value reinforced by the tenure and peer-review processes. Many disciplines promote independent work by preferring single authorship to multiple authors. Stein and Short (2001) argued that without incentive systems designed to reward collaboration many faculty and administrators lack motivation to
collaborate on program reform. Schroeder (1999a) and Ahren (2008) also emphasized the need to align reward structures and incentives to support collaboration.

One participant acknowledged the importance of changing rewards to support the philosophy of collaboration, “If you have structures to facilitate collaboration, but not the rewards, collaboration is just not going to happen throughout the institution. Rewards signal where people’s values lie” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 154). Highly collaborative campuses were found to balance intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Rewards included changing the tenure and promotion process to support collaboration, creating grants and individualized incentives, and highlighting personal benefits such as increased job satisfaction. Changing the tenure and promotion process to support collaboration was common at collaborative campuses, but was also identified as difficult to implement (Kezar, 2006). Collaborative projects can provide many intrinsic rewards such as learning new skills and working with new people (Kezar, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Leaders can enhance intrinsic rewards by highlighting collaborative successes (Schroeder, 1999a).

External Pressure

External pressures are characterized as forces outside the organization that influence internal functioning. A variety of external pressures affect institutions of higher education including governmental agencies, funding sources, accreditation, and public support. Collaborative universities used external pressures to highlight the importance, value, and need of partnerships (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Kezar (2005b) surmised, “Because collaboration is such a difficult transition to make, external pressures seem needed to overcome institutional inertia and disciplinary silos” (p. 826).
As discussed in Chapter I, there have been increased pressures by private groups, government entities, and professional organizations to use collaboration as a method to enhance student learning. Within student affairs there have been numerous documents from professional associations encouraging collaboration with academic affairs (AAHE et al., 1998; ACPA, 1994; Keeling, 2004; Keeling; 2006). Likewise, academic librarians have had calls to collaborate across campus from standards outlined by their professional association (ACRL, 2011a).

Academic libraries have encountered various external pressures to adapt to the changing nature of technology and shifting student needs of the Millennial Generation. Gardner and Eng (2005) reported, “Today’s undergraduates are pushing the academic library to rethink the ways in which it presents its most basic services” (p. 405). Current traditional age undergraduates have been described as “digital natives” who “are not simply technology users but who are also literate in the use of technology, information and media” (Levine & Dean, 2012, p. 165).

Surveys have indicated that students’ first source for academic research is often Google and students are not using the library in the same way as past generations (Gardner & Eng, 2005; Oblinger, 2003; Online Computer Library Center, 2006). This change in user services and expectations has led to critiques of academic libraries and challenges to reform. Upon conducting research on the current generation of students, Levine and Dean (2012) described a new future for academic libraries:

The library must move from the periphery of the college campus to its center. It has to be transformed from a storehouse for content to the central campus authority on knowledge-the discovery, incubation, distribution, application, combination and recombination of knowledge. Colleges and universities are populated by faculty members who are experts
in content but they know relatively little about the structure and use of knowledge. Libraries will have to lead their campuses in this regard (pp. 170-171).

Cummings (2007) encouraged librarians to respond to these external pressures by collaborating with student affairs professionals. She proposed reaching out to students in new spaces and “physically move out of or leave the building [library] and take our instruction and reference services across campus” to areas such as residence halls and student unions (Cummings, 2007, p. 286).

Learning about Collaboration

As an organizational feature, learning about collaboration refers to “communicating the need and importance of collaboration” and “how to collaborate” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 195). In order to evolve from a culture of isolation to collaboration, all members of the community must have access to developmental activities (Grace, 2002; Kezar, 2005b; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Simple initiatives such as brown-bag luncheons and social media forums can provide an outlet for the conversation on the nature of student learning and campus cultures. On collaborative campuses, learning about collaboration was achieved through informal networks, formal workshops, observing successful collaborations, and designing a variety of approaches to meet a specific population (Kezar & Lester, 2009). The feature of learning about collaboration, although important, was found to be dependent on other features such as integrating structures and rewards (Kezar, 2005b).

Brown (1997) argued that in order for higher education to fully institute a student learning philosophy, learning must extend to the workplace. Leaders must transform organizations into learning organizations committed to equal participation, the examination of assumptions, and acceptance of conflict (Senge, 2006). Although, the role of formal learning
was not as strong in higher education settings as compared to business environments (Kezar, 2006). Kezar (2005a) discovered, “Informal learning and conversation – colleague-to-colleague information sharing – seems to be the most powerful learning experience and motivator” (p. 56). Considering this, providing many opportunities for networking can be as productive as any formal workshop.

**Sense of Priority from People in Senior Positions**

Although collaborations are most likely to be successful when championed by faculty or staff, senior leadership must be able to support collaboration by modeling collaborative behaviors and incorporating collaboration into strategic initiatives (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Kezar, 2005a; Schroeder, 2003). Engstrom and Tinto (2000) encouraged leaders to model collaborative behavior. “Leaders are needed who will take risks and be vulnerable in the spirit of collaboration as they emphasize learning” (p. 443). Additionally, leadership reinforces collaboration through reward and recognition structures, and adequate resources.

In a national study on academic and student affairs collaboration, senior administrative support was reported by SSAOs as the most important feature for enhancing partnerships (Kezar, 2002; Kezar, 2003a; Kezar, 2003b), but Cohen and March (1974) found that survey respondents overestimated the influence of senior leadership. Kezar (2003a) advocated for additional investigation of the effect of senior-level support on collaboration. Senior administrative support may be a conduit to achieving other features such as rewards or integrating structures, or may emerge as a successful condition in its own right. This feature was included independently to further assess its impact on collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians.
**Academic Library-Student Affairs Collaborations**

During the last decade, librarians have advocated for increased collaboration between student affairs and academic libraries. A growing number of journal articles in library publications have addressed library-student affairs collaboration and described successful partnerships in areas such as first-year programs and orientation (Boff, Albrecht, Armstrong, 2007; Boff & Johnson, 2007; Cummings, 2007; Forrest, 2005; Kuh, Boruff-Jones, & Mark, 2007; Tag et al., 2007; Tenofsky, 2006), career services (Hollister, 2005; Scott & Verduce, 2012; Song, 2007), co-curricular programming (Crowe, Hummel, Dale, & Bazirjian, 2012; Cummings, 2007; Kahl & Paterson, 2012; Maio & Shaughnessy, 2012), multicultural student services, (Love, 2007; Love, 2009; Love & Edwards, 2009), and academic integrity (Swartz et al., 2007; Accardi, Garvey-Nix, & Meyer, 2012). In this section, I will review the literature on collaborations between student affairs and academic libraries in each of these areas.

All but one article (Hoag & Sagmoen, 2012) was published in librarianship journals. Although there is a plethora of research regarding student affairs and academic affairs partnerships, there is often only a cursory mention of the library in student affairs publications. I estimate that university libraries may be playing a larger role in these partnerships, yet they have been overlooked in the literature because of a focus on collaboration with traditional teaching faculty. A majority of the collaborations presented are based on anecdotal evidence. Additionally, although many of the case studies presented started in one student affairs functional area, once an initial collaboration exists, more were likely to follow (Hollister, 2005; Kezar, 2001; Love, 2007; Tag et al., 2007).
Librarians as Faculty

Prior to discussing specific collaborative initiatives between academic librarians and student affairs professionals, it is important to clarify the role of librarians in the academy. Although the status of librarians can vary between institutions, librarians are frequently classified as faculty. ACRL has continued to advocate and promote the role of librarians as faculty. In 2011, ACRL’s Committee on the Status of Academic Librarians released a document that outlined the professional responsibilities of librarians and standards for faculty status. The document called attention to the contributions of librarians including “developing collections, providing bibliographic access to all library materials, and interpreting these materials to members of the college and university community” (ACRL, 2011c, para. 3) and directed institutions to provide librarians with the same rights and responsibilities as traditional teaching faculty.

The committee also noted that although ACRL “supports faculty rank, status, and tenure for librarians” (ACRL, 2011d, para. 1) they conceded that not all institutions provide faculty status to librarians. Due to this, they developed a set of guidelines for librarians that operate without faculty status and stressed the need for librarians to have academic freedom, commensurate pay, and clear contracts. In recent years, the need for faculty status and tenure for librarians have been debated in the library community (Dunn, 2013; Wyss, 2010). Some institutions such as East Carolina University have opted to remove tenure status from librarians but maintain faculty status (Dunn, 2013). Hosburgh (2011) reported that academic librarians often fall on a continuum between staff and faculty. He further noted, “faculty status is not a static state and may be very different across institutions” (p. 2). In this study, the librarians at
Augustana have faculty status, and serve on faculty-committees, but are not subject to tenure and promotion guidelines.

**First-Year Programs and Orientation**

The most frequently cited library-student affairs collaborations in literature are with first-year experience programs (Boff et al., 2007; Boff & Johnson, 2007; Cummings, 2007; Forrest, 2005; Kuh et al., 2007; Tenofsky, 2006). A national study on academic and student affairs collaborations supported this observation; “institutions are experiencing the most success with counseling, first-year experience (FYE) programs, orientation and recruitment” (Kezar, 2002, p. 41). First-year programs already exhibit a high degree of faculty-student affairs crossover, so seeing similar trends in libraries is expected.

Information literacy skills are essential across the curriculum and encourage life-long learning (Kuh & Gonyea, 2003). Oakleaf, Millet, and Kraus (2011) advocated for a collaborative approach to information literacy instruction and assessment. The need for information literacy skills is growing with the ever-increasing availability and abundance of information (Oakleaf, et al., 2011). Kuh and Gonyea (2003) reported that only half of undergraduates feel confident in their ability to find good information and an equal number of students acknowledged difficulty in assessing information quality. This supports the need for information literacy education as a collaborative venture.

Boff and Johnson (2007) noted that first-year seminars were ideal for introducing students to library services and information literacy skills. In 2001, they conducted a national survey to assess the frequency of library skill curricula in FYE courses. Approximately, 67% of respondents required a library component. The authors reported mixed student and faculty
reaction to the inclusion of information literacy in first-year seminars, which may be due to a lack of knowledge regarding information literacy skills and learning outcomes.

One example of an academic library and first-year program collaboration is at Western Washington University (Tag et al., 2007). After staff turnover, the library created an outreach team that focused on developing relationships with student affairs entities (also referred to as non-academic departments). They began working with first-year programs and orientation and created joint workshops with technology services for incoming students focusing on information literacy. The initiative began with incoming first-year students and after seeing successes, was quickly expanded to include transfers. Through their work with first-year programs, additional student learning needs were identified and student affairs staff began to understand the role of the library in educating students about information literacy and providing valuable resources. During a conversation between librarians and residence life staff, both realized they had shared goals in wanting to improve academic services in the residence halls. Through this conversation, additional services were developed within the residence halls to academically support students and increase their information literacy skills (Tag et al., 2007).

In 2007, ACRL and the National Resource Center for First Year Experience and Students in Transition mapped a path for libraries in first-year experience programs. Aptly named, *The Role of the Library in the First Year of College* (Hardesty, 2007), this publication served as a call to action to involve libraries within the first-year experience and the creation of first-year experience librarian positions that focus on new student orientation, campus reading initiatives, first-year seminars, and representation on campus wide first-year experience (FYE) committees (Boff et al., 2007).
Cahoy and Sanavely (2007) urged libraries to become a destination for co-curricular activities and argued, “Libraries are in a unique position to reach students at both the curricular and co-curricular level and can help bridge the gap between in- and out-of-class experiences” (p. 123). They described possible outreach to residence halls, but provided very little guidance for building collaborative partnerships with student affairs (Cahoy & Snavely, 2007). The editors discussed 13 examples about library involvement in the first-year experience, yet their focus is on the librarian’s role with faculty in the classroom. There are only perfunctory mentions of collaboration with student affairs professionals.

**Career Development**

One of the first student affairs-academic library collaborations found in literature was at the University of Buffalo between reference librarians and career services. Prior to 2003, the Undergraduate Library and Career Services Office at University of Buffalo worked together “informally and infrequently” (Hollister, 2005, p. 105). In 2003, a librarian initiated contact with the career counselors to integrate library instruction sessions into career preparatory workshops and cross-catalog career preparatory materials. Immediate responses from students were positive and one student was quoted as stating, “I didn’t know I could use the library to find out about specific companies” (p. 106).

This initial success led to a deeper partnership, both librarians and career services staff began meeting regularly and each developed a greater understanding of the other’s structure and culture. Initially, steps were employed to develop a common language and vision, which included facility tours, and cross-committee representation. The partnership is on-going and has provided career services staff with a better archived satellite library, increased information literacy skills for students, and the library with increased access to students in a venue that
connects library research to personal goals. Similar partnerships between academic libraries and career centers have occurred at Indiana Tech (Scott & Verduce, 2012), and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Song, 2007).

**Co-curricular Programming**

Librarians report that a barrier for student access to library services is *library anxiety*. *Library anxiety* is defined by four main attributes including the library size, uncertainty regarding where to find items, insecurity over where to begin, and what processes to follow (Mellon, 1986, p. 162). Many first-year students have library anxiety and 75-85% of students regularly report feeling scared, lost, or confused in the library. Furthermore, studies on student perceptions indicate students are fearful of asking librarians questions, and are generally unaware of the resources librarians have to offer (Fagan, 2002). Overall, library anxiety and incorrect perceptions of librarians impede student success.

In the last decade, librarians have turned to co-curricular programming to outreach to students in new ways and reduce library anxiety. Cahoy and Snavely (2007) reported that creative library orientations such as mystery tours, scavenger hunts, and festivals enhanced student comfort with the library facility. As library space has been converted from quiet study space to a collaborative learning hub, libraries have begun to incorporate gaming programs (Vander Elzen & Roush, 2013; Zitron & Drew, 2011). Vander Elzen and Roush (2013) identified collaboration with student affairs professionals and student organizations as a key component for a successful gaming program. They also found that gaming programs increased library visibility. Students reported feeling more comfortable with library staff and 76.9% of attendees felt that the activities enhanced their sense of belonging on campus.
Student affairs staff members have also reported advantages to joint co-curricular programming including increased engagement of commuter and non-traditional students in programming initiatives (Hoag & Sagmoen, 2012). In addition to programming within the library facility, librarians have brought programs into student affairs managed spaces such as diversity centers, career centers, student unions, Greek houses, and residence halls (Cummings, 2007; Kraemer, Keyse, & Lombardo, 2003; Lampert, Dabbour, & Solis, 2005). Cummings (2007) worked with residence life staff to incorporate a passive programming initiative, Library in your Room, aimed at educating residents of online library resources via door hangers, posters, and bulletin boards. Similarly, Kraemer et al. (2003) designed a book club for residence hall students.

Librarian outreach programming has enhanced traditional student activities such as Welcome Week (Kraemer, et al., 2003), late night programming (Cummings, 2007), citizenship programming (Kahl & Paterson, 2012), cultural celebrations, (Kraemer et al., 2003) and student leadership trainings (Maio & Shaughnessy, 2012). Not only are librarians assisting in coordinating campus activities some have begun participating. At Mansfield University in Pennsylvania, librarians sought to reduce library anxiety by participating in a theater production and campus orchestra performance (Kasperek, Johnson, Fotta, & Craig, 2006). As a result of this participation, assessment results indicated students felt more comfortable with the library and librarians. The authors concluded, “Librarians involved with student activities outside the library improves student comfort in the library, and should therefore be considered a service to the library and university” (Kasperek et al., 2006, p. 124).
Multicultural Student Services

Walter (2005) contended that libraries have intermittently engaged in diversity issues on campus and stated, “A commitment to supporting diversity initiatives across campus is not a deeply-rooted feature of the service profile of academic libraries” (Walter, 2005, p. 439). Although some libraries have created diversity committees within their organizational structure, little outreach has occurred to student services. Kuhartets, Cahalan, and Gitner (2001) maintain that one of the most important goals of any library is “its dedication to serving ethnic populations” (p. xii). Student affairs has the knowledge and ability to assist libraries in achieving this vision.

The need for integrating librarians into diversity centers is grounded in learning environments theory. Creating an inclusive campus environment is critical for student success. Strange and Banning (2001) stated, “When fundamental needs of safety and inclusion are in jeopardy, the effectiveness of involving and communal environments may be compromised” (p. 109). Students of color and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning (LGBTQ) identified students often experience a less than welcoming campus environment and take comfort in cultural centers. Librarians who work within cultural centers can provide historically underrepresented students with greater access to services and support. Love (2007) noted that partnerships with cultural centers can create trust and alliances for libraries that allows librarians to reach students outside the classroom.

Research has also shown an organizational need to integrate library services into cultural centers. Theories for multicultural organization development cite collaboration regarding diversity, inclusion, and social justice as central to developing a more inclusive organizational structure (Grieger, 1996; Jackson, 2005). Norlin and Morris (2001) conducted a survey of
cultural directors regarding their interactions with library staff; 85% responded they did not network with library staff. This indicated a dearth of communication and knowledge between the organizations regarding each other’s services. As cultural directors and librarians interact with students on a daily basis, increased communication could enhance organizational knowledge capacity and improve student service. Prior examples of library collaboration with cultural centers and TRIO services have demonstrated successful and sustaining partnerships (Love, 2009; Love & Edwards, 2009; Norlin & Morris, 2001; Walter, 2005).

At the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), significant measures were taken to entwine library resources with multicultural student services (Love, 2009; Love & Edwards, 2009). Previous empirical studies have shown the use of academic libraries by historically underrepresented students is positively linked to retention (Mallinckrodt & Sedlacek, 2009). Due to this and an increased push for multiculturalism in academic libraries, numerous partnership opportunities were identified at UIUC. In 2006, librarians at the undergraduate library created an outreach program aimed at building connections with student services. This movement created two positions, an Outreach Librarian for Multicultural Services and an Orientation Services Librarian. Each was tasked with creating partnerships within the library and bringing library services to other areas of campus (Love & Edwards, 2009).

The Outreach Librarian for Multicultural Student Services began working with staff in the Minority Student Center to assess the needs of students and how they could partner to provide essential skills. Initially, an instruction session was added to the curriculum of all three summer TRiO programs. Students reacted positively and more than half set up additional appointments to learn more about topics such as RefWorks, a citation management tool (Love &
Edwards, 2009). The librarian began holding weekly sessions in cultural centers that provided students with research support and tutorials.

Student leaders began partnering with the outreach librarian to promote these services on a peer level. This step dramatically increased students’ use of the service and earned students’ trust. The collaboration soon broadened further to include international and study abroad students. This ongoing partnership has fulfilled a variety of outcomes including increased visibility for the library, connecting minority students with a specific librarian, improved student access to library resources, and increased student learning on information literacy (Love & Edwards, 2009).

**Academic Integrity**

Two recent case studies have validated the potential for a successful collaboration between student affairs and academic libraries regarding academic integrity issues. The College Library and Office of the Dean of Students at University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) recognized they had a common goal of educating students on the ethical use of information. They joined forces to create various learning modules (Swartz et al., 2007). The authors noted that both offices were “invigorated by a new sense of camaraderie” and numerous collaborative projects followed the initial partnership (Swartz et al., 2007, p. 114).

A similar partnership was formed at Indiana University Southeast between the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the Writing Center Director, and an instructional librarian (Accardi et al., 2012). The team developed academic integrity workshops designed to be a sanction component for violators of the policy. The authors indicated the development of learning outcomes were critical to the program’s success.
Overall, there are numerous anecdotes of successful collaborations between student affairs and academic librarians in the areas of first-year programs, career development, co-curricular programming, multicultural student services, and academic integrity. Additional empirical research is needed to better understand how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning including successful strategies and potential barriers.

**Evaluation and Summary of Literature**

There has been a wealth of research on student learning and the need to collaborate across organizational boundaries in higher education. Improving student learning is essential to meeting the future needs of higher education and an essential component of this study. Both scholars and professional organizations have presented compelling arguments to increase collaborative efforts between student affairs and academic affairs. Although there has been research on barriers to collaboration, such as cultural differences and unexamined mental models, much of the literature in these areas is dated, and recent research (Papish, 1999; Santiago-Vargas, 2010) suggests a need to re-examine these elements as potential barriers. Furthermore, no empirical research has specifically examined collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals; therefore, there may be unexamined benefits and challenges to collaboration for these groups.

Although collaboration has been frequently discussed in higher education literature, only three studies empirically assessed the outcomes and context for collaboration. Similar findings existed across these three studies including the importance of a common vision/mission, the need to focus on student learning, and the importance of relationships. Additional scholarly literature supports these commonalities, and each of these have guided my research questions.
Numerous models for collaboration have been developed for the business sector, but only one model, the SMCHE, has taken into account the unique context of higher education. The eight features of the SMCHE provide a useful heuristic to analyze collaborations between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. The features have evolved from earlier conceptual models of collaboration in a business environment, but have been adapted for higher education.

The literature regarding collaboration between academic libraries and student affairs professionals is fairly recent and anecdotal. These initial accounts have portrayed successful partnerships that warrant further investigation. An overwhelming majority of the literature on these collaborations have been published by academic librarians. Little attention has been given to library partnerships in student affairs journals and publications.

In summary, the potential for student learning and organizational outcomes in student affairs/academic library collaborations are tremendous. In order to capture the breadth and depth of future partnerships subsequent empirical studies are needed. Empirical research on specific collaborations between student affairs and academic libraries has not been, after months of searches, discovered by this researcher; thus, there are many opportunities for future studies. Therefore, this study seeks to examine how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning at a private liberal arts institution. The following chapter is a presentation of the methodological literature and selected methodology for this study.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this single instrumental case study was to describe the collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians at one private liberal arts institution. The research question is:

- How do student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning?

The research sub-questions include:

- What strategies are utilized to facilitate collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals? What were the barriers to collaboration?
- How has the existence of a shared facility affected collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians?
- How do the mental models of each profession at the institution influence collaborative relationships regarding student learning?

I used a qualitative case study approach to answer the above questions. Qualitative research is appropriate when a phenomenon warrants exploration and the researcher seeks to understand the context of an issue (Creswell, 2013, p. 48). Qualitative inquiry was well suited for this study because there has been no systematic scientific inquiry conducted on collaborative relationships between academic librarians and student affairs professionals and exploration is needed. Consistent with qualitative inquiry, I sought to understand the emic perspective of participants and explore how individuals make meaning of their experiences within the boundaries of the case.
Social Constructivist Paradigm

This study was grounded in a social constructivist paradigm. Guba (1990) defined a paradigm as “a basic set of beliefs that guide action, whether of the everyday garden variety or action taken in connection with a disciplined inquiry” (p. 17). Broido and Manning (2002) noted that “Paradigms shape research at its most basic level” including what questions are explored and the interpretation of data (p. 435). Paradigms are normative and guide inquiry, thus it is important to explore the underlying epistemological, ontological, and axiological assumptions of the chosen paradigm (Patton, 2002).

Ontological assumptions are beliefs about the nature of reality (Creswell, 2013; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The social constructivist paradigm is rooted in the premise that individuals construct reality through personal experience and the overall nature of reality is co-constructed (Broido & Manning, 2002; Creswell, 2013). In a social constructivist paradigm, individuals construct multiple realities through their experiences and interactions.

Epistemology refers to the concept of knowledge and the interaction of the “knower and the known” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37). Within a social constructivist paradigm, knowledge is co-constructed between the researcher and the participant (Creswell, 2013). The researcher and participants bring a set of background knowledge and values to the research, which shapes interpretation. Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined the relationship between the researcher and participant as “interactive” and “inseparable” (p. 37).

Axiological assumptions represent the role of values in the research (Creswell, 2013; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that inquiry is value laden in five ways (a) by the values of the researcher, (b) the choice of paradigm, (c) choice of theoretical framework, (d) values of the context, and (e) the alignment of values with the research
conducted. Researchers bring a set of values to an inquiry, and in qualitative studies, researchers
must acknowledge their values and “position themselves in the study” (Creswell, 2013, p. 20).

Furthermore, in a social constructivist paradigm, researchers are cognizant of historical
and cultural settings of participants and organizations, and ask broad questions in order to
interpret meaning in context (Creswell, 2013). Social constructivist researchers focus on
interactions, which makes the paradigm well suited for studying collaborative relationships
(Creswell, 2013). This paradigm aligns with the purpose of my study as it allows participants to
make meaning of their collaborative relationships. Next, I will discuss my background that is
relevant to this research.

**Role of the Researcher**

Prior to conducting qualitative inquiry, it is necessary to first position myself in the
context of the research in order to convey my assumptions and background experiences. Patton
(2002) explained that reflexivity acknowledges, “the importance of self-awareness,
political/cultural consciousness, and ownership of one’s perspective” (p. 64). Creswell (2013)
further illuminates the concept of reflexivity by describing it as the researcher engaging in two
distinct processes: (a) conveying their experience with the topic, and (b) discussing how these
prior experiences influence interpretation. I will share my experience with student affairs and
library collaborations, explain how it may affect my interpretation, and acknowledge my
assumptions.

**Experiences**

My interest in the collaborative relationships between academic librarians and student
affairs professionals stems from my professional work in student affairs. Prior to beginning a
Ph.D. program, I worked for eight years in student affairs, the latter six years at a small public
institution. My professional passion has always been working with student activities and organizations. Although the majority of my job focused on these areas, like many student affairs professionals at small institutions, I was often called upon to serve in other capacities. Due to this, I have experience in multicultural affairs, judicial affairs, residential life, and LGBTQ student services.

I view student activities and organizations as learning laboratories where students could apply classroom knowledge and learn valuable transferable skills such as leadership and critical thinking. I believe that student involvement is critical to student learning. Professionally, my foremost goal was to help students connect their in-class learning with their involvement experiences. I strived to work across the organizational boundaries of student affairs and academic affairs, but became frustrated when I witnessed little interest from my academic colleagues.

During the Fall of 2011, a librarian proposed to meet with me to discuss collaborating to plan student social events in the library. I was initially skeptical; campus departments had previously approached me under the premise of collaboration, but after initial discussions, it became clear the expectation was for my unit to plan the event, pay for it, and ensure students attended. I had grown frustrated with requests to collaborate that entailed anything but collaboration. Similarly, I questioned how student social events could operate in the library; after all, these events were loud and the library was supposed to be quiet. I also presumed that my job was the opposite of a librarian and wondered if we would be able to find common ground.

After our first meeting, my fears faded and I was challenged to acknowledge my own assumptions about academic libraries and librarians. We identified common needs and began
planning collaborative events. The events evolved into an informal partnership between our units that was increasingly focused on student learning. Programs and trainings were developed with a student learning focus. The library began to see an increase in users at the reference desk and a new demographic of students began attending student events. We became each other’s advocates and learned about each other’s jobs. The partnership grew and was sustained through staff transitions.

As our partnership grew, I realized that I had no one idea what a librarian really did and discovered most of my student affairs colleagues were equally ignorant. While planning our first event, the librarian I was working with needed to shift her attention to a new project. When she informed me that another librarian would be taking over coordination, I looked at her and said half-jokingly, “There can’t be two cool librarians.” Of course, I was wrong. There are many great librarians, but there has been little exploration of collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians.

When I returned to graduate school, I focused my cognate courses on collaboration in higher education and specifically between student affairs and academic affairs. I conducted research on collaborative experiences between academic libraries and student affairs. I immersed myself in the library science literature to gain a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of librarians. During my first two years of coursework, I held an assistantship in the BGSU Office of the Division of Student Affairs and served as president of the Friends of University Libraries. In my third year, I began a new assistantship working in the library coordinating student engagement initiatives and managing the National Student Affairs Archives. These experiences have provided me with a foundation to pursue this line of inquiry.
Assumptions

For this study, I considered how my prior collaborative relationships with academic librarians would affect my interpretation of data. Although, the human instrument is the preferred method of data collection for qualitative research, due to its responsiveness and adaptability, I needed to acknowledge possible assumptions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

First, I assumed there is value in developing collaborative relationships between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. Although I do not believe collaboration is suited for all circumstances (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Magolda, 2005), I believe student affairs and academic libraries could benefit from a better understanding of each other and collaborative relationships (Forrest, 2005; Hinchliffe & Wong, 2012). This assumption is based upon my personal experience and examples found in the literature.

Second, although I believe there is value in collaboration, I do not assume it is easy. I ascribe to the belief that collaboration is a paradox, both an innate goal and challenging reality (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Collaboration demands commitment and can fail without strong communication (Blake, 1979), willing partners, or understanding of cultural assumptions (Arnold & Kuh, 1999; Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Working with individuals who are different from oneself can challenge preexisting assumptions and force people to re-think problems from another perspective. Professional cultures may appear at odds with one another, and true collaboration requires each partner to understand the viewpoint of the other.

In addition, I believe collaboration can be fostered through social interactions (Kezar, 2005b; Kezar & Lester, 2009). In higher education, we can underestimate the value of social gatherings that bring people together from across the university. Personally, I have found that connecting first on a social level can make professional collaboration stronger.
Case Study Methodology

For this study, I utilized a single instrumental case study methodology to explore the above research questions. Case study lends itself to the study of a “real-life, contemporary context or setting” (Creswell, 2013, p. 97) and “interpreting observations of educational phenomenon” (Merriam, 1998, p. 2). Case study is beneficial for examining organizations because it allows for comprehensive interpretation that is concentrated on the environmental context of the case (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014). I examined collaborations between student affairs professionals and academic librarians within the bounded context of an institution and the initiative of the Center for Student Life. This allowed participants to reflect on their experiences and refer to specific collaborative successes or failures within their specific context.

I utilized an instrumental case study approach. An instrumental case study is designed to explore an issue or concern and the bounded case is the vehicle to achieve this understanding (Stake, 1995). Thus, an instrumental approach is “less about the case itself and more directed toward understanding of an issue” (Jones et al., 2014, p. 96). I focused on the collaborative relationships between academic libraries and student affairs and used the Center for Student Life at Augustana College to provide the vehicle to understand this relationship.

Sampling

The case study methodology is defined by the selection of an identifiable bounded case (Jones et al., 2014). For this study, the case was a single institution. Then, a second level of purposeful sampling took place to identify the individual participants. Stake (1995) encouraged researchers using the case study methodology to sample from unusual cases. He noted, “sometimes a ‘typical’ case works well but often an unusual case helps illustrate matters we overlook in typical cases” (p. 4). Stake also argued that the primary decision for selecting cases
should be the ability to learn from the case. “Balance and variety are important; opportunity to learn is of primary importance” (Stake, 1995, p. 6).

**Case Selection**

After reviewing current examples of student affairs and academic library collaborations, one unique instance that arose was the co-location of services within a central facility. Some institutions have combined traditional student affairs functions (e.g., student involvement, activities, multicultural affairs) with library facilities to enhance a seamless student learning environment, meet numerous student needs, and conserve financial resources (Augustana, 2016e; Biemiller, 2010; Carlson, 2009; Schroeder, Chaney & Wade, 2012; “The case”, 2014). I believed institutions with a shared facility would provide an information rich case because the library and student affairs staff members at these institutions have a higher likelihood of interaction, and may have already begun to self-analyze their collaborative relationships. The existence of a co-located student affairs/library facility was my initial selection criteria.

My next set of sampling criteria is theoretically driven. In case study methodology, “the selection of the case emerges from the theoretical framework because this provides the foundation for the particular investigation and leads to the purpose of a study” (Jones et al., 2014, p. 96). The theoretical concepts of student learning and collaboration are core to my study and thus comprised my final selection criteria. The site met the following two attributes: (a) a demonstrated commitment to student learning in and out of the classroom, and (b) value collaboration. The case I selected fulfilled both of these requirements as exemplified in their strategic plan and campus-wide learning outcomes.
Description of Case Context

Augustana College is a private residential liberal arts institution enrolling 2,500 students located in Rock Island, Illinois. The college describes itself as “a selective, private liberal arts and sciences college, founded in 1860 by Swedish settlers” (Augustana, 2016a, para. 1). A majority of students live on campus during their first three years (Augustana, 2016a). The international student population has been growing and currently comprises 10% of the student body (K. Brill, personal communication, August 1, 2014).

*Augustana 2020*, the current strategic plan, lays out a vision that is grounded in student learning, “Augustana will offer intentionally designed curriculum and integrated learning experiences through active engagement, both within and outside the classroom, that recognize the holistic nature of student learning and development” (Augustana 2005, para. 1). The second strategy of the strategic plan, *Integrated Experiences*, elaborates on this vision:

Connect the distinctive aspects and outcomes of an integrated residential college experience to what is most valuable for success in life after college by ensuring that all students combine an individualized set of curricular, co- and extra-curricular experiences that maximizes their educational development and success in college and provides superior preparation for life after college. (p. 3)

Ken Brill, Augustana College’s Associate Dean & Vice-President, Student Life, Leadership and Engagement, illustrated how this strategic commitment has resulted in a dedication to collaboration, “I spend half of my time with academic affairs, the second flank of our strategic plan is integration and building that seamless community. So much of my focus now is creating collaborative relationships on everything that we do” (K. Brill, personal
communication, August 1, 2014). Augustana’s commitment to student learning and collaboration made the college a strong candidate for study.

**Student affairs.** Student affairs services at Augustana are organized under the umbrella of the Division of Student Life, which is overseen by the vice president and dean of student services who reports to the president. In addition to the vice president, an associate dean of students (who also serves as the director of student life and leadership) and assistant dean of students lead the division. The Division of Student Life comprised seven departments at the time of the study: Residential Life, Public Safety, Office of Student Life and Leadership, Multicultural Student Life, Student Counseling Center, Athletics, and Intramural Sports and Recreational. The Division of Student Life and its individual departments describe a commitment to student learning in various mission, vision, and planning documents. For example, one of the guiding principles of the Division of Student Life states,

> We believe that student involvement inside and outside the classroom promotes learning and student success. We offer a vast array of programs and activities, facilities and services designed to assist students in achieving a sense of belonging while learning how to be contributing community members (Augustana, 2016b, para. 3).

Similarly, the Office of Student Life and Leadership listed both *Learning* and *Collaboration* as core values. The associate dean and vice president explained,

> In the last couple of years the [Division of Student Life] has really shifted our focus to being more learning centered . . . we are focused on our institutional learning outcomes and identifying where our programs, services, and experiences we create for students connect with those outcomes (K. Brill, personal communication, August 1, 2014).
Library. Augustana’s Library is named after Augustana’s former President Thomas Tredway. The library employs 15 full-time staff members. Eight positions are librarians and require a Master of Library Science (MLS) degree (five research and instruction librarians, one director of the library, one technical services librarian, and one special collections librarian). The head of circulation is a full-time academic professional who also holds a MLS degree, and the remaining six staff members are hourly employees. Librarians have faculty status, but are not eligible for tenure (Carla Tracy, personal communication, August 1, 2014). The director of the library reports to the Provost. Carla Tracy, the director of the library explained the ethos of the facility. “The president at the time, Thomas Tredway, said that the library was going to be the living room of the campus. That was always taken extremely seriously from the word go” (C. Tracy, personal communication, August 1, 2014). The *living room of the campus* ethos translated into consistently high usage levels among students and Tracy described the building as a central meeting place for students, faculty, and staff.

The mission statement of the library is learning-centric, “The Thomas Tredway Library serves Augustana College by making learning the touchstone of all library activities and decisions” (Augustana, 2016f, para. 1). Throughout the six goals of the library’s strategic plan, there are multiple references to collaboration with student services. One objective clearly articulates the library’s desire to enhance collaborative relationships with student services, “Cultivate robust and creative partnerships with all occupants of the Center for Student Life” (Augustana, 2016f, para. 8). Many references to collaboration with student affairs are associated with the newly constructed Center for Student Life.

Center for Student Life. Augustana College opened the Center for Student Life (CSL) in Fall 2013. The facility houses the Thomas Tredway Library, Office of Student Life and
Leadership, Reading/Writing Center, Multicultural Student Life, International Student Life, and Dining Services. Augustana (2016e) described the facility as “a destination that centers our students’ out-of-classroom experiences — learning, social interaction, reflection and recreation — in a single building” (para. 2). Vice president of enrollment and communications Kent Brands characterized the center as “a one-of-a-kind building that is an intentional connection of the library, dining and student services” (Becker, 2013, para. 6).

The director of the library and associate dean/vice president of student services were involved from the creation of the project and currently co-manage the facility through a steering team. The associate dean of student services stated, “It is not like this floor is my floor and the three below are library floors . . . . We are working collaboratively together” (K. Brill, personal communication, August 1, 2014). Tracy and Brill both expressed that the first year of operation they collaborated primarily on facility issues, but hoped to use the next academic year as a time to build stronger collaborative relationships and programs. Tracy stated, “I know we haven’t had time to really tap into our collaboration. We have spent most of our time just dealing with logistical issues of the building” (personal communication, August 1, 2014). Brill expressed excitement for the upcoming year,

One of the nice things about the future, once we get there to collaboration, is that they [librarians] are wonderful idea people. I think we can get those ideas churning together, and with some of the funds that we have available, we are going to be able to create some cool opportunities. (K. Brill, personal communication, August 1, 2014)

Participants

I used criterion purposeful sampling approach to obtain participants from the Tredway Library, the Division of Student Life, and senior administration. Purposeful sampling is used
when the researcher selects information-rich participants to explore in detail (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). Patton (2002) described an information-rich participant as “those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of inquiry” (p. 230). For criterion sampling, the researcher predefines a set of criteria and all cases that meet the conditions are studied (Patton, 2002).

First, The Director of the Library, Carla Tracy and the Associate Dean of Students, Ken Brill were chosen as critical case participants. Critical case participants are those who clearly represent the phenomenon being studied (Patton, 2002). Both were instrumental in the development of the Center for Student Life and currently oversee the day-to-day operation of the facility. Through this work, a collaborative relationship has begun to form that could be information-rich.

Seven librarian participants were initially identified as potential participants based upon the following selection criteria; (a) is employed full-time in the Tredway Library, (b) has a Master of Library Science (MLS) degree, and (c) holds the designation of librarian. One potential librarian participant was on maternity leave at the time of interview and was not available for the study. The Tredway Library Head of Collections, Christina Aden was added to the study due to her involvement in the CSL steering committee. Although Aden does not have the distinction of librarian in her title, Aden has an MLS degree and was recommended for inclusion in the study by the director of the library.

Participants from the Division of Student Life were initially selected based on the following criteria (a) full-time academic staff status, and (b) participant office being housed in the Center for Student Life. These criteria yielded three potential participants from the Division of Student Life. The Assistant Director of Residential Life, Alisha Smith was also interviewed
for the study based on recommendations of her ability to discuss collaborative relationships outside of the context of the CSL.

When conducting interviews, I asked participants if they would recommend other staff members who should be included in the study. Multiple interviewees recommended I include the Director of the Reading/Writing Center, Virginia Johnson. The position was initially excluded from the study because the Reading/Writing Center was organizationally situated outside the of the Tredway Library or Division of Student Life reporting structure, but Virginia Johnson was ultimately included because of the office’s physical location in the CSL and recommendations from participants.

Finally, senior-level support is a key factor in successful collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs (Kezar, 2003b; Kraemer, Keyse & Lombardo, 2003). Due to this theoretical basis, four senior administrators were identified as potential participants including President Stephen Bahls, Provost Preena Lawrence, Vice President and Dean of Students Evelyn Campbell, and Vice President of Enrollment, Communications, and Planning Kent Barnds. Each of these participants provided strategic direction for the creation or current operation of the CSL and/or oversaw units within the facility. All four senior administrators participated in the study. Ultimately, a total of 18 members participated in the study.

**Data Collections Strategies**

Case study demands the collection of a vast array of data from multiple methods (Creswell, 2013; Jones et al., 2014). Yin (2009) described six common forms of data collection in case study research: documentation, archival records, interview, direct observation, participant-observation, and physical artifacts. Although not all methods are required, utilizing various forms of data can increase trustworthiness and illuminate the nuances of the case. Stake
(1995) explained, “With multiple approaches within a single study, we are likely to illuminate or nullify some extraneous influences” (p. 114).

In this study, I collected data from interviews, observations, and document analysis to answer the primary research question: How do student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning?

**Engagement with Augustana**

In order to allow sufficient time for data collection, I visited Augustana on three separate occasions to conduct interviews, observations, and document analysis. Each visit lasted at least two business days. Visits began after receiving Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) approval in January 2015. Specific visit dates to identify information-rich observation opportunities were planned in conjunction with the director of the library and associate dean and vice-president of student life, leadership, and engagement. Each visit took place approximately one month apart in February, March, and April of 2015. Allowing time between visits provided participants and the researcher an opportunity for reflection and permitted data triangulation across multiple engagement periods. After three visits, I assessed that I achieved data saturation (Merriam, 2009). Data saturation is attained when “you begin to see or hear the same things over and over again and no new information surfaces as you collect more data” (p. 219). Next, I will describe each of the data collection techniques in further detail.

**Interviews**

Interviews were the primary form of data collection for this study. DeMarris (2004) defined an interview as “a process in which a researcher and participant engage in a conversation focused on questions related to the research study” (p. 55). Interviews allow the researcher to learn how participants interpret their experiences and are necessary when behavior cannot be
observed or when studying past events (Merriam, 2009). Patton (2002) explained the purpose of interviewing is to “allow us to enter into the other’s person’s perspective” (p. 341).

Interviews for this study were semi-structured. As Merriam (2009) explained, semi-structured interviews are “guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, and neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions is determined ahead of time” (p. 90). This approach allows the researcher to adapt to participant needs and emerging topics. I used an interview protocol (see Appendix A) to guide the discussion, but the questions and order varied based on participant responses and emergent themes. Yin (2009) encouraged researchers to develop interviews that are “guided conversation rather than structured queries” (p. 106).

Interview questions were piloted prior to data collection with two academic librarians and one student affairs professional who were engaged in a collaborative student affairs/academic library relationship. Piloting questions can identify questions that are confusing or irrelevant and may result in new lines of inquiry not previously considered (Merriam, 2009). The initial interview questions were focused on the participants’ role on campus, knowledge and experience with collaboration, perceptions and knowledge of academic librarians/student affairs professionals, conceptualization of student learning, individual involvement, and experiences with the CSL facility. Minor adaptations were made to the questions based on pilot interviews in order to enhance question clarity.

I conducted one 60-90 minute in-person interview with each participant over the course of three visits. Interviews were held in a private location chosen by the participant to increase their comfort level during the interview process. All interviews were audio-recorded upon consent of the participant. I chose to use audio recordings to minimize the intrusion on the participant. Finally, I conducted follow up interviews if more time was needed to address the
interview questions, approach saturation, and triangulate earlier interviews. Follow-up interviews were conducted with two participants because time had run out during the initial interview and they had asked to continue the interview.

**Observations**

Observations are a form of data collection that takes place in a naturally occurring setting and provide the researcher with a firsthand account of the phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). The researcher can utilize observation to gain a better understanding of the context surrounding the issue being studied and to substantiate the findings in interviews. Merriam (2009) recommended that researchers pay attention to six elements when conducting an observation: physical setting, participants, activities and interactions, conversation, subtle factors, and your own behavior. Creswell (2013) encouraged researchers to “start the observation broadly and then concentrate on research questions” (p. 166).

Prior to conducting an observation, the researcher must determine their role in the process. Creswell (2013) characterized a researcher’s involvement in the observational process on a continuum with four categories. On one end of the spectrum, the researcher is a *complete participant* and “fully engaged with the people he or she is observing” (p.166) whereas on the opposite end of the continuum a researcher is a *complete observer* and has no interaction with participants. The two categories in the middle of the spectrum, *participant as observer* and *observer as participant* are a hybrid of these extremes. My role during this study was primarily an *observer as participant*. Creswell (2013) defined this position as “an outsider of the group under study, watching and taking field notes from a distance” (p. 167).

As I spent more time with the participants, my role shifted closer to *participant as observer* and some participants asked for my advice on potential collaborative programs, or my
observations of a meeting. Creswell (2013) acknowledged the potential for this shift, “As a good qualitative observer, you may change your role during an observation, such as starting as a nonparticipant and then moving into the participant role” (p. 167). Ultimately, my goal during observations is to combine the roles of participant and observer in order to, as Patton (2002) explained, “become capable of understanding the setting as an insider while describing it to and for outsiders” (p. 268).

I conducted two formal observations: a library staff meeting and a student life staff meeting. Additionally, I was invited to a number of informal observations including three lunch sessions where participants often discussed their roles on campus and the nature of collaboration. I had originally planned to attend a meeting of the Center for Student Life Steering Committee, but it was cancelled. I had hoped to observe more scenarios where student affairs professionals and librarians were interacting with each other, but the timing of such meetings and gatherings did not align with my on-campus timeline. Prior to any formal observation, I ascertained permission in advance from supervisors and made participants aware of my role as an observer. I utilized an observation protocol (see Appendix B) to record both descriptive and reflective notes during the observations (Creswell, 2013).

**Document Analysis**

I used document analysis to develop a greater understanding of the context of the case. Documents were used to confirm and triangulate data gathered from interviews and observations (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). Yin (2009) warned researchers about the breadth of data found in documents and recommended identifying potential documents prior to collection.

I focused my document analysis on materials pertaining to the creation of the Center for Student Life and collaborative ventures between the Division of Student Life and the Tredway
Library. I was able to obtain a wide assortment of building documents including meeting minutes, campus master plans, task force reports, building designs, budget estimates, and weekly electronic communication from the construction company. Guiding documents such as Tredway Library and Division of Student Life mission statements and the Augustana strategic plan were also examined, along with operational documents including meeting minutes, and unit/program budgets. Some of these materials were publicly available, whereas others needed participant authorization. The Associate Dean of Students Ken Brill and Director of the Library, Carla Tracy granted me access to all available documents from the planning of the Center for Student Life. Collectively, I analyzed 55 physical documents including approximately 363 pages of material.

I initially reviewed all documents to gain a general understanding and grasp of the totality of materials. During this process, I sorted and triaged the most relevant sources and identified key documents that transcended numerous themes or chronological times such as task force reports or construction summaries (Yin, 2009). I noted any materials that matched emerging themes from the interview data analysis and included the information in my coding schema. I then re-sorted the materials based on date and constructed a detailed chronological timeline of events. Next, I used the timeline to construct an account of the creation of the Center for Student Life found in Chapter V. Finally, all documents were cataloged chronologically and utilized throughout the writing process to triangulate interview and observational data.

Data Analysis

Unlike other qualitative methodological traditions, case study data analysis has not been well defined (Yin, 2009). For this study, data analysis was on-going throughout the data collection process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and was guided by my research questions. Creswell
(2013) represented qualitative data analysis in a spiral image that circles throughout four phases: (a) data management, (b) memoing, (c) describing, classifying, interpreting, and (d) representing and visualizing. Three techniques guided my analysis: case description (Yin, 2009), open/axial coding (Jones et al., 2014), and theoretical proposition (Yin, 2009).

**Data Management & Memoing**

Case studies can produce a large volume of data (Merriam, 2009) and a plan for maintaining and organizing the information prior to collection is essential. In order to appropriately analyze data in an ongoing manner, data should be appropriately labeled and categorized (Jones, et al., 2014). Each electronic transcription file was labeled with the participant’s name and interview date to ensure consistency. A similar identification system was applied to observation notes. Hard copy data were dated and chronologically filed. I maintained both an electronic and physical case record. The rationale for this was two-fold; maintaining two copies minimized the risk of data loss, and I conducted some of the final data analysis using physical copies.

Glesne (2006) advocated for the creation of analytic files while memoing as a way to organize your materials. She noted that this process would allow a smoother analysis process and enable the researcher to self-monitor subjectivity. She recommended three types of analytical files: a *title file* that will capture central concepts, an *introduction/conclusion* file for data germane to background and context, and a *quotation file* for meaningful and potentially useful participant quotations. I utilized this structure during my note taking and also maintained a researcher journal to capture musings not easily categorized in this filing system.
Case Description

A critical component of data analysis in case study research is the creation of a thorough case description (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2009). Case descriptions can help a researcher to identify linkages between the data and gain a greater understanding of the overall context (Yin, 2009). The case description for this research included a historical account of the Center for Student Life, portraits of participants, review of current/past collaborative projects, and relevant college information. The case description is presented as a narrative throughout the document. Refer to Chapter IV for participant and organizational profiles and Chapter V for a history of the CSL.

Open and Axial Coding

After building a description of the case, I analyzed the transcribed data by employing open coding techniques. Open coding “breaks data into manageable pieces and allows the researcher to explore the ideas contained within the in-depth aspects of the data” (Jones et al., 2014, p. 165). In this initial phase of coding, I reviewed the data line by line to minimize any preconceived notions and allow themes to emerge (Jones et al., 2014). I used a word processor to cut and paste data into open coding themes, divided by research question. Each code was identified by participant and timestamped to allow quick reference to the audio file. Some participant comments were included in multiple research questions. The first phase of open coding produced approximately 350 codes.

Since open coding is likely to produce numerous codes it is followed by axial coding. During axial coding, the researcher examines the open codes and begins to put them into categories (Jones et al., 2014). The process can also be described as categorical aggregation (Stake, 1995). In categorical aggregation, the researcher looks at the data and “seeks a collection of instances from the data, hoping that issue-relevant meaning will emerge” (Creswell, 2013, p.
I went through numerous phases of axial coding to refine the data into thematic categories. Themes emerged within each of the research questions and are presented in Chapters V, VI, and VII.

**Theoretical Proposition**

My final phase of data analysis was guided by the eight theoretical propositions of Kezar and Lester’s (2009) strategies for reorganizing campuses for collaboration; (a) mission, vision, and educational philosophy, (b) values, (c) social networks, (d) integrating structures, (e) rewards, (f) external pressures, (g) learning about collaboration, and (h) sense of priority from senior administration. Yin (2009) regarded theoretical proposition as the “most preferred strategy” for data analysis because studies typically evolve from theoretical schemas (p. 130). I conducted this phase of analysis after open/axial coding to allow for themes that did not align with this framework to emerge. For this phase of the analysis, I re-reviewed all of the data for evidence of each feature in the SMCHE framework. The data from this study aligned well with the theoretical model, and many of the findings from the open/axial coding process were confirmed and reinforced during this stage of analysis. Chapter VIII reviews the findings from the SMCHE framework.

**Trustworthiness**

To strengthen the research process and enhance the credibility of qualitative approaches, the researcher must employ design strategies to enhance the level of trustworthiness. To do so, Creswell (2013) recommended that qualitative researchers employ at least two validation strategies. I strove to go beyond this standard to achieve credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as outlined by Shenton (2004) and Lincoln and Guba (1985).
Credibility

Credibility in qualitative studies is defined as “assurances of the fit between respondents’ views of their life ways and the inquirer’s reconstruction and representation of same” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 299). Triangulation, examining a conclusion from multiple angles, is one of the primary methods to enhance credibility (Schwandt, 2007). I triangulated the data using multiple methods (interviews, observations, and document analysis) and multiple sources of data across three data collection time periods (Merriam, 2009).

Additionally, I engaged in periodic member checking. In member checking, the researcher brings preliminary findings back to the participants to gauge accuracy via the participants’ responses to the preliminary findings (Creswell, 2013). Stake (1995) argued that member checks are particularly important to case study research and participants should “regularly provide critical observations and interpretations” to ensure the participant voice rises to the forefront (p. 115). Since data collection and analysis will be occurring simultaneously in this study, member checks were a regular occurrence.

All participants were asked to participate in three phases of member checks. First, all respondents reviewed transcribed interview data for accuracy. Next, participants reviewed a description of the case and individual participant profiles for accuracy. Finally, all participants were sent a summary of themes and recommendations. They were asked to respond to the accuracy of the findings and interpretations and identify any missing themes. Since all of the participants elected to use their names in the study, I often double checked quotes or reviewed themes with individual participants to ensure accuracy. In addition, preliminary observations and findings were reviewed periodically with the director of the library and associate dean after each visit to gain their insight and critical interpretations.
I also employed a peer reviewer to scan my raw data to ensure the findings were congruent. My peer reviewer was a Ph.D. colleague with more than 35 years of student affairs experience. Her experience with academic and student affairs collaborations coupled with her course work in qualitative methods qualified her to review the data and provide insightful critique.

**Transferability**

The concept of transferability is akin to generalizability in quantitative positivist research. Unlike quantitative research, qualitative inquiry is designed to study a small number of individuals within a specific context, thus direct generalizations to larger populations are undesired (Shenton, 2004). Yet Stake (1994) encouraged qualitative researchers not to reject the idea of transferability outright, and proposed that although qualitative cases are unique, they may also serve as an example of larger groups. Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that the researcher must provide thick description in order for the reader to be able to ascertain if the findings are transferable. They noted, “The original inquirer cannot know the sites to which transferability might be sought, but the appliers can and do” (p. 298). Thick description is the “highly descriptive, detailed presentation of the setting and in particular, the findings of a study” (Merriam, 2008, p. 227). In this study, I have provided thick description of the case, context, participants, and data collection methods to enhance transferability.

** Dependability**

Dependability, also referred to as consistency, (Merriam, 2008) is akin to reliability in quantitative methods (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton, 2004). Reliability is understood as the ability to replicate the findings of a study, but this definition is problematic for qualitative constructivist research because it presumes a single unchanging reality. Thus, qualitative
research is held to the standards of dependability, which addresses whether “results are consistent with the data collected” (Merriam, 2008, p. 221). Many of the strategies I identified to strengthen credibility are also necessary to enhance dependability such as triangulation and a peer examiner. I also created an audit trail, a traceable linkage between data and analysis, to strengthen dependability. This included numerous dated versions of the analysis process, and a researcher journal that reviewed procedures, personal reflections, and issues that arise during data collection and analysis.

**Confirmability**

“The concept of confirmability is the qualitative investigator’s comparable concern to objectivity” (Shenton, 2004, p. 72). A central tenant of social constructivism is that full objectivity cannot be reached because each person brings a set of background knowledge and values to the research. Yet, qualitative researchers still strive to confirm their findings are based upon the data gathered as opposed to investigators’ viewpoints. Confirmability was enhanced by acknowledging my beliefs and assumptions, providing an audit trail, and clarifying the study’s limitations.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical considerations are paramount in constructivist qualitative inquiry. Jones et al. (2014) advocated for going beyond the standard of *do no harm* and employing “the ethical imperative to *do good*” in qualitative research (p. 175). This elevated standard requires researchers to actively protect participants and ensure they are aware of potential risks.

Prior to each interview, participants were provided with an informed consent document (see Appendix C and D) that outlined the purpose of the study, confidentiality, benefits, and risks to the participant. Participation was voluntary and consent could be withdrawn at any time. The
study was not anonymous, as the participants were interviewed one-on-one and observed in meetings. Confidentiality from other participants was not guaranteed in observational settings. In addition, the nature of this study made it difficult to disguise the institution because of its unique features; therefore, the college was named in the study. Augustana administration agreed to having the institution named in advance. All participants were given the option of pseudonyms, but all choose to be self-identified for the research. Participants were informed they may be directly quoted in the dissemination of final results.

Although participants were not provided any tangible rewards for their participation, they benefited by engaging in self-reflection activities that clarified their individual role and collaborative relationships. Participants have access to the final product to aid in departmental strategic planning and the development of further programmatic initiatives for the Center for Student Life.

In order to maintain the confidentiality of data, all raw electronic data were stored on a password-protected computer, and backed up on an external hard drive stored in a safe. All hard copy interview notes and physical consent forms were stored in a safe at a locked residence. Only the primary researcher, peer reviewer, and advisor had access to the primary data. Since all participants chose to be self-identified, transcribed data still contained identifying characteristics. Original data will be destroyed within a year after the publication of the study.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

Several delimitations and limitations should be acknowledged for this study. In designing this study, I chose to explore collaboration at one small private liberal arts institution. This single-case design was a delimitation. Due to the single institution design, wide generalizations from this study would be inappropriate. I also limited my sampling frame to
institutions with a shared library and student affairs facility. These criteria allowed me to identify six institutions with varying degrees of shared space. Three of the six identified institutions were located outside of the Midwest and were eliminated due to distance and lack of financing for travel expenses. One of the six institutions did not respond to requests for preliminary information. After preliminary discussions with the final two sites, only Augustana had a documented institutional commitment to student learning and a seamless learning environment. This was demonstrated through their values, vision, mission, and strategic plan, and aligned them with the numerous calls for collaborative undergraduate education reform. In addition, the collaborative CSL facility designed to enhance collaboration was opened in 2013. All of these elements met my criteria for case selection, and I determined an in-depth inquiry into Augustana would produce rich data due to its current environment and the recent opening of the shared facility.

During the study, some limitations also arose. First, I was limited by the time period in which I conducted the study and the staff members available. Although all of the participants were eager to meet with me during the period I conducted interviews the Augustana Division of Student Life had been going through various staff transitions, which may have affected participant responses. For example, the director of residential life was originally slated to be interviewed for this study, but that position became vacant shortly before I arrived on campus. Additionally, the coordinator for international student life was transitioning to a new position. She disclosed this to me in our interview. Two other participants within student affairs left Augustana shortly after the interviews. I was unaware of their departure until member checking, but I was able to locate both of these participants and they did confirm their transcripts and preliminary findings. By the time the results of this study were written, approximately a year
later, new staff members had been hired who may have had a different perspective on the research questions. Additionally, I had 17 out of 18 participants engage in member checking. I was unable to reach Pareena Lawrence, Provost and Dean of College to confirm to the findings after multiple attempts, and was informed that she had been out of the country for an extended period of time.

The number and amount of documents available was also a limitation of this study. Although, I was able to obtain a wide range of documents and correspondence regarding the CSL, it was inevitable that some email communications and meeting agendas were not preserved and thus I was unable to examine them. Finally, I had originally planned to engage in more observations including a meeting of the CSL steering committee. A CSL steering committee was not scheduled during one of my visits, so I had made alternative arrangements to Skype in for the meeting. This meeting was then cancelled due to participants’ schedules and I was not able to schedule another observation due to time constraints. Despite these challenges, I had a high degree of participant engagement in process, examined a wide breadth of documents, and conducted two observations.

**Summary**

Using a qualitative case study methodology, I investigated how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning. A variety of methods were employed to answer this question including interviews, observation, and document analysis. The constructivist approach focused on the emic voice of the participants. Data were first analyzed using open and axial coding and then compared to the theoretical framework of the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (Kezar, 2005b; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Numerous trustworthiness strategies were employed including a rich, thick case description,
member checking, and a peer reviewer. In the following chapters, I will present the results and analysis of the study.
CHAPTER IV: PARTICIPANT AND ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILES

This chapter contains a profile of each study participant detailing work duties, personal experience with collaboration, philosophies of student learning, and an overview of their individual involvement in the Center for Student Life. Eighteen participants were interviewed for this study including representatives from Augustana’s Division of Student Life, Tredway Library, and senior administration. If provided by participants, the profiles of librarians and student affairs professionals also include personal reflections on the misconceptions of their respective fields and a summary of knowledge and experience with the other field (i.e., librarians’ knowledge of student affairs or student affairs professionals knowledge of libraries). Table 1 provides a summary of participants including their job title, organizational classification, and an indication if their office is housed in the Center for Student Life. Appendix E provides an organizational chart of the participants.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the reader with rich description regarding each participant. I wanted to provide sufficient background information on all participants so the reader could understand their context and individual perspective. I hope these profiles bring the participants to life and allow the reader to assess transferability of the data and themes. Similarly, I also constructed organizational profiles of the Division of Student Life and the Tredway Library. These are an extension of what is provided in Chapter III and addresses the participants’ collective understanding of the organization unit and its values.
Table 1

Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organizational classification</th>
<th>Located in CSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christine Aden</td>
<td>Head of Circulation</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Bahls</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Senior Administration</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Barnds</td>
<td>Vice President of Enrollment, Communication and Planning</td>
<td>Senior Administration</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katey Bignall</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Student Life and Leadership/Coordinator of Greek Life</td>
<td>Division of Student Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefanie Bluemle</td>
<td>Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth “Ken” Brill</td>
<td>Associate Dean and Vice-President, Student Life, Leadership and Engagement</td>
<td>Division of Student Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Evelyn Campbell</td>
<td>Vice President and Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Division of Student Life/Senior Administration</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Crisp</td>
<td>Special Collections Librarian and Instructor</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance “Connie” Ghinazzi</td>
<td>Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Johnson</td>
<td>Director, Reading/Writing Center Provost and Dean of the College</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Pareena Lawrence</td>
<td>Provost and Dean of the College</td>
<td>Senior Administration</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Makula</td>
<td>Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Santoyo-Marin</td>
<td>Director, Multicultural Student Life</td>
<td>Division of Student Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha Smith</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Housing</td>
<td>Division of Student Life</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Tatro</td>
<td>Technical Services Librarian and Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Tiedge</td>
<td>Coordinator of International Student Life</td>
<td>Division of Student Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Tracy</td>
<td>Director of the Library and Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Weiss</td>
<td>Research and Instruction Librarian and Instructor</td>
<td>Tredway Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christine Aden, Head of Circulation

As the Head of Circulation for the Tredway Library, Christine Aden oversees two staff supervisors and approximately 38 student employees including three student supervisors. Collectively her team is responsible for maintaining the collection, which includes shelving, cleaning, and the checkout process. The circulation team manages the checkout process for traditional library materials such as books and reserve items, but is also in charge of laptop and study room checkout. These functions take place at the main circulation desk on the second floor and at the information desk on the fourth floor, which is shared between the Office for Student Life and Leadership and the Tredway Library.

Aden is in her 11th year working at the Tredway Library and pursued librarianship as a second career path after working in corporate communications for seven years. Although not a requirement for her position, she has a Master of Arts in Library and Information Science. She described her schedule as “typically 9-5:30 with built-in flexibility” but noted, “A typical day isn’t really typical.” Her workday begins by checking-in with the supervisor on duty and student employees. She works about five hours a week at the research help desk assisting students with class projects and various inquiries. In addition to her general circulation duties, she utilizes skills from her former profession to design posters and marketing campaigns for the library.

Aden felt that many of the traditional misconceptions about librarians such as “we all shelve or librarians just sit around and read” are not common on campus, but that she hears it from people in the public. Upon reflection she noted, “I don’t think people have really any conception of what I do, they just know that I work in the library.”

Aden conceptualized student learning as a holistic process, she described, “It’s not just their classwork, but also the research that they do, and also their life experiences. It’s the jobs
that they have, or the clubs they belong to.” She described librarians as generalists and thought this approach aligned with her definition of holistic student learning. Additionally, she thought it was important to learn about the lives of students and be able to “tailor the services that we offer” to advance student learning and development. She indicated that an important aspect of student learning is to provide a welcoming environment that encouraged learning.

Aden viewed collaboration as a prevailing campus value, and cited her partnership with the Office of International Student Life as a successful example. For the annual International Street Fest, the library had contributed by creating displays and extending hours of operations to promote the event. She thought that the event was mutually beneficial for both units and acknowledged that simply extending hours displayed a commitment to the international community that librarians are willing to support students outside of their academic work.

As a member of the CSL Steering Committee, she is involved in the day-to-day management of the CSL facility. She felt that the creation of the CSL improved the library’s relationships with the other units in the building, she described:

> We have always had a fairly decent relationship with the other departments, but I think it has been truly enhanced by them being here and having the steering committee meetings. Just opening up and talking has helped us to understand the other departments’ perspectives and for them to understand ours as well.

Aden admitted that when the CSL was first proposed she was overwhelmed with potential concerns including traffic flow, permeating food smells, and reducing the print collection, but “once we got past the worries and concerns of the practicalities, the excitement began to be, what kinds of collaborations can we have?” She felt that during the creation of the CSL the steering
committee had conversations that allowed each other to see different perspectives and set the stage for a successful facility.

**Steven Bahls, President**

Steven Bahls began his tenure as the eighth president of Augustana College in 2003. President Bahls has a background in law and is a certified public accountant (Augustana College, 2016c). His leadership has been instrumental in creating the Augustana Strategic Plan and campus-wide learning outcomes. He frequently writes about higher education and has recently published a book with the Association of Governing Boards entitled *Shared Governance in Times of Change: A Practical Guide for Universities and Colleges*.

Bahls is a strong proponent for facilitating collaboration across organizational barriers. He pointed to the changing nature of higher education as a justification for increased collaboration: “I think that higher education across all sectors is in a time period of pretty significant change, and we need to collaborate to align our actions for the benefit of students.” In order to foster a culture of collaboration, he creates “a culture of transparency” and poses strategic questions. His approach is to frame questions and “then try to create a marketplace of ideas where differing ideas can be set forth in a safe zone and ideas that are the best can rise to the top.”

Bahls described how Augustana’s nine student learning outcomes defined what learning meant for the Augustana community. He recounted that the faculty developed the outcomes and the administration signed off and worked to develop metrics to evaluate students’ achievement on each outcome. He viewed his role as being able to “align resources” to ensure that students succeed in each of the nine learning outcomes. Bahls explained, “I believe that it is important to
share governance to achieve those learning outcomes, and then I try to allocate resources among the various departments to achieve those outcomes.”

Bahls credits the concept of the Center for Student Life to Vice President Kent Barnds’ vision to create a “concept where the living room, the dining room and the study of the college would be under one roof.” Bahls described his role in the project as three-fold (a) determining the cost parameters, (b) approving the final project, and (c) trying to “shape it in a way that advances the sustainability of Augustana and the student learning outcomes.” During the visioning phase of the Center for Student Life, Bahls recounted reading an article by architect Geoffrey Freeman that challenged his thinking about the changing nature of libraries. He recognized that the needs of students were changing and the modern academic library had to reflect these changes by providing less space for books and more space for interactive learning. He reflected on the removal of study carrels as a challenging but necessary change:

One of the proposals that we adopted was to remove virtually all the study carrels with the high sides because those are a thing of the past. When I was a student and many of our faculty members were students, we were pretty good students, all of us, we’d get to the library early to get the study carrel, so that was a challenge for us.

In addition to adapting his personal vision of an academic library, Bahls also described struggling with the need to downsize dining staff for the new facility:

There were up to 30 fewer positions, so I was really proud that we could manage that through attrition, reassignment and so on, because that’s the value of the college. We don’t like to lay people off. But that was a challenge to figure out how to do that.

Overall, Bahls felt that the creation of the Center for Student Life positively impacted the campus culture by providing a central place for students to congregate and interact, he
summarized: “The plan has been realized . . . a center of student life where they dine, they study, and hang out, and I like that.”

Kent W. Barnds, Vice President of Enrollment, Communications, Planning, and Executive Vice President

Serving as both the Executive Vice President and Vice President of Enrollment, Communications, and Planning Kent Barnds has had a breadth of job responsibilities since beginning at Augustana in the summer of 2005. He humorously characterized his enrollment management duties as being paid “to think like a 17-year-old all the time.” As Executive Vice President, he worked closely with senior administration and the board of trustees to oversee large-scale initiatives including master planning.

To Barnds, successful collaboration in higher education is built upon interdisciplinary connection and the ability to create a shared vision. He stressed that higher education collaboration is essential to both model teamwork to students and to increase efficiency. “I think that collaboration is more relevant not only because we have to model teamwork . . . but also because of the pressures we face financially, because it’s just not feasible for us to continue to add, add, add.” He cited Augustana’s strategic plan, *Augustana 2020*, as the catalyst for increased collaborative initiatives on campus, but saw the decentralized nature of higher education as a barrier.

Barnds believed Augustana had a clear definition of student learning as articulated through the College’s nine learning outcomes. He was proud that the learning outcomes were not “exclusively classroom based,” because skills such as teamwork and inter-cultural understanding are “learned, developed, and cultivated outside of the classroom.”
He chaired the task force that eventually developed the concept for the Center for Student Life (CSL) and continued to oversee the construction of the facility until completion. The CSL was not originally envisioned to be a hybrid facility, and he acknowledged, “I think it [the CSL] was fortuitous to be honest.” The first task force, started in 2007, was charged with building a stand-alone student center that did not have dining. Due to the economic recession and a lack of donor interest, the initial vision of a stand-alone facility was abandoned. At the same time, discussions arose surrounding excess space in the library and the need to save money by combining two dining halls into one. Together these factors lead to the creation of a new task force that was charged with exploring,

The feasibility of combining three central aspects of the students’ life at a liberal arts college, and those central aspects were learning – with the library; dining – the importance of that on a residential life campus; and then of course recreation and student activities.

Barnds described the process of chairing this task force as both rewarding and challenging. From the beginning, he discovered that the leaders of each of the three areas were “strong personalities . . . and personal advocates for their program.” He solicited outside facilitation to ask the difficult questions and challenge departmental leadership. He summed up the process, which led to the creation of the building like this,

We went from defining the size of box that everybody wanted to defining the size of the box that everybody needed. And then figuring out where those boxes could become circles and overlap. And that is how we got to the point that we got to with this building. We knew we had to have overlapping, shared space, and we had to reimagine the way space was used.
Katey Bignall, Assistant Director of Student Life and Leadership/Coordinator for Greek Life

As the Assistant Director of Student Life and Leadership/Coordinator for Greek Life, Katey Bignall’s primary responsibilities include fraternity/sorority advisement, student programing, and student organization support. She has served in her role since 2009. When asked to describe a typical workday, Bignall laughed and stated, “Being part of student affairs there is not a typical.” Her mornings start with answering emails and working with students to plan programs, produce marketing, or assist fraternity/sorority presidents with the management of their chapter. She recounted that her workday often changed with the time in the academic calendar, “if we’re in [fraternity/sorority] recruitment, then it’s the recruitment chair; if it’s new member time, new member educators.”

Bignall also serves on many campus committees including Title IX, sexual assault task force, and symposium planning committee. Her workday regularly extends to evening hours and weekends where she meets with student groups and supports student events. If there are judicial incidents within the fraternity/sorority community, she works closely with the Dean’s office and joked that she is an advocate, but has to “put on my ‘mom pants’ sometimes.” In addition to her day-to-day duties, Bignall stressed a personal commitment to ongoing professional development, she expressed, “Trying to stay up on the literature, in those little spaces, those nooks and crannies.”

She feels like the most common misconception about her work is that “it is all just fun and games.” She elaborated,
I think a lot of people don’t understand the depth of student development through student engagement, so they kind of view it as, “You just bring comedians, or movies. You just work with Greek life because they have a lot of fun and parties.”

She suspected that most faculty believe she is right out of undergrad and are unaware that she has a master’s degree in higher education.

Bignall equated successful collaboration to relationship-building and a knowledge of your own profession. She stated,

Understanding where others are coming from is a big one because if it’s a two-way street, it works a lot better; we don’t crash into each other . . . and being pretty strong in what your knowledge of your own job is . . . really being able to say, this is why we do this.

Overall, she believes that collaboration is essential at Augustana, “Being on a small campus, you have to be able to collaborate or otherwise it’s just a detriment to yourself and to others.”

Bignall defined student learning as something that is on-going and ever-present. She noted that at Augustana the commitment to learning outcomes has drawn more attention to student learning outside the classroom, but that they still struggle with “marrying the two together, the inside and outside the classroom components.” She believes that her job as an educator is to “help students make those connections . . . so that they can solidify their learning.” She often challenges students to connect their co-curricular involvement to their classroom learning, for example, if a student plans a program that failed, she asks them to reflect upon their business class and ask what lessons they could apply. She described her role as teaching, “helping them work through some of those situations and letting them have those times where they don’t do as well . . . but then helping them reflect.”
Bignall described her role in the creation of the CSL as a spectator. She came to Augustana after the first vision of a stand-alone student center was stalled due to a lack of financing. When the concept of a combined student center and library facility first arose, her supervisor, Ken Brill, regularly informed her of its progress. She worked with Brill to research Student Life’s needs for the facility, but was not “at the table” during planning. Bignall actively supported the building and recalled,

If they would have a campus forum or if they would talk about the designs or anything, I would try and attend it to show my support, because I truly believed in the CSL . . . . So I was more of a spectator, cheering them on.

She described a lot of excitement about the building and noted, “When I first came [to Augustana], we were in a house . . . I felt very isolated . . . it’s much nicer to be in the center of campus.”

**Stefanie Bluemle, Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor**

Stefanie Bluemle has been a research and instruction librarian at Augustana for the last seven years. She serves as the library liaison to Augustana’s Humanities Division, which includes the history, philosophy, and religion academic departments, and also to interdisciplinary units such as Asian Studies. In addition, Bluemle holds the title of Instruction Coordinator for the Tredway Library. She described that her primary role was to provide leadership and strategic outlook to the instruction program and think “about where we want to go over time.” She also handles various administrative aspects of the instruction including pairing up faculty with librarians and conducting assessment. She often serves as the spokesperson for the library’s instruction program and advocates for information literacy education on campus.
Bluemle struggled to describe a typical workweek, indicating that her workflow changes based on the point in an academic term. Although new projects are constantly emerging she described a typical week as spending two-three shifts at the research help desk assisting students, teaching about two-eight class sessions, and attending a variety of meetings. She serves on a range of department and college level committees including the assessment committee, general education committee, and the library management team. The rest of her time is spent preparing curriculum for courses, working on special projects, and consulting with her liaison areas and fellow librarians.

Overall, Bluemle felt that the common misconceptions about librarians are “less severe” at Augustana “because we have done a really good job of reaching out to the faculty and the students and communicating what it is that we do.” She recognized that the prevailing misconception of librarians in America is that we “sit around and read books all day.” Bluemle did not believe that her Augustana colleagues bought in to this stereotype and guessed that some “simply aren’t sure what we do.” Additionally, she felt that many people on campus do not realize the amount of teaching the librarians do regularly.

She defined student learning as a student’s ability to apply the knowledge to future situations. “For me, it [student learning] really is that ability to take whatever concept we are working on and to be able to apply it, not just in that situation, but hopefully in other situations as well.” This definition impacts her approach to teaching information literacy skills, she explained,

I think it is really important to tell students why we are doing what we are doing, and what we hope they will get out of it . . . to be really explicit about the fact – especially in LSFY [Liberal Studies First Year] – we are doing this assignment or this activity in
connection with the paper you are writing for this class, but the process we are going through to think about it is something you can use in your other classes.

When asked to describe a successful collaboration she had been engaged with, Bluemle reflected on a current relationship with the co-directors of the campus Honors Program. She explained that the co-directors were new to their positions but she “had a good relationship with them before . . . so I was able to speak with them about why I thought we should be more systematic with [information literacy] in the Honors Program.” She has found their initial collaboration to be supportive and together they are piloting a new informational literacy curricular model for honors students. Bluemle added that the co-directors not only agreed to a new model, but also were actively “speaking to other faculty in the program and helping to convince them that it was something important to do.” She felt that this collaboration had been successful due to the past years of work by the library to build strong relationships with faculty. She summarized,

I think it’s focusing on the relationships that you have with people that really allows for success because when something comes up, like when these particular people happen to become the co-directors of the Honors Program, I was able to build on an existing relationship to do something new, because they already were interested in working with me and knew that we could be successful.

Bluemle was involved in the creation of the CSL, but described her primary role as a bystander. She was however, heavily involved in the downsizing of the book collection, which resulted in tension on campus. She explained,

That was the piece where I was really involved because some of the people who felt the worst about it, were the people who worked with me. I got a lot of the feedback, and I
not only had to talk to people about it a lot, but I also had to actually do the job of removing some books anyway, even though people were not happy about it.

When the concept of the CSL was first proposed, Bluemle did not have strong reactions. She was initially skeptical about the concept, but drew confidence in the project from Carla Tracy’s leadership.

Kenneth “Ken” Brill, Associate Dean and Vice-President, Student Life, Leadership and Engagement

Ken Brill has been at Augustana College since 1985. In his dual role as the Associate Dean and Vice President of Student Life and Director of Student Life and Leadership, Brill has a breadth of responsibilities. He summarized his duties as being “responsible for student life programming outside the classroom, creating learning opportunities for students and experiences ideally that connect with learning inside the classroom.” He is number two in the Division of Student Life and reports to the Vice President of Student Services/Dean of Students Evelyn Campbell. He supervises the Director of Campus Recreation, the Director of Multicultural Student Life, the Director of International Student Life, and the Assistant Director of Student Life and Leadership/Coordinator of Greek Life.

In addition to his administrative functions, Brill oversees the student leadership development program. He recently created an emerging leaders program that comprises 20% of the first-year class, and developed a leadership academy for all students to improve their leadership knowledge and skills outside the classroom. Additionally, the Office of Student Life oversees a variety of experiential leadership programs including the outdoor leadership adventure, multicultural leadership retreat, international/intercultural leadership retreat, Washington DC exchange, and Disney Institute.
Brill explained that he spends about half of his time working collaboratively with academic affairs to advance the integration agenda of the strategic plan. “Much of my focus now is really creating collaborative relationships on everything that we do . . . working toward creating a more integrated seamless learning community for our students.” Specific initiatives have included the creation of community principles, development of learning outcomes, a white privilege seminar, a faculty/athlete mentoring program, and a first-year experience initiative.

When asked to describe a typical day or week, he looked to his desk and pointed to his categorized stacks of papers and folders. “My desk is a typical day for me.” He picked up a folder on the first-year experience initiative, pointed to notes from meetings with the various units that report to him, and schedules for leadership programming retreats. At the time of the interview, Brill was serving as the Board Chair for the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) and subsequently pointed to a stack of papers about the impending national convention while fielding a call from a Board member to further describe his typical day.

Brill acknowledged that he felt there was a universal “lack of understanding about what people in student affairs do,” but he does not believe that his Augustana colleagues have many misconceptions because of the depth of relationships he has developed during his years of service. He recounted that when he first began as a student affairs professional, he felt differently about his relationships with faculty,

Early on, I always thought that it was the faculty members who needed to come to me.
Somewhere along the way, I realized, first of all they don’t even know what you do.
Secondly, you probably need to go to them, and then I also learned that if you go to them, you have to have a compelling reason why, and there’s gotta be some value for them.
Brill described his philosophy of collaboration as “the more people at the table, the greater the idea that will generate.” He cautioned that collaboration only works if one has the confidence to reach out to others and the willingness to “change the idea once you hear other people’s ideas and perspectives.” He recounted that he had been planning a Global Learning Retreat, which sought to bring together international students and domestic students to enhance cultural competencies, develop leadership skills, and reduce barriers on campus. He reached out to an anthropologist on campus who had been an advocate for global competency and a staff member with experience working abroad. Together they created a stronger event that provided an international experience to students without the means to study abroad, honored the experience of international students, and aligned course content to experiential learning.

Brill further concluded that collaboration on campus, specifically between student affairs and faculty, was based on the operating student affairs philosophy.

If you’re an institution where the people in student affairs are centered on student learning and not on services that we provide to students, then I think that they probably have a different relationship with the greater academy, with their colleagues in academic affairs. If they’re stuck in that old place, before the teaching/learning paradigm shifted of providing services, then they’re probably less relevant and have less connection.

For Brill, student learning is all about change and relationships. “Typically we get students who see things very black and white . . . . We want to move students to a place where they begin to see the complexities of information and are able to see through their own lens.” He sees himself furthering student learning by mentoring and providing experiences for learning outside the classroom. For example, he noted that when he advises the programming board, a student organization that plans and executes social events for the student body, the learning was
not necessarily the final event, but the process it takes to get to the event. He elaborated that the learning “could be a conversation that takes place about an off-color comedian and what does that mean? I think that’s where the learning occurs and that’s where their minds begin to expand and from that I think people change.”

Brill was a key player in the creation of the Center for Student Life and jokingly remarked that he was involved “way too much.” His participation began years prior, when consultants indicated the need for a stand-alone student center in the campus master plan (Augustana College, 2004). He recalled working with three sets of architects during the evolution from a stand-alone student center to the Center for Student Life. Once the idea of a fusion facility was conceived, the project shifted into high gear:

Because they wanted to move quickly, everybody was around the table at the same time. We had lots of meetings. We would meet collectively and then break into groups and have ongoing communications via email. I was very involved. Every step of the way.

Brill described being excited about the concept of a fusion facility and specifically wanted to ensure that the best building on campus, the Tredway library, was not negatively impacted. “I was very excited about it [the CSL], and concerned, because I love Augustana, so I wanted to make sure they improved our best building.” He admitted that by the time construction started he was excited but exhausted, and relied heavily on the support and guidance from Carla Tracy, Director of the Tredway Library. He expressed, “Hopefully we supported each other, but I was so done by the time of construction . . . Carla [Tracy] made sure that if our reality was not being executed to set up some flags.” Ultimately, he was very proud of what the CSL has become: “It’s a great mix of relax, reflect, study . . . . When I speak of learning being centered on relationships, this is a home run. There’s no question about it.”
Dr. Evelyn Campbell, Dean and Vice President of Student Life

At the time of her interview, Evelyn Campbell was in her 24th year as the Dean and Vice President of Student Life at Augustana College. She oversees counseling, residential life, student life, multicultural student life, athletics, public safety, and conduct. In addition, she coordinates with external providers for health services. Campbell is a member of the president’s cabinet, and as the dean of students she is referred to as the “trouble shooter” on campus, handling issues such as academic violations and emergency response to parental inquiries.

Campbell was clear that collaboration plays an integral role at Augustana and is a critical component of the current strategic plan. She stated,

Our strategic plan 2020 is built around the idea of collaboration . . . . We really believe that a significant way we can educate our students equal to and better than the competition is if we really learn how to use the out-of-classroom experience in a way that we really haven't fully used before. So I guess I want to say for Augustana, we almost look at it as part of our survival.

She noted that for a collaboration to be truly successful, it must have shared input and develop an outcome that excites both parties. As dean and vice president, she fosters a culture of collaboration through a term she coined as “forced communication.” She explained,

I really am a believer that putting people in the same place at the same time, even for social activities—actually will result in collaboration, because the conversations eventually will go to the shared common interests, which for most of us . . . is going to be work.

To achieve this, she creates both formal and informal opportunities for her staff to meet and share ideas, whether it is over lunch or a standing meeting. She also expects her direct
reports to share information and develop cross campus partnerships: “I think each Director realizes I am looking for collaboration.” Additionally, the new campus-wide commitment to learning outcomes and integration between student and academic life has strengthened the communication between members of her unit and faculty. “First-year teachers of our Liberal studies class are meeting with Ken Brill . . . Athletics and faculty are sitting down. Things that didn’t happen before.”

Campbell conceptualized student learning at both an individual and big-picture level. She pointed to Augustana’s nine student learning outcomes as how the institution defined what students are learning from their total experience, but also discussed the need for individual curiosity to propel learning. The goal of higher education is to bridge the “gap between their [students’] curiosity and where you need them to be,” and it is the mission of the institution to pull them in that direction.

Furthermore, Campbell noted that outcomes also needed to be demarcated for individual classes or activities. She saw Augustana’s strategic focus as a method to formalize specific outcomes that happen outside the classroom. She expounded, “Inside the classroom, you are getting grades. That is pretty formal. But outside the classroom, to get these certificates, or get some kind of recognition piece that you are competent in multicultural because you did XYZ.” She acknowledged that the college had only begun this process, but the intent to capture outcomes of the co-curricular experience was a focus of her unit’s work.

In addition, she recognized that as the division leader she must prioritize the allocation of resources, including time, to allow for collaborative learning-focused projects. “It is very very time consuming . . . . It is a year and half or two year process, where you don’t see anything for a couple years, yet we have students here who want a program Sunday night.” She noted that any
change was difficult, but saw the result as transformative to the work of student affairs, “It will transform the way we spend our time, what we think about, who we talk to. Ultimately it will transform us.”

Campbell actively participated in the creation of the Center for Student Life; she recalled that Student Life had limited space on campus, which resulted in plans for a stand-alone student center. In many ways, Campbell saw the creation of the CSL as a fortuitous accident. She reflected that the stand-alone student center had gotten approval from the Board of Trustees, but due to the economic recession and subsequent budget cuts the project was put on hold; this along with an emerging commitment to integration at Augustana “came together to create this building which would represent this new blend of learning/collaboration/blended learning/integration.”

**Samantha Crisp, Special Collections Librarian**

Crisp joined the Thomas Tredway Library as the Special Collections Librarian in 2014, the inaugural year of the Center for Student Life. A significant component of the CSL project included a major renovation of the Special Collections area, which updated the archival area and created a state of the art learning laboratory. Crisp spends most of her time coordinating the instruction program that utilizes this facility. She stated, “I teach classes, I help instructors develop assignments using special collections material, I work with major projects. I’m also in charge of processing our archival and manuscript collection, sending our books to be cataloged, making preservation/conservation decisions, prioritizing things for reformatting.”

The Special Collections area opens weekdays from 1-5pm, so she used her mornings for more individualized tasks such as policy writing, class preparation, and staff meetings. Her afternoons were often spent working with students on reference inquiries or with her student employees processing collections. Crisp felt that the biggest misunderstanding of librarians is
that “we all just sit around reading old books or looking at old documents.” She went on to explain that in reality she spent very little time exploring the collection.

Crisp acknowledged that she also had a limited understanding of student affairs. Upon reflecting on her own undergraduate experience she stated,

When I was in college, I would say I had a minimal to nonexistent relationship with student affairs, and that partly may be because I went to a really big school. I definitely don’t remember, as compared to Augustana in particular, anyone being invested in learning outcomes for me, I don’t remember anyone being invested in my first-year experience or my experience as a student. There was nothing focusing on integrating my class work and the curriculum with my life outside of classes.

Crisp believed that she needed a better understanding of the operations and functions of student affairs, but also pointed out similarities between the professions such as a focus on students outside the classroom, attention to student safety, and a commitment to diversity. She stated, “We’re very similar in that we both have students’ best interests in mind from all different perspectives.” Personally, Crisp defined student learning as the ability to develop skills for lifelong learning, and noted that her job was not simply to give students the resources but to teach them the “skills that they need to do research on their own.” She integrated this philosophy into her work by teaching students how to find materials and encouraging critical engagement with archival resources.

Crisp eagerly described a partnership that was currently underway. Throughout the term, she worked with a faculty member to develop curriculum and activities for a public history class. She felt that by working together, they had created deep learning opportunities that “forced them [students] to come in here and think about Special Collections in a more iterative and hands-on
way.” The success of the collaboration was rooted in respect and mutual control. “I felt really respected as a librarian . . . and the instructor was really great about giving me some control over both the way that we structured the course and the kinds of projects that we did.” Overall, Crisp acknowledged that many people working in higher education, including herself, fell into a “tunnel vision” about their position, “I’m so focused on my job and my role on my campus that I tend to lose the bigger picture.” Although she reminds herself, students are experiencing college as a total experience, “we’re [all] working together to craft the same student experience . . . so I feel like it’s important we are all working on the same page.”

**Constance “Connie” Ghinazzi, Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor**

Connie Ghinazzi is a Research and Instruction Librarian at Augustana’s Tredway Library. Prior to returning to school to obtain her Masters in Library and Information Science, she spent 15 years working in a sales position in the pharmaceutical industry. She arrived at Augustana in 2001, and due to her background in the medical field, the director appointed her as the liaison librarian for the natural science division.

During her first year at Augustana, the number of instruction sessions increased and she was appointed instruction coordinator. This coincided with the College’s general education reform in the early 2000s, and Ghinazzi was actively involved in designing and implementing skill-based information literacy instruction in the Liberal Studies First Year (LSFY) curriculum. This sequential model integrated library instruction across the first-year curriculum; librarians work collaboratively with faculty members to teach information literacy and evaluative skills based on the ACRL standards.

In 2012, Ghinazzi left the role of instruction coordinator and created a new position as outreach coordinator. At the time of interview, her primary focus in this role was working across
campus to build the Augustana Digital Commons, an institutional repository for administrative records and scholarly work. The role of outreach coordinator is evolving, Ghinazzi commented, “When I was designing this position, I didn’t designate a lot of specific things because I don’t really know where the needs are, what are the opportunities, what do we want to build on, extend, and what makes the most sense.” She noted that she had “not explored more ways of collaborating with student services” but had a desire to start the conversation.

In addition, Ghinazzi serves as a first-year academic advisor, primarily advising science majors. She enjoys building relationships with students in the sciences and appreciates, “they simply don’t have enough people over at the science departments to handle all the ‘first years’ in addition to their majors.” She is also the advisor to the Equestrian Team and Club, and acts as the informal advisor/mentor for students interested in library science as a career. She frequently meets with students who have an interest in library science and often organized field trips for students to meet professional librarians outside of academics.

Ghinazzi described spending her time at work largely on instruction and advising and expressed that the intensity of these varied based on the time in the term. She values being visible to students, “I like being out on the floor and at the research desk or meeting with students.”

Ghinazzi believes that a common misconception about librarians is that they are “redundant” and under-utilized, but encourages others to see the breadth of librarianship. “Google employs a lot of librarians, not just tech people. Any time you need to figure out a structure for information chances are there are librarians involved.” She further added that a strength of Tredway’s librarian team is their commitment to teaching and ability to be connected within the campus community, “No one is waiting around for someone to ask a question. We
serve on numerous faculty committees, work with large numbers of students and are actively involved in the life of the campus.”

Ghinazzi characterized a successful collaboration as being able to work with colleagues to create/enhance programs or services. She cited a recent library exhibit, “Insect-Inspired Art” as an example,

I worked really closely with a biology professor and we brought lots of sample specimens over here and interspersed them with geology specimens and numerous pieces of art. We had students enrolled in an entomology class, acted as docents for a public event. She further explained that it was successful because she was able to work with faculty in departments who “hadn’t had a presence in the library . . . and it brought a lot of people to see the exhibit.” In many ways, Ghinazzi compared her approach to outreach and collaboration to her previous occupation in sales. She described her work with science faculty as a sales approach in that she proactively reached out to others,

I wasn’t like, “Oh, here I am come see me if you want to.” I visited them in their offices, spent a lot of time meeting them . . . asking if they were pleased with the research results they were seeing from their students, and if not, what would they like to change and offering suggestions on how I could make a difference. It was really need/benefit selling. Ghinazzi characterized student learning as both change and curiosity, “if you’re willing and open to changing something and you allow experiences to modify how you think about things or modify your behavior, then that’s learning.” She elaborated that in order for learning to occur students need to feel safe, welcomed, and engaged, “It doesn’t have to be that we cater to each one of them [students] and give them everything they need, but they have to have that ability to grow, engage, be curious, and experience wonder.” She believes that fostering
curiosity was central to her role as a librarian and the primary way she promotes student learning.

Ghinazzi described the creation of the CSL as a stressful process, largely due to the need to reduce the print collection, a process that initially upset some faculty members. She was not a member of the core planning team, but was kept apprised of the process by the Director of the Library. She acknowledged that throughout the process she “knew the library was always valued.” Overall, she is satisfied with how the building turned out, but has been disappointed in use of the dining space. The original plan for the fifth floor dining facility had included a section that could be used for student study space during non-peak hours, but with the switch to all you can eat dining, that vision had not come to fruition. She was concerned that without the use of dining facilities the building lacked adequate study space for the students.

Virginia Johnson, Director of the Reading/Writing Center

Virginia Johnson has served as the Director of the Reading/ Writing Center for 21 years. In her role, she oversees a staff of two full-time colleagues and 22-26 undergraduate peer tutors. Johnson described a typical day as arriving to the office between 7:30 and 8:00 a.m. to prepare for her courses in the first-year program. She has professional faculty status, which requires a 24-credit load, 16 of the credits are teaching or tutoring and the remaining eight are administrative. The rest of her day often consists of “meetings, arranging meetings, doing workshops on campus if I am requested.” Her day typically ends around 4:00 or 4:30 p.m. and recently she has not had a lot of evening or weekend commitments.

Organizationally, the Reading/Writing Center has a similar reporting line as the Tredway Library and reports through academic affairs to the Provost/Dean of the Faculty. The Reading/Writing Center is located on the third floor of the Center for Student Life, but prior to
the opening of the remodeled facility, it was housed on the second floor of the Tredway Library. Johnson described that the Center was in a transition period, noting that previously they were the only student support center on campus so their work extended beyond reading and writing skills to study skills, but during the last few years they have shifted back toward a focus on teaching college level reading and writing skills.

Johnson defines successful collaboration in higher education as,

Something that you sort of spark off, like a piece of flint off stone. Each person brings something to the party. You might bring some of the same things, but you also bring something unique, either through what you know, or through your personality, or through prior experiences.

She sees collaboration as essential to all campuses but believes it is easier at a campus the size of Augustana. She added, “You never know when two people with disparate background or knowledge or personalities are going to come up with something completely new because they come at it from differences.” She sees collaboration as blurring boundaries and models this with her staff. She stated, “We try in here not to have such barriers of peer tutor/faculty tutor. We faculty will take our written work to peer tutors and say, what do you think of this?” Similarly, she added that she tries to avoid claiming absolute ownership, as it hinders collaboration.

Originally, I did not plan to interview Johnson because the original scope of participants had been limited to librarian, professional staff in the Student Services Division, and senior administration, but numerous participants from each category recommended I speak with her. During the course of interviewing, many participants misattributed the Reading/Writing Center’s place in the Augustana organization structure. Some participants assumed it fell under the umbrella of student services and others associated their work as a department of the library.
When Johnson was asked what she thought about the different perceptions of where they fit in the organizational structure, she chuckled and said, “I am happy with that. It would be especially nice if the same people thought that” she further added, “I don’t know the point of making such distinctions.”

Johnson defined student learning as the “freedom to explore ideas or topics – things they have a passion for” and believes that her role in advancing student learning is to “to help them locate something they are passionate about, or they get interested in that they didn’t think they could be passionate about.” She explained that learning has to take into account the whole person, and she is conscious of both the affective and cognitive pieces of learning.

During the creation of the CSL, Johnson was involved throughout the planning process. She was excited and supportive of the hybrid-building concept. She continues to participate in the CSL Steering Committee and believes that the entities in the building have developed successful collaborative relationships and that “Everyone has offered something.”

**Dr. Pareena Lawrence, Provost and Dean of the College**

Pareena Lawrence is the provost and dean of the college at Augustana. She was eager to discuss collaboration on campus and expressed a deep commitment for student success. As provost, she sets the academic priorities for the campus and works with faculty to create and implement the strategic plan. The “integration agenda” of the strategic plan is a central part of her work. She explained that the concept of integration was beyond interdisciplinary: “we are talking about integration across campus from different divisions altogether.” She saw creating a seamless student experience as pivotal to her role as provost and essential at a small liberal arts college.
In order for collaboration to be successful, Lawrence believed that the first step was to create a culture that valued all members of the community as educators. She explained, “All of us, no matter what our role might be, are educators and we all influence students in different ways and help to guide them.” Furthermore, she saw Augustana’s learning outcomes as the common language and framework for building partnerships. As provost, she found that providing continual opportunities for conversation was essential to creating and maintaining a culture of collaboration. She met regularly with a team of directors from the Division of Student Life to brainstorm and plan upcoming events. Institutionally, leaders have also created annual retreats that bring together faculty and staff to work collaboratively, problem-solve, and stress common themes.

Lawrence looked to the mission of the College for her definition of student learning: “if you look at our mission, we want our students to be complex problem solvers. We want them to be ethical decision makers. So it comes from the mission of the institution.” She saw the institutional learning outcomes as a derivative of the mission and noted the learning outcomes crystalized and broadened the understanding of student learning: “it brings coherence and intentionality to it. It really has changed how we talk about student success.”

Lawrence came to Augustana during the CSL contractor-bidding phase, after the design was completed. Throughout construction, her primary focus was to support the library staff and ensure the library was able to continue to meet campus needs. She explained,

The library had given up a lot of space, and so to make sure that they could still function and meet their obligations, what they wanted for students, how they wanted students to learn and there was enough physical space for that to happen.
She indicated that there had been some initial push back from faculty who saw the library “as a place of worship,” but many came to realize that students study differently from the past and needed a facility to reflect this. Conversely, she saw the librarians as cutting-edge champions for the space, and the library had an existing image as the “living room” of campus.

Lawrence felt that the existence of the CSL strengthens collaborative ties across campus through proximity: “It’s a central place. It’s where we run into one another constantly. And I think there’s something to be said about it, because that again helps us know what each other does.” She expressed pride in the facility and its atmosphere: “It’s been a place where I go to get energized . . . . There’s always workshops going on, students collaborating on projects, faculty meeting with students in The Brew or up eating together.”

Amanda Makula, Research and Instruction Librarian and Assistant Professor

Amanda Makula often used the word *variety* to describe her job as a research and instruction librarian. She teaches information literacy classes for first-year students in the Liberal Studies First Year program and serves as the library liaison to faculty in the languages and literature division. Additionally, she maintains the library’s website and oversees the new institutional repository, *Augustana Digital Commons*. In addition to these primary tasks, she does some collection development for her division, regularly works at the Research Help Desk, and helps to mentor the student employees. Makula described a typical day as “kind of fragmented,” and includes “teaching class or preparing for a class, working on digital commons, making some updates to the website. Maybe there is a meeting.”

When asked to describe what she perceived as common misconceptions of her job, she stated, “some people just don’t know what we do.” She surmised that most people did not realize the amount of teaching the job required or the variety of duties in her position. She felt
that depending on one’s familiarity with libraries, others could assume her primary role was to organize and classify books, and although these tasks are essential to library operations, they are not part of her duties. Makula further explained, “We have a foot in both worlds, because we're faculty and we're teaching and we're working closely with the classroom faculty – but we're also doing administration type things. So we are really both in a way.”

Makula believes that successful collaborations evolve over time through the cultivation of relationships. She has been in her position for 11 years, and this longevity has allowed her to develop relationships with faculty that have resulted in positive collaborations. She also discussed creating successful collaborations with her librarian colleagues. These were built on mutual trust and a desire to be innovative. As an example, she described her relationship with Stefanie Bluemle, a fellow research and instruction librarian,

> We can bounce ideas off each other a lot. And she looks at things in a way that I don’t, and vice versa. So we have built things up to a point where I have learned a lot from her; hopefully she has learned from me.

Makula conceptualized student learning as refining critical thinking skills, providing students with the tools for lifelong learning, and learning self-awareness. Specifically from an information literacy perspective she described it as:

> moving away from ‘this is how you use X database, and how you search and how you find’ – and moving towards more of a broader conception of what information is, how it's produced, how to interact with it, how to evaluate it, how to think critically about it.

She stated that her conception of student learning drives how she designs and teaches her courses. She employs active learning pedagogies, scaffolds the material, and emphasizes exploration in order to further learning in her students.
Makula explained that she was involved in the creation of the CSL, but not “on the front lines.” She elaborated, “We talked about it a lot in the management team meetings and other meetings that Carla [Tracy] would call. She led it, but I think everyone felt like they could express concerns and ideas.” When she initially heard about the concept of a hybrid facility, Makula was curious and open-minded, but found it difficult to imagine what the final facility would look like. She was excited that the library, which was already being used as a de-facto student center, would become more formalized as such though the redesign: “We were going to recognize what was happening anyway and we were going to embrace it and go with it, instead of resisting it.”

**Patricia Santoyo-Marin, Director of Multicultural Student Life and Assistant Dean of Students**

Patricia Santoyo-Marin came to Augustana College in 2014, a year after the CSL opened, as the director of multicultural student life and assistant dean of students. During her short tenure, the role and scope of her office has expanded. She explained that when hired for the position, her job was primarily to advise the eight multicultural student organizations on campus. Although student organization advisement is still included in her job responsibilities, she has expanded the office’s scope to a “vision of holistic student development and support” for students of color. This vision included guiding students and their families through all aspects of the collegiate experience, advocating for and empowering students of color, and promoting “intercultural competence for the whole campus.”

She likened a typical day to “playing triage” in order to meet the ever-changing needs of students and constantly “re-allocating some of my daily time to make sure that I am reaching out
to the student and having those conversations.” Santoyo-Marin also supervises approximately 10 student coordinators who are responsible for multicultural programming initiatives on campus.

At the time of the interview, she was the only professional staff member, but they were in the process of hiring a full-time assistant director. In addition to serving students, she also frequently assists campus colleagues with diversity related questions. Her workdays frequently extend until 8:00 p.m., as she attends student organization meetings to provide support and advocacy.

The Multicultural Student Life office was founded in the early 2000s, and Santoyo-Marin felt many on campus were unsure of her role and the mission of the office. This is likely due to her changing role. She described that when she was first hired the goal for her position was to “be promoting all of us engaging in dialogue or all of us celebrating our difference,” but instead they needed “to start with providing transitional services . . . before reaching the peak of intercultural dialogue.”

When Santoyo-Marin came to campus she was struck by Augustana’s commitment to collaboration. “It is something that is promoted at Augustana. I think it is something that we are proud of . . . . It is something that is much stronger here.” She felt that the college avoided the silo effect common at other institutions and embraced ideas from all areas and classifications of staff. She summed it up by stating, “It is understood that at the end of the day, we all have the same mission to serve our students.”

Santoyo-Marin defined student learning as a holistic process that occurs in the classroom, through informal interactions, and personal development. She stated, “Learning is ongoing, and there is formal learning we have in the classroom, but again personal development learning, different stages we have to go through before going to the next step of learning.” This definition
guided her to make connections with faculty and to reach out to the student families so students can smoothly transition and grow as individual learners. She saw the CSL as creating a culture of “learning and developing 24/7.”

**Alisha Smith, Assistant Director of Residential Life**

Alisha Smith served as the assistant director of residential life at Augustana College for three years. In this position she was primarily responsible for housing operations including building, housing selection, and roommate matching. She also worked as a conduct officer, overseeing cases with higher-level offenses, and coordinated medical support services. Augustana does not have an on-campus health center, and Smith acted as a liaison for students to access medical care in the community: “I also do medical for campus, so that is a significant part of my time.” Smith did not directly supervise student Community Advisors, but explained, “being a small office, we do a lot . . . I’ll help with the programming and those sorts of things. We kind of all chip in and do our part.”

The Office of Residential Life is comprised of a director, assistant director, three area coordinators, three resident directors, and an executive secretary. At the time of Smith’s interview, the director of residential life had recently resigned which caused the staff to redistribute responsibilities. When Smith first joined the staff, the office was operating with a limited number of professional staff in the halls. The resident director positions were added to fill this need, and the department collaborated with athletics to hire resident directors who were also part-time coaches. She described this partnership as successful, “For our student population being 40% athletes, it worked pretty well for us. We found a lot of collaboration with that because it’s bridging the gap with things that maybe we didn’t see eye to eye on with athletics.”
When asked to describe a typical day or week in her position, Smith noted that it changes a lot based on the time in the academic year. During the summer months, she is focused on housing the incoming class which includes projecting the gender breakdown and matching roommates, “I review every match to make sure there’s not too many red flags.” During the academic year, she described conduct, billing, and medical support as taking up a large portion of her day.

Smith believed that both students and faculty misperceive the role of her office, “I think that probably students and faculty, sometimes, think that we may be out to ‘get’ students because we do so much conduct,” but “we do support the learning process and that a lot of learning happens outside of the classroom.” She likened student learning to challenges, “At least from our perspective, challenges. We see a lot of learning happen that way. Challenge and support is a big part of our department.” She further described that her department does not get “a lot of the ‘warm and fuzzy’ learning” because of the nature of their jobs, but they approach conduct as a learning process that helps a student “grow as a person.”

Smith described that although she had little interaction with the librarians at Augustana, she had worked closely with librarians at a previous institution and found them “incredibly willing to help” when she needed help researching new retention initiatives. She also described helping the library organize student socials, such as Snacks in the Stacks that served as an informal library tour for incoming students. Upon reflecting on her prior experience collaborating with librarians, she stated, “they have a lot of the same goals of what drove them to the job as I did in student affairs, so there’s a lot of potential for collaboration.”
Mary Tatro, Technical Services Librarian and Assistant Professor

Mary Tatro has served as the technical services librarian and assistant professor for 14 years. In this role, she oversees many of the behind-the-scenes operations of the Tredway Library including database management, collection development, cataloging, and Interlibrary Loan. She also serves as the library liaison to the business, economics, and accountancy departments on campus. This liaison role has been a new addition to her job duties. She describes her typical day as looking at “problem-solving, running reports, gathering statistics, speaking with vendors and customer service representatives, approving invoices and reviewing the budget, original cataloging, and database maintenance.” She supervises three staff members: two who manage the interlibrary loan process and one who is focused on more technical aspects, such as cataloging and acquisition of new materials. Recently, she has taken on more instruction responsibilities and has been working at the research desk at least once a week.

Tatro feels that most people on campus are not aware of her position, which she describes as the most common misconception. She elaborated,

I don’t know if they even realize I’m even here, most of the work I do is at my computer behind the scenes. I don’t think they even know that I probably exist, so that’s a misconception. That even someone’s back behind the scenes checking to make sure things are working correctly. I think they realize I exist once something goes wrong.

Although, Tatro expressed that her position was largely invisible on campus, she believed the Augustana community was committed to collaboration across organizational lines.

Tatro conceptualized student learning from an information literacy perspective by describing the importance of teaching students to “learn what resources are out there; to see, to distinguish, to evaluate which resources are the most valuable.” She went on to describe
learning as a process that grows exponentially, “student learning just builds on each other and grows,” and is entwined with critical thinking. Tatro applies this definition to her work as she manages both the physical and online collections by asking herself, “How can we best use the students’ tuition money to go toward them and their learning experience here at Augustana?”

During the creation of the CSL, she was kept informed of the progress but was not on the committee that led the visioning effort for the building. She became actively involved in the transition when the collection needed to be reduced to accommodate the new design. Along with her team of staff members, she was tasked with flagging and pulling items from the physical collection that needed to be reviewed for removal. Although the weeding of the collection was a stressful endeavor, Tatro was in favor of creating a facility that merged student and library services. She summarized, “I personally think having these services here in this building with Student Life, Reading/Writing . . . and bringing in dining . . . was a good idea.”

Jane Tiedge, Coordinator for International Student Life

I interviewed Jane Tiedge in the beginning of March 2015. At that time, she had been at Augustana for 23 years and was serving as the coordinator for international student life within the Division of Student Life, but was preparing for a shift in job responsibilities and would be moving to a new position under the admissions/enrollment management umbrella. In her role as coordinator for international student life, she was responsible for working with international students throughout their academic career from acceptance to graduation. This included planning international student orientation, designing programming through the year, and overseeing student global ambassadors. Tiedge observed that she was often the go-to person for many of the international students, “You end up becoming a familiar face and they’re more
comfortable, sometimes, talking to you than to a faculty member or even someone in the res-life office.”

Tiedge was also responsible for handling the numerous governmental reporting responsibilities for international students. This entailed insuring international student I-20s and visas were current and processing term-reports through the federal SEVIS (Student Exchange Visitor Information System) database. She continued with these responsibilities as she moved to her new position in the Enrollment Management Division.

Tiedge discussed how her job does not have a typical day: “That’s the one thing about this job is, you may sit at home eating breakfast and think, “Oh today I’m going to do this, this, and this and get this done. And you have a crisis and there’s no way it can be done.” Although she noted that her responsibilities shift with the academic calendar, she described the fall term as her most hectic: “You’re battling home sickness. Everybody’s got jet lag. The academic classroom culture is so drastically different from anything that they’ve ever experienced. So you’ve got students coming in all the time with questions.” Tiedge expressed that winter term was similar to fall, but due to the three-week Christmas break in the middle of the term; she would increase programming efforts for international students who were unable to return home. The spring term consisted of commencement planning and interviewing for student global ambassadors. During late spring and the summer, she described working with incoming international students, ensuring their paperwork was up-to-date while planning for a mandatory international student orientation.

Tiedge observed that a common misconception about her role by other faculty and staff members was that she had “all the cultural answers.” She illustrated,
I get a lot of phone calls from faculty that talk about students’ demeanor and activities in the classroom and then they call and go, “I don’t know whether to say anything to the student. Is this a cultural thing?” Sometimes I know the answer to that; I haven’t traveled to most of the countries where the students are from, so I can’t – I’m not the cultural expert.

She also recognized that most faculty and staff have “no clue what SEVIS is or the rules and regulations,” but also does not expect that to be common knowledge. Conversely, she observed that students always assumed she had breaks off and were shocked when she told them she had to work.

Tiedge was not involved with the creation of the Center for Student Life, but felt that the strength of the facility was that it placed her office in a centralized space that was close to the Reading/Writing Center. This proximity has allowed her to serve students better because they are more apt to utilize tutoring services. Tiedge described that she had positive relationships with the librarian staff and indicated she was friends with many of them. She described two projects they collaborated on annually: an academic integrity workshop and the international street fest.

She conceptualized student learning as a holistic process that was disconnected from traditional grades. “It’s not success by saying ‘They can earn an A so they’ve learned the subject.’ But it’s being able to grow academically.” Tiedge further expounded on this, “that they learn from their mistakes, whether it’s academic or social mistakes and have grown from that, then they’ve achieved their learning goals.” She expressed that collaboration was valued and important at Augustana, she explained, “just like we don’t want students in individual silos you can’t do that with the college staff.”
Carla Tracy, Director of the Library

I first met the director of the Thomas Tredway Library, Carla Tracy, in August of 2014, when I was investigating the feasibility of this research project. I was immediately struck by her kindness and excitement to discuss collaboration between student affairs and libraries. Her smile and positivity is infectious, and her dedication to students and the library is instantly apparent. Tracy began working at Augustana in 1994 as the reference librarian, and began her tenure as director during the 2002-2003 academic year. Tracy was recently named academic librarian of the year for Illinois and has published a variety of articles on library administration and management.

As the director of the library, Tracy oversees the budget, personnel, and the general direction of the library. She operates the library by utilizing a team approach, and the library management team, which is comprised of all the librarians and the head of circulation, makes decisions. Her day-to-day job duties frequently vary. She prides herself on an open-door policy: “I’ll just talk to whoever happens to come to my door for any reason. And often those things are – one is to having a sounding board, or they want to talk about some idea they have.” Overall, personnel issues are minimal, but since assuming the role of director, she was surprised to discover how time intensive building issues are. She elaborated,

The building issues are huge and can suck all kinds of time . . . . The building is a huge part of a library’s service and particularly since the current building was built to be spacious and inviting . . . . Thus, even more the reason that perhaps we want to keep up our standards, but it is very important, especially on a residential campus to remember that this is the living room of the campus.
Tracy felt that others probably had little knowledge of what she did on a daily basis. She recognized that a lot of her work was relationship building and involved invisible aspects. She lamented that few people would identify “how much time and energy that takes.” She identified the biggest misconceptions of librarians as “introverted people who spend a lot of time reading books.” When people first learn that Tracy is a librarian, they will often tell her how lucky she is to read at work, or they will comment on the time she must spend shelving materials. When receiving these comments she often struggles for a response,

I never quite know whether to say to the person “you know what, I’ve never shelved a book since I’ve worked here. That’s what our student workers do.” That’s not because shelving books is beneath me, but I and all the rest of the librarians have way more to do than shelve books.

Overall, she felt that those on campus had a deeper understanding of librarians, but noted that many were still surprised when she discussed global concerns related to librarianship:

I think people are always surprised when I or the other librarians start talking to them about the major issues that libraries get involved in . . . . Libraries are fighting for openness of information and access for everyone not based on your wealth or your prestige, or what school you are in enrolled in – but based on your right to have information.

She jokingly recalled a quote about librarians by filmmaker Michael Moore that illuminated this complexity, “You think they’re just sitting there at the desk, all quiet and everything. They’re like plotting the revolution, man. I wouldn’t mess with them.” Tracy chuckled at the quote and classified herself as someone that tends to “push the envelope.”
Tracy was eager to learn about my work and to discuss the evolution of the Center for Student Life and collaborative relationships. She initially described a workshop she had participated in a few years prior that focused on collaboration between libraries and student affairs. The workshop facilitators challenged participants to interview a member of the student activities staff. Tracy followed through on this challenge, and interviewed Ken Brill, associate dean and director of student life and leadership. She recounted, “I went and interviewed Ken Brill – before this building – and I learned so much by just spending an hour with him . . . . We had both worked here for years, but how valuable that was.” This interview laid a foundation for future work with student affairs and was instrumental during the CSL project.

Tracy identified the library’s most successful collaboration as their continued work with teaching faculty in the first-year classes. Librarians are embedded in these classes and collaboratively design curriculum that integrates information literacy with teaching faculty. The librarians at Augustana teach over 300 sessions per academic year and due to their frequent interaction with teaching faculty often build relationships that lead to further collaboration. She believed that the library’s partnerships with teaching faculty were successful because of the library’s history of being a service-provider, “always saying ‘yes’ as much as you possibly could . . . . Just being accommodating and friendly, creating a nice place to be.” She has also found that librarians’ classification as faculty have allowed them to be at the table to build partnerships.

When asked to define student learning, she pointed to Augustana’s learning outcomes and mission statement as a guide. The mission statement calls for an Augustana education to develop the mind, spirit, and body of students, a holistic philosophy that she supports (Augustana, 2016d, para.1). She sees her role and that of the library, as developing life-long learners who “add to their foundation for learning throughout their lives.” She promotes this by
connecting the library goals and measures to the campus strategic plan and ensuring all goals are “in the service of student learning.”

Tracy was actively engaged in the creation of the CSL, and many others looked to her for guidance and updates. During the process, she was always able to envision the finished product, but found that others struggled to see a result: “It is very difficult for people, even librarians, who I tried to bring into this as much as I could – they had a hard time envisioning it.” Because of this, communication became her mantra, and she worked to understand all aspects of the project. She credited administration for actively including her throughout the planning and construction, but commented, “I also made it my business to stick my nose into everything.” Tracy believed it was her duty to ensure the integrity of the library, and that their ability to serve students would not be compromised, yet she always maintained a cautious optimism about the process. Overall, Tracy believes that the CSL “turned out better than the people who had the greatest fears, and perhaps not as good as the most optimistic.”

**Rachel Weiss, Research and Instruction Librarian and Instructor**

Rachel Weiss began working as a research and instruction librarian at Augustana College in August 2014. She had previously served as a librarian at St. Olaf College in a one-year temporary position after obtaining her master’s degree in library science. When asked to describe a typical day, Weiss acknowledged that she was “still getting my feet under the desk, so to speak,” but noted that like her colleagues she wore “a lot of hats,” including being the liaison to the Fine and Performing Arts, Communications, and Communication Sciences & Disorders academic departments. Her coordinator role is to oversee the displays and events within the Tredway Library. In this role she is responsible for putting together a themed exhibition during each term.
Her typical week is comprised of about 10 hours at the research help desk including one evening shift and two day-time shifts. She also spends much of her workdays meeting with faculty, and preparing to teach in the first year liberal studies curriculum. She stated, “Right now I’m in lots of meetings talking with faculty about what they want to get out of their instruction and their courses, planning those courses, implementing those courses, as well as trying to keep up on professional development.” During the current term, she began taking on new roles in campus-wide committees and working with faculty to create a bibliography for a new academic program.

Weiss believed that there were many misconceptions about her job including, “that we sit at a desk all day. And we’re just here.” She recalled that most people outside of the academy were surprised to know that she taught classes: “A teaching librarian is not a concept a lot of people are familiar with.” Additionally, she also believed that most people did not know that her job required a specialized level of education. “People don’t realize that we get Master’s Degrees and many of us, actually I have two Master’s Degrees, so I have a specialization and many of us do. That’s very common.” Overall, she felt that librarians were “victims of our own success” because they made complicated processes appear seamless to the general public. She explained,

They would have no idea that there are folks downstairs in Tech Services who are taking care of all the interlibrary loans, the databases, the catalog, all of that stuff is curated and maintained by people who have professional degrees . . . and that’s all invisible to people.

Finally, she noted that the nature of the library as an event space is often very foreign to people, “I don’t think people expect things to go on here and then they have preconceptions about what these things might be,” further explaining the perception that a library must be strictly a quiet space.
Weiss approached every aspect of her job as a teaching and learning opportunity. She defined student learning as “anytime you give them a tool that they can use and take with them” and characterized learning as a holistic process that extended beyond the classroom. In her own work, she saw “every encounter on the research desk as being an opportunity for student learning,” and reflected on how that could be achieved through student employment.

Although only at Augustana for a short period, she was quick to identify a successful collaboration she had on campus. She described an on-going collaboration with a faculty member in the graphic design department that allowed her to teach innovative lessons. The collaboration was successful during the first term and has grown during each subsequent trimester. When asked to describe what made it successful she stated, “Both of us are open . . . we’re both excited and open to trying different things and we’re open to potential failure.”

Overall, Weiss thought that collaboration was valued on campus and progressively important for a small campus. She felt that it has been easier for her to be involved with collaborative initiatives at Augustana, but believed this could have been due to a variety of factors including size, campus culture, and the more permanent nature of her position. She summed up her viewpoint of collaboration at Augustana by stating, “Overall, I have felt like people here are really open to new ideas and excited about trying new things.”

Tredway Library

Collectively, participants presented a unified identity of the Tredway Library. All library staff identified shared values including teamwork, communication, a welcoming environment, customer service, and innovation. Organizationally, the Tredway Library operates under a philosophy of consensus, teamwork, and shared decision-making. Many librarians cited teamwork as the primary value of the library team. Samantha Crisp acknowledged that
teamwork was integral in the hiring process, “It [collaboration] is a value that we are pretty explicit about. We look for the ability to collaborate or to be a good team member when we hire.” Non-librarian participants also commented on the library staff’s ability to work well as a team.

Librarians discussed that this teamwork philosophy was only possible through communication and shared decision-making, “We’re open to hearing each other’s ideas. We are good communicators. Even Carla [Tracy] tries not to make too many executive decisions . . . but to talk things through with us.” Many viewed the library staff as a close-knit group who enjoyed spending time together. Stefanie Bluemle stated, “In some ways, some of the people around here start to feel like family more than anything else. We get along tremendously well, but it just feels like family in some ways.”

Participants indicated that another collective value of the library was its dedication to providing a welcoming environment. Librarians expressed a clear commitment to the physical space of the library, Connie Ghinnazi described, “We value this place as a place that is welcoming and provides what people need so quiet spaces, group spaces, more like living room space, not a loud space, but where people can feel comfortable talking and visiting.” Similarly, all librarians described a universal commitment to providing exceptional service to customers, especially students. Katey Bignall recognized that the library staff was always willing to track down an answer to a question, even when it was outside of their purview.

Librarians also identified innovation as a value and a strength. Mary Tatro noted, “We have a lot of forward-thinking people who work here that see what else is happening in our profession.” When searching for new staff, they seek to hire staff who are open to new ideas and have an enthusiasm for advancing librarianship.
Division of Student Life

Unlike the library, the Division of Student Life did not display a collective identity. Units within the Division interacted regularly, but participants struggled to identify shared values. Many participants spoke from a functional unit perspective, as opposed to identifying commonalities across the broader Division of Student Life organizational unit. Participants also struggled to identify a common name for the unit sometimes calling it student services, dean of students’ office, division of student affairs, and division of student life. A distinction that was also unclear on the Augustana website. Many librarian participants were unaware of which units fell under the Division of Student Life umbrella, and frequently interchanged the Office of Student Life and Leadership with the Division of Student Life.

The one commonality that emerged among all student affairs participants was an overwhelming commitment to student success. All student affairs participants spoke of creating student-centered environments that promoted student success. Alisha Smith described, “We’re definitely student centered, and I would say more so than any other place I’ve worked. So, ensuring students have what they need to the best of our ability to be successful.” Similarly, student affairs participants identified creating a safe environment that cultivates a student’s individual sense of belonging as a priority. Patricia Santoyo-Marin described that students need to feel both safe and comfortable to “navigate through the educational system successfully.” Katey Bignall also defined an essential component of her work was to make “students feel at home” on campus.

Summary

Overall, the participants in this study were very welcoming and willing to share their perceptions and observations. Collectively, they were engaged throughout the study and freely
discussed strengths and areas for improvement. When discussing weaknesses, some participants viewed these as politically sensitive topics. Participants described their perceptions, and allowed me to use the data, but asked for quotes to be anonymous.

Since the time of data collection, there were some staffing changes by the participants. Katey Bignall was promoted to assistant director of student life and leadership/director of greek life. Patricia Santoyo-Marin and Alisha Smith left the college in 2015. Jane Tiedge moved into her new role in enrollment management at Augustana.

I found that a majority of the participants were passionate about their work and dedicated to future collaboration. All participants expressed pride and excitement in the CSL facility, and were eager to discuss its creation and management. Many viewed my study as an opportunity to jump-start relationship-building between the library and student affairs.
CHAPTER V: CENTER FOR STUDENT LIFE

In order to understand the impact of Augustana’s *Center for Student Life* on collaborative relationships, it is important to first examine the history of its creation. In 2004, Augustana hired a team of architects to assess the physical campus and provide recommendations for the capital plan. The team was tasked to “identify and address existing capital investment needs and plan for the growth” (Augustana College, 2004, p. 1). The consultants surveyed the physical environment, held open forums for the campus community, interviewed key campus stakeholders, and benchmarked Augustana’s facilities with peer institutions.

When comparing Augustana’s facilities to those of peers, the consultants found that student life general use space was at a deficit, and estimated the need at approximately 55,000 gross square feet (Augustana College, 2004, p. 21). The *Campus Assessment and Capital Priorities Plan* also outlined concerns about the existing College Center, noting that it has “less space per student than it should” and the “dining hall was cramped” (Augustana College, 2004, p. 21). The authors elaborated on the collective desire of the campus community, “While there are valued social spaces throughout the campus, many yearn for a campus center-like facility with medium scale meeting rooms that can be combined to accommodate large groups and with food service to enhance social interactions that occur in general use spaces (Augustana College, 2004, p. 22).

The final capital plan included preliminary plans for a future stand-alone student center facility at the core of campus. Although none of these proposed facilities were designed as a joint library-student union facility, the architects acknowledged that the library facility may be able to facilitate student life uses. They stated, “Five options were studied for design of the
student center space. Included with this is assignment of additional student life uses in the 
library” (Augustana College, 2004, p. 75).

**Student Center Task Force**

Upon completion of the *Campus Assessment and Capital Priorities Plan*, the Student 
Center Task Force was formed and charged by President Bahls to “imagine a student-oriented 
facility—physically and programmatically—that operates 16 hours a day as Augustana’s 
‘common room’” (Augustana College, [ca. 2007], p. 1). The need for the task force was also 
prompted by a growing acknowledgement of the competitive environment for recruiting students 
and the changing needs of students. The task force began by researching and visiting student 
centers at peer and ‘reach’ institutions. The group considered renovations to the existing College 
Center, but reported, “even with substantial renovation, we do not believe the College Center 
could fulfill the vision the task force has for a student center” (Augustana College, [ca. 2007], p. 
1). Ken Brill, associate dean and vice-president, student life, leadership and engagement, echoed 
this sentiment,

> We had a Student Center – the College Center – that had meeting space. People were 
saying we should expand that, but it is on the very edge of campus. In the middle of 
winter, are you going to come all the way down there to watch a movie? No.

In their report entitled, *Toward a New Student Center at Augustana College*, the task 
force further articulated the need for a student center by pointing out the deficiency of student 
space, declining rates in students’ sense of belonging, and increased expectations of prospective 
students. The report also highlighted that due to its central location the Tredway Library had 
become the social place for students, and was struggling to meet the increased student demand 
for meeting spaces. The task force further concluded,
The library has done a fine job of trying to accommodate student demand for meeting space, but it is reaching its limits and overstepping its primary role as the academic research and information center on campus, as well as a place for quiet study. (Augustana College, [ca. 2007], p. 2)

In an interview, Kent Barnds, vice president of enrollment, also reflected on the role the library had been playing in the student experience,

> I think that in our case – the library had become our de facto student center. It was a disco. The library and the librarians were involved in student affairs and student support and student activities to a degree that probably student activities in Ken’s shop didn’t understand. The library was doing student affairs like programming during finals week and hosting tables for students to sell their wares and their goods.

Ultimately, the Student Center Task Force submitted a recommendation to the Board of Trustees to move forward in planning and the construction of a new student center that would be “the programmatic and symbolic center of the campus community” (Augustana College, [ca. 2007], p. 1). They recommended a freestanding facility in the center of campus that would be approximately 35,000-40,000 square feet and cost an estimated $8-10 million. The committee identified key components for a future facility including a large programmatic space, coffee shop/grab-and-go dining facility, student organization offices, an information desk, meeting rooms, student media offices, flexible exhibit space, office space for student services, and a patio. At the time the task force did not recommend relocating all dining services to the new facility, but envisioned a smaller satellite food service operation that acted as a coffee shop and provided a “destination” dining experience that was not offered in the dining halls such as sushi, pub food, or grab-and-go.
The task force developed a vision statement to guide how the new facility should affect the student experience and outlined the campus benefits,

The Augustana College Student Center must be a destination for all that centers Augustana students’ out-of-classroom experiences, learning, social interaction, reflection, recreation and play. The envisioned Student Center must become the place to be as well as the place to be seen and to see others. It should be a destination offering many choices for many people and should invite synergy among complementary activities. Such a facility must offer inviting social spaces designed specifically for students. A Student Center must reflect our community values and balance unification with diversity. It must also be the center of information – to learn about things and to share things with members of the student community. (Augustana College, [ca. 2007], p. 2)

In fall 2007, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation from the Student Center Task Force to go forward with a Student Center that increased student activity space, aligned with the Campus Master Plan, and fulfilled the outlined vision. Construction was planned to begin in the summer of 2010 (Augustana College [ca. 2010, January], p. 1).

**External Factors**

Shortly after the Board of Trustees approved the construction of a new stand-alone student center, the United States financial and sub-prime mortgage crisis began to affect Augustana (Augustana College [ca. 2010, January], p. 1). The institution encountered new financial realities including a lack of borrowing capacity and absence of lead gifts (Augustana College [ca. 2010, January], p. 1). This forced the Board of Trustees to table the Student Center project and begin exploring ways to reduce the institution’s core costs.
Meanwhile, discussions had begun regarding the changing nature of the academic library, and the Tredway Library’s use of existing space. President Steven Bahls described finding an article by a renowned library architect Geoffrey Freeman (2005) that sparked his re-envisioning of library space. Bahls summarized the article as “Today [the academic library] is the center of learning and the center of student life. The technological resources are as important as books, so [the architect] essentially said that you need to redesign these libraries as interactive learning environments.”

Similarly, the library staff had begun discussions about the underutilized portions of the physical collection and the evolving nature of campus libraries. The staff described never having to engage in collection weeding, a practice common at many libraries that removes outdated or underused books to make way for new additions, because the facility had been large enough to accommodate all incoming materials. Carla Tracy, library director, acknowledged that she “had been seeing that dead wood, and I had heard it from my predecessors. We hardly ever weeded anything.” This anecdotal evidence was coupled with data that showed that approximately one-third of the collection had not been circulated since the 1980’s (Augustana College, [ca. 2012], p. 3; K. Barnds, personal communication, March 10, 2015). Together Bahls and Tracy concluded that the collection could be downsized, the library reimagined to meet changing needs, and some space re-purposed to accommodate compatible campus services.

Many of the participants in this study noted that the Center for Student Life was conceived only after external factors such as the economic downturn promoted a re-examination of the original vision of a stand-alone facility. Evelyn Campbell, Vice President and Dean of Student Services, recounted that the concept of a combined facility was derived from a combination of fiscal realities, timing, and emerging research on student learning:
The truth is, we could be having a stand-alone building here if timing wasn't what it was. So there we were – without the budget to build this building that we had approved – research telling us that integration was the key to successful student learning – and us trying to figure out "if we can’t do a stand-alone building, what do we do?" Somehow all of that came together to create this idea of a building which would represent this new blend of learning, collaboration, blended learning, integration, whatever you want to call it. In a very visible, very symbolic way to demonstrate that we were doing what the literature said, and that's one piece of it.

Similarly, Kent Barnds described the inspiration for the Center for Student Life as a merger of three external factors, “We didn’t have a lead donor, we needed to cut core costs, and we thought we had some excess space available in the library.” Ultimately, these external factors lead senior administrators to begin devising alternatives to a stand-alone student center.

**Birth of the Fusion Concept**

At the 2010 Augustana Winter Retreat, the Student Center project was discussed despite the Board’s decision to indefinitely delay the project. The campus community continued to express a desire and enthusiasm for the facility. Following the retreat, a report was drafted for the Board of Trustees, which outlined emerging internal opportunities and changing financial conditions (Augustana College [ca. 2010, January]). The report detailed the institution’s new fiscal condition, but also pointed to two new opportunities- the possibility of a combined dining facility that was estimated to save $1 million annually and a re-assessment of pre-existing campus space that identified available square footage in the Tredway Library. The authors recommended that the administration review the Campus Master Plan and investigate the possibility of a Student Center that would include a central dining location.
In July 2010, an exploratory task force, comprised of representatives from the Office of Student Life, Tredway Library, Dining Services, Reading/Writing Center, and Student Government Association, was convened to research the potential of a fusion facility for Augustana College (Boyd, 2010). Three vice presidents also served on the committee: Evelyn Campbell, Dean and Vice President of Student Services, Paul Pearson, Vice President of Business and Finance, and Kent Barnds, Vice President of Enrollment, Communications, and Planning. As chief administrator for the Augustana campus plan, Barnds oversaw the task force and soon recognized that each of the three areas (Dining Services, Student Life, and Tredway Library) had representatives that were strong advocates for their individual areas. Barnds stated, “I figured out early on that we might not be successful if we didn’t have some outside facilitation,” thus, he recruited the assistance of an external consultant, Karen Boyd, who had training in campus planning and architecture to take the lead. Karen assumed a leadership role and was charged with asking critical questions and challenging each unit to define their essential needs and conclude what functions could be combined in shared space.

The committee’s charge was to “develop a proposal to combine these functions on campus – the dining room, the study (library) and certain student activities” (Brill, Campbell, Douglas, Griffith, Jakielski, Johnson, Paris, Tracy, & Barnds, 2010, p. 3) utilizing the existing library location within a budget of $13 million. According to meeting minutes, the focus was on a collaborative facility, “President Bahls has made it clear that he is not interested in a plan that merely houses the library, student center and dining center under one roof. It is essential that the plan realize a genuine integration of the three components” (Boyd, 2010a, p. 2).

During the initial meeting, all stakeholders shared their individual opportunities and concerns for the facility. A host of logistical concerns and questions were raised, but many
agreed that the project priorities should be to first preserve and enhance the integrity of the library, followed by a need to create a student center concept, and finally to add a combined dining facility. The student representative was in favor of the library as a central location for the proposed facilities because it was “already the place ‘to see and be seen’” (Boyd, 2010a, p. 4). The planning process was to be executed in three phases (1) define project vision/space program requirements, (2) generate/evaluate planning options, and (3) document planning recommendations (Augustana College, 2010, p. 1). The final presentation to the board of trustees was slated for January 2011.

The exploratory task force continued to meet regularly over the course of 2010. As the lead consultant, Karen Boyd, also conducted meetings with individual units to assess needs and identify priorities. Barnds described the process as:

We went from defining the size of box that everybody wanted to defining the size of the box that everybody needed. And then figuring out where those boxes could become circles and overlap. We knew we had to have overlapping, shared space and we had to reimagine the way space was used.

In late August 2010, members of the student services staff met with Karen Boyd to discuss student activities space needs. Ken Brill reiterated that the building had the potential to “model the seamless nature of students’ lives inside and outside the classroom” and further elaborated that “it would allow students to move seamlessly among many fundamental college activities – studying, collaborating, pursuing club interests, socializing, eating – all within this multi-purpose building (Boyd, 2010b, p. 1). The student activities staff stressed that a physical priority for the building should include a large multi-purpose space with a pre-function area to accommodate their award-winning student activities programming.
In early October 2010, a draft document containing a breakdown of the square footage needs for the facility was presented from the architectural firm to the task force. The project had been nicknamed *Agora*, derived from ancient Greek society and defined as “a multi-functional gathering place where learning, communication, commerce, politics, and philosophy flourished. It functioned as ‘an integrative center’ for ‘activities that were crucial for the Greek way of life’” (Brill et al., 2010, p. 5). The plans called for 86,561 net square feet (nsf) of added space and included the 60,149 of existing library space. The proposed 146,710 nsf building was projected to comprise of 30,659 nsf for dining, 43,617 nsf for library, and 12,285 nsf for student activity space.

In late October 2010, Kent Barnds confirmed that after a thorough analysis of space needs for the library, dining, and student activities, the plan for a combined building remained feasible. He stated that in order to move forward they would begin to solicit designs, continue to examine costs, but most importantly begin “introducing the concept we’ve developed, through conversation and space planning to the campus community” (Barnds, personal communication, October 28, 2010). The first conceptual design/floor plan was developed in early September 2010.

By the end of 2010, the task force released a report of their progress entitled, *Interim Report for the Exploratory Task Force for Combined Center for Dining, Library and Student Activities*. The report detailed the task force’s role, vision, progress, space assessment, and addressed concerns. The vision for the facility was clearly articulated in the document and emphasized a commitment to collaboration, “the agora which will be at the heart of our campus, will be a place—the place—where our community will grow as it is nurtured, challenged, and
supported through intellectual, social and cultural communication and collaboration” (Brill, et al., 2010, p. 5). See Appendix F for the full vision statement of Augustana’s agora concept.

The document also reported the results of a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis, which outlined five areas of concern (a) the perception of a smaller library (b) less student activities space than originally planned (c) fewer dining establishments on campus (d) the feasibility of a fusion floor, and (e) cost. The committee noted that the facility has significant strengths and they acknowledge that “the conversation thus far has involved a series of trade-offs for everyone involved” (Brill et al., 2010, p. 8). The planning committee worked through potential and challenging logistical concerns such as traffic flow, noise, and the smell of food. Evelyn Campbell explained,

I think we grabbed onto [the CSL] as a great ‘idea,’ but since we’re all sort of practical people, it was like ‘how in the world can this possibly happen?’ The turf wars will be a problem, the kids will be confused, it’s going to be too loud, student activities will be hushed down, so they won’t enjoy, there will be a smell of food –so those were all concerns, but there was also a deep commitment.

Concerns were raised about the lack of physical space for both student programming (K. Brill, personal communication, September 20, 2011) and office space for services such as the Reading/Writing Center (Augustana College, [ca. 2012]). Additionally, the change to a single dining hall reduced the need for dining services staff. President Bahls described the difficulty of this obstacle,

The challenge was that we were downsizing our dining staff because we didn’t need as many, and there were up to 30 fewer positions, so I was really proud that we could manage that through attrition, reassignment and so on, because that’s the value of the
college. We don’t like to lay people off. But that was a challenge to figure out how to do that.

During the 2010-2012 academic years, the fusion-building concept, named the Center for Student Life, was rolled out to the campus community through information sessions, educational documents, and individual conversations. The Tredway Library also conducted an anthropological study that investigated how students utilized the library (Augustana College, [ca. 2012]). The study found that students were relying on the library as a social gathering place more than had previously been estimated. The task force continued to work with the BLDD Architects to finalize building plans.

“The Big Weed”

The committee compiled a final report entitled, *The Case for a Center for Student Life at Augustana College*, which outlined the philosophy of the building, changing needs of the academic library, facts and figures about the new facility, and an FAQ about opportunities and concerns. The report further outlined the rationale for reducing the library’s print collection, “In its continual aim to be an effective contemporary resource for undergraduate learning, the library will tighten and focus its collection, and replace stacks with more advanced compact book shelving” (Augustana College, [ca. 2012], p. 3).

The library team began the process of identifying books for removal to accommodate the impending renovations. Books that had been used once or less in the last 25 years were considered for elimination (Augustana College, [ca. 2012]). The library team was under a tight timeline to reduce the collection, a task they jokingly referred to as “the big weed.” The reduction of the collection became one of the most politically sensitive and controversial parts of
the CSL project. Connie Ghinazzi, noted that the stress on the library staff was amplified by an early mistake that angered a faculty member,

It was a very stressful two years in the planning stages of the CSL . . . we had to reduce our collection by 60,000 volumes, and there were all kinds of repercussions with an error that was made . . . early on in that process.

Inadvertently the library staff recycled a collection of classical Chinese writings, which were originally purchased through a grant secured by a prominent faculty member. The professor was upset at the removal of the books they had worked hard to obtain, and the campus community became emotionally charged about the weeding process (Tracy, 2011). Director of the Library Carla Tracy believed the strong reactions to the weeding process were associated with “what each person believes the college library should be” (Tracy, 2011, para. 5). She further elaborated in her interview,

There is such a strong attachment to the idea of libraries . . . and then of course you add on to the nostalgia and the fact that [for] many of the disciplines, the library is their laboratory, and they have a tremendous attachment to books for intellectual reasons as well as emotional reasons. So put all that together, and it is just powerful.

Each of the librarians interviewed discussed the weeding process and their individual role. A protocol was developed that first identified books to be removed and then invited faculty members to review the items. Faculty could inform the library staff if they highly recommended a publication be kept or updated with a new edition. The librarians who worked closely with humanities and social science faculty reported dealing with higher levels of criticism and frustration. Stefanie Bluemle, the library liaison to Augustana’s Humanities Division struggled to work with faculty to come to a consensus on the items to be removed. She empathized with
their perspective, but also understood the need to make the collection more tailored to the college’s curriculum. She recalled,

Some of the people who felt the worst about it, were the people who worked with me – I am their librarian, everyone sees it that way. So I got a lot of the feedback, and I not only had to talk to people about it a lot, but I also had to actually DO the job of removing some books anyway, even though people were not happy about it.

Ultimately, the collection was reduced to meet the needs of the renovated facility. Many staff commented that the process revitalized the collection and made it more accessible to students. One participant commented, “I think that the collection is much more vibrant and people can find the things that they really want.”

**Construction and Beyond**

In late May 2012, construction on the Center for Student Life began. The final design included a five-level facility. The first floor had a renovated special collections area, office space for library technical staff, and utilized new compact shelving to house a majority of the print collection. The second floor continued to serve as the hub of library services and included the circulation desk, reference desk, leisure and reference reading materials, student study space, new collaborative small group work stations, and library administration office space. The third floor was designated as a quiet study floor and was arranged to increase study spaces. The fourth floor was completely re-imagined and dubbed the hybrid floor, which included an information desk, *The Brew* coffee shop, a multipurpose event space, game room, student study space, interactive classroom, and office space for Student Life and Leadership, International Student Life, Multicultural Student Life, and the Reading/Writing Center. The hybrid floor also had a rounded patio that looked onto the slough and was accessible through common lounge space near
The Brew. In the middle of the fourth floor, a large fireplace acts as a focal point and gathering space for students. Figure 2 depicts an architectural sketch of the fourth floor. The fifth floor sits on the top of the hill and connects to the rest of the facility on the South side. The fifth floor dining area contains a variety of themed dining stations, open seating for 700, and a hydroponic garden. A large open staircase provides the main thoroughfare between the fifth and fourth floor, also symbolically connecting Augustana’s upper and lower campus areas. Figure 3 shows the fifth floor entrance and overlooks the slough that separates upper and lower campus, and Figure 4 depicts the exterior of the building on the library side and second floor entrance.

Figure 2. Architectural sketch of the fourth floor of the Center for Student Life. Copyright 2011 by Augustana College. Reprinted with permission.
Figure 3. Entrance to the Center for Student Life on the fifth floor. Copyright 2016 by Ken Brill. Reprinted with permission.

Figure 4. Exterior of the Center for Student Life on the library side and second floor entrance. Copyright 2015 by Christine Aden. Reprinted with permission.
Project superintendent Bob Happ of Russell Construction led the management of the project. The first phase entailed the renovation of the special collections area. The unit was expanded to provide additional space for valued collections and re-designed to promote a “teaching archives” equipped with a state of the art classroom and display area (Happ, 2013). As the building progressed decisions were made regarding signage, audio-visual, and security. Next, the Brew coffee shop, located on the new ‘hybrid’ floor (fourth floor), underwent a remodel and was re-opened following winter break in January 2013, and the work on the addition followed. President Bahls described the physical challenges with the construction site:

First of all, it’s a tough sight to build on . . . . It’s on a hillside. The cost of shoring up that building and putting a heavy building on top of the hill without it collapsing was a challenge. We spent more money on the engineering and did some interesting things.

Despite the difficult location and engineering challenges, the project proceeded largely on schedule. The Center for Student Life was completed and opened in August 2013 and garnered local and national attention.

Since the opening of the CSL, the building has been managed through the CSL Steering Committee that would meet approximately every six weeks (C. Aden, personal communication, February 3, 2015). The Steering Committee was comprised of representatives from each unit in the facility; Student Life and Leadership, Tredway Library, International Student Services, Multicultural Student Services, Dining Services, and the Reading/Writing Center. On May 14, 2015 the Center for Student Life was renamed the Gerber Center to honor the support of Murry and Cindy Gerber who have donated over 9.8 million to Augustana (Augustana College, 2015).
Themes

Several themes emerged from this study to answer the question: How has the existence of a shared facility affected collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians? Collectively, participants were excited about the facility and believed it had positively impacted the institution and student body. Participant responses fell into six thematic areas:

1. symbol of seamless learning,
2. unified and strengthened the student experience,
3. encouraged collaboration,
4. enhanced the library mission and collection
5. difficulty collaborating with dining services, and
6. lack of physical space.

Symbol of Seamless Learning

Participants indicated that the CSL embodied the concept of a seamless learning environment, and many believed this representation was its greatest strength. Overall, participants felt that the CSL effectively combined numerous aspects of the student experience and symbolized a commitment to holistic learning. President Bahls pointed out that this was always the primary goal of the facility, and described that they wanted to develop a concept “where the living room, the dining room, and the study of the college would be under one roof.” Brill also noted that in order for the building to successfully convey this image, collaboration was necessary, “I think it’s a great mix of relax, reflect, study, and so I think that we needed to collaborate on this.”
Librarian Stefanie Bluemle commented that the CSL, “allows students to combine life and learning,” she elaborated,

Having The Brew and having dining here, spaces where students can eat with a faculty member, get coffee, or just sit down and eat and talk about ideas . . . the same thing goes for International Student Services, Multicultural Student Services – we are trying to draw all of these pieces of their experience together – can see bringing some of those things together really helps to tie student life and all of those pieces of it to student learning.

Similarly, Student Affairs Professional Patricia Santoyo-Marin felt that many students naturally compartmentalized different aspects of their lives, but the building challenged those assumptions:

I think that for many students, learning is still kind of check-in check-out of the classroom. Then it is study time, and then there is social time. But a building like this brings that idea – emotes a culture of “you are learning and developing 24/7.”

Rachel Weiss had similar observations, “it puts it in peoples’ minds, ‘Oh, this is all connected.’”

Many participants witnessed that the facility had increased the interactions between students and faculty; Barnds remarked, “It is hard to walk through the concourse or Main Street and not see a handful of faculty meeting with students in open space.” Others also witnessed increased learning and collaboration among students, Librarian Amanda Makula stated, “I feel like there's a lot of ‘on the fly’ learning that happens. They'll be hanging out with their friends in the library, or in another part, and they'll be working together.” Ken Brill found that interaction had increased between all campus constituents, “Look at the level of engagement of students in interaction with each other, with administrators, with faculty members, it’s all over the place all the time.”
Staff also commented that the building had increased their ability to connect students with other services. As the Coordinator of International Student Services, Jane Tiedge described that she often referred students to the Reading/Writing Center for assistance:

My office used to be located across campus and when I would have a student that would be in and talking about the difficulties they were having in the classroom . . . I would tell them, ‘Well, you need to go over to the Reading/Writing Center.’ They’re not going to go. Because it’s too far away. Now I can just pick up the phone or we just walk over.

So that’s been very helpful.

Librarian Connie Ghinazzi also saw the variety of services as a way to help “students reach their academic potential and to have available to them different ways of study and different techniques.”

Many library staff noted that the library was achieving this vision of seamless learning before the remodel, but the changes had strengthened its commitment. Stefanie Bluemle stated,

The library has always been a place that is social in ways for them [students], as well as a place that is academic, even before any of this happened . . . I think one of the main strengths of the building is that it has really built on that character of the library, and expanded it in some ways, and really allowed students to tie – at a few pieces – of their lives on campus – together.

Kent Barnds also hoped that students looked to this facility as a model of “what we want them to be thinking about once they graduate” and described work environments such as Apple’s headquarters that integrates a person’s work, learning, and life.
Unified and Strengthened the Student Experience

In addition to being a symbol of seamless learning, many found that the CSL had unified and strengthened the student experience. Participants pointed to the central location, array of services, and welcoming atmosphere as attributes that positively affected current students.

A majority of the participants in this study commented that the CSL’s central location was crucial to bridging the physical campus and facilitated increased interaction among students. At Augustana, campus residences are located on both the upper and lower areas of campus, and prior to the CSL, campus dining operated two separate facilities on opposite ends of the campus. This caused students to stay primarily on one side of campus, with the library being the sole congregating spot in the middle. Barnds recalled, “We had a dining hall in Westerlin Hall and a dining room in the College Center, and never would the two meet. We were really building two different communities.” Provost Pareena Lawerence echoed this sentiment, “Everybody runs into one another [in the CSL], otherwise we would have upper dining, lower dining students and . . . [they] would never really meet and hang out and there’s so much conversation that happens over food.”

The CSL sits on a hill that bridges the physical divide between the two sections of campus and makes it easier to travel back and forth. Katey Bignall described,

Since the building is built into a hill . . . you can enter one side of the building on floor five (ground level) and exit the building on the other side floor one (ground level) or two (some stairs to get to ground level). The students use the building to get from upper campus to lower campus all the time!

She further observed that due to the nature of the location and breadth of services provided, the building itself encouraged student interaction,
The students used to be spread out a little bit more. But now, if you come to campus and you’re a commuter let’s say, you don’t have to feel like you have to leave at any point. There truly is something going on. There truly is a place that you can sit and study before you go to class, before you go to dinner.

All participants indicated that students immediately welcomed the facility and commented on the consistently high student traffic. The one-stop nature of the building attracts students from a variety of backgrounds and encourages what Katey Bignall called, “cross-pollination.” Many students are known to spend a majority of their day in the building. Both librarians and student affairs professionals commented on this phenomenon, Samantha Crisp stated,

We joke about students who say they basically live in this building because they don’t ever need to leave here. They have the library here, they have their study space, they have the dining hall and tutoring if they need it, Reading/Writing Center, things like that. I think it is just really great at fostering success in a way that spreading out the spaces would not be.

When students come to the building for one function or service, they are often exposed to other services. Virginia Johnson, Director of the Reading/Writing Center, had discovered her office was receiving more drop-ins, which she attributed to high volume of students being exposed to the services. The Office of Student Life and Leadership have also seen an uptick in student visits, Katey Bignall and Ken Brill both commented that they felt they were able to reach more students and indicated that student organizations were “feeling empowered” by their accessibility to assistance.
Likewise, Vice President and Dean of Students Evelyn Campbell described that the CSL was able to appeal to all students whereas many of the campus buildings were aimed at a specific segment of the population. She reflected that prior to the CSL there was not a “focal place that defined the campus.” She listed other campus facilities such as a popular residential hall or a new science laboratory as locations many, but not all, students identified with. She explained, “But I think that building – the CSL – there is some memory of talking to somebody at The Brew, or talking to a faculty member, or going to a program . . . everybody has ‘stuff’ that happened there.”

Many participants also commented that the home-like and student-centered atmosphere of the facility served as a support for students and strengthened their campus experience. Head of Circulation, Christine Aden described that the library was always committed to being the living room of campus, she concluded, “we take it to heart, and we want to make this a homey and welcoming atmosphere that people can come and spend time here and do their studying.” Others also stated that the living room of campus philosophy has been expanded. Amanda Makula thought,

They used to call it the living room of the campus. But it is like the living room, the dining room, hopefully not the bedroom. It’s just that there is so much. There is so much that goes on here in a given day. And a student will come and will do one thing, and they'll be doing something else and move around the building. I think it's great that it's at the heart of campus, sort of physically and symbolically.

Overall, the CSL has strengthened the student experience by providing a welcoming destination for all students and connecting students with services and peers.
Encouraged Collaboration

The third theme that emerged was that the facility encouraged collaboration among the units housed in the facility and by modeling collaboration to the rest of campus. Both librarians and student affairs professionals felt they were in the beginning stages of developing relationships with each other and had just begun to develop a greater understanding of each other’s work through their close proximity. Katey Bignall discussed that having their offices in the same facility increased their communication, “It’s been easier because then if I need something, I can just go down the stairs versus call.” Similarly, Rachel Weiss reflected on the impact of proximity when working with International Student Life:

We worked with [Jane Tiedge] to put together a display for that [International Street Fest], so it also brings opportunities for collaboration into the forefront just because you share a building with these people and you’re like, “Hey, I could go talk to so-and-so about this.”

Virginia Johnson also commented on how proximity had affected her collaborative relationships with both the librarians and student affairs units. Prior to the remodel, the Reading/Writing Center was located on the main floor of the library, next to librarian offices. She found that since their move to the fourth floor they are a “little more removed from the librarians” but have increased collaboration with other units on the floor, “We have Multicultural, we now have an ESL person, who is sort of our liaison with the International folks and OSL, so we have more collaboration with different people here than we ever have before.” She concluded, “physical distance is kind of a funny thing” inferring the impact it can have on collaborative relationships.

Christine Aden also recalled that through conversations about building operation, they have developed a deeper understanding of each other’s work:
Once we started to communicate and see their perspective, and they saw our perspective, it opened up wonderful conversations. We know that we can call on them and ask for help on various things. They know they can call down and ask if we can be on the lookout for this or that – that has helped.

Many participants commented that Ken Brill and Carla Tracy had set a tone for working together to solve problems. Kent Barnds pointed out, “One of the things that I think has been successful is the degree to which Tracy and Brill in particular collaborate, think about shared spaces, think about the learning outcomes associated with the space.” He continued to elaborate, I think that they genuinely think about how, where, and when they can collaborate, and I think that they have approached the management of the Center for Student Life in a way that exemplifies shared ownership and shared responsibility. That is impressive to me. It was clear from my discussions with Brill and Tracy that they felt pride in their ability to work collaboratively and had developed great respect and concern for the needs of each other. Yet, they also identified that their collaborative interactions were primarily focused on the facility itself and hoped they could build deeper connections in the future.

The senior academic leadership also felt that the building had not only increased collaboration among units in the building, but impacted collaborative relationships across campus. Pareena Lawrence remarked that the central location facilitated numerous interactions, “It’s where we run into one another constantly. And I think there’s something to be said about it, because that again helps us know what each other does.” Similarly, Evelyn Campbell witnessed a broader impact on collaborative endeavors for student affairs units, “It hasn’t just connected us with librarians, it’s really helped with the whole academic side – the faculty.” Collectively,
participants felt that the building had inspired staff to make connections, develop relationships, and find commonality.

**Enhanced the Library Mission and Collection**

Although not as prominent as the previously mentioned strengths of the CSL, participants also felt that the building renovation enhanced the mission and collection of the Tredway Library. The upgrade of the special collections area had already resulted in increased usage of the facility and faculty were working closely with the special collections librarian to use it as a learning laboratory. Similarly, many librarians commented that the reduction in the physical collection, although challenging, had been beneficial. Connie Ghinazzi found “the collection is much more vibrant and people can find the things that they really want.” Others agreed and felt that the downsizing was long overdue. Ultimately, the process allowed the library to create a comprehensive collection development plan that focused on supporting the curriculum.

Many found that the vision of the library as the *living room of campus* was enhanced through the remodel. The new facilities and services only strengthened and expanded the living room concept. Students have heavily used the new collaborative learning spaces on the main floor, and there was a moderate uptick in study room usage. Vice President and Dean of Student Services, Evelyn Campbell also expressed that the new facility may make the library more accessible to students and showcase the variety of services to a new group of students. She commented,

Now every student is coming through there, and even those who might have avoided the library in the past, or only gone if they absolutely had to, are in there seeing what the library can offer that is not just going and pulling out a book. The research opportunities, even the displays that they have – they do a lot of educational stuff.
Difficult Collaborating with Dining Services

The biggest frustration of librarians and student affairs professionals in this study was their collective working relationship with dining services. They frequently discussed hindrances when working with dining services in the CSL. Many felt that unlike the other units in the building, dining services had not bought in to the collaborative spirit of the building, nor were they being held accountable by senior administration to work with other units. Multiple participants felt this was the biggest failure of the CSL project. One stated,

We haven’t been able to work as well with fifth floor, with dining services. They’re kind of on their own thing. So that’s been one of the challenges that I’ve tried to collaborate with and it hasn’t gone well . . . . That would be one of my ‘fails’ in collaboration.

Similarly, a librarian commented, “the collaboration has happened with everybody else in this building except for dining services.”

The concepts of ownership and territory came up frequently when participants discussed their interaction with dining services.

The word “ownership” comes to mind, it’s not really the right word, maybe, but especially with dining services being in the same building, everything from the way that decisions are made and the way that they’re viewed is a different entity. That affects their willingness to work together with us.

Multiple participants thought the dining services leadership was uninterested in working with other units and some concluded it was due to “clashing personalities” and “territorial concerns.”

Prior to the CSL renovation, the fifth floor of the library was a quiet study floor. Study participants involved in the planning of the facility had envisioned a fifth floor dining space that could be also used for a place for student events, study groups, and faculty gatherings. The space
was originally conceived to be accessible during non-peak hours for these purposes, but late in the planning stages of the facility a change was made to the fee structure for meals. Pareena Lawrence explained, “The whole idea of all-you-can-eat dining came much later in the game as a lot of the planning had already happened.” She continued, “We suddenly lost all that space, because the whole idea had been that in the evenings this would be program space and student groups meeting and all this multi-use . . . and then one change happened.” She also noted that this was a good lesson for other institutions planning collaborative facilities, “one change, the impact that it has unintended consequences, be aware of that and plan accordingly because had we thought of that, we could have redesigned it so that a part of it could be gated.”

The dining facility has two main areas each with seating and serving stations. Customers come in through the west entrance and pay a flat fee to gain access to the facility. The serving stations and open seating on the east side of the facility are gated off during non-peak hours. This restricts access for space for approximately 300-400 seats. Many of the interviewees felt this space was extremely underutilized and much needed especially during finals time. One student affairs professional described that the library is always packed during finals week. Since dining closes at 8-9 p.m. and the library stays open to 2 a.m., she strongly felt this space should be used for study space especially during finals. Although, this request has consistently been denied by dining services due to a fear of vandalism. She commented,

But that’s a huge space that has tables, that has chairs, that would be great, loud space for students to study in and you could have one or two staff members be there. Or just say, “You know what, it’s free pop” or charge students $2.00 to come in to study there. There’s so many options that could have been come up with instead of just ‘no.’
Many participants felt discouraged that senior administration had not done more to encourage collaboration from dining services. Some felt that dining services was being allowed to operate by a different set of rules and the campus commitment to student learning and collaboration was not being applied to them. One participant pointed out,

Everybody’s on board with the overall mission and vision of the campus, and I think that’s the part that’s so annoying . . . that [dining services] clearly doesn’t give a damn about anybody else except [the] bottom line. At least that’s the way it comes across.

Similarly, one librarian stated, “I think that simply by virtue of the fact that on paper we suck money and they generate money; that creates a weird conception about who should have political sway.” Kent Barnds acknowledged that they had not been “as successful in integrating dining” into the collaborative nature of the CSL and thought they could do better in the future. Pareena Lawrence also felt she could do more but was also cautious:

Could I push them more? Probably. They’ve had a lot of changes there and I think if I push them right now, it would be the breaking point, because they had significant change going from two to one, figuring all these things out. There are lots of pressures on them already to figure out what it is they’re doing that one more thing which is this major would really really impact.

**Lack of Physical Space**

A continued challenge of the CSL was a lack of physical space and specifically a concern for student study and common spaces. Many felt they wished it could be bigger, but also knew the financial restraints. Others found that the space issue has only increased with the success of the facility. Katey Bignall noted many entities who want to be in the building:
Student Government said, “Why don’t we get an office?” The mailboxes say, “We want to be over there.” So I think now more people see that is where all the students are, so I want to be there, too. Just space-wise, we don’t have it. There’s only so much space. Kent Barnds echoed this sentiment, “It is such a successful facility that I think there will be a continual desire to get space there. We are already seeing that happen.”

The design of the building and allocation of space was developed over months of planning and through multiple conversations and compromising, but since the opening of the CSL, participants voiced concern regarding encroachment on the original vision of intentionally designed space. During the semester I conducted interviews, Augustana had created a Learning Commons that was aimed at providing student and academic support services such as tutoring. In order to accommodate office space for this new unit, group study rooms were reallocated for office space, and tutoring was slated to take place in an open area outside of the student computer lab. Many were concerned that student common space was being redistributed and others were equally concerned that it was decided by a mandate and not discussed with the units in the building.

The librarians were the most affected and troubled by this change. I observed a library staff meeting in early February 2015 during which the library faculty learned of the redistribution of student study space. They all understood the need for increased support services for students, but were disappointed that more student study space was taken away from students so soon after they had worked to reallocate library space for the CSL. The group study spaces were highly utilized by students. As of February, during 2015-2016 academic year, the fourth floor study rooms had been reserved approximately 200 times. Many librarians feared that one of the
primary reasons the CSL was created, a shortage of student gathering spaces, was being usurped by office space. Stephanie Bluemle summarized the librarians’ perspective:

Obviously we, as people who are interested in the academic side of student life – were very supportive of what’s being done with expanding tutoring and adding staff to different areas where we need to add them, but it is difficult when it comes out of study space. What we see is that roughly the same number of students who were studying in the building before any of the construction happened are still studying here, but kind of in a smaller amount of space – so that is why I worry about it.

This concern was coupled with the continued frustration that students were not allowed to freely congregate in dining services spaces during non-peak hours.

Director of the Library, Carla Tracy also worried that directives were undermining the CSL’s vision of operation through consensus. She concluded,

Everybody just [thinks] it's just space. No, it isn't just space – that is not what the vision was. So it goes beyond the fact that we (the library) lose a couple of study rooms. I'm thinking – is this just a beginning of a creep of ignoring the mission of the building.

Kent Barnds reiterated this concern, “The president said, ‘Look I don’t want this to be a collection of offices,’ and we’re making another move, which makes it a collection of offices, rather than shared student space. That’s a concern.” He felt there would be continued pressure to “encroach on the play and study spaces in the Center for Student Life.”

Collaborative Partnerships

Many librarian and student affairs participants felt the shared facility had improved collaborative relationships between them, but also indicated that they needed to do more to collaborate on projects and learn about each other’s work. Connie Ghinazzi stated, “I think we
have a good relationship, but in terms of collaborating on a lot of projects, I don’t know that we’ve done that in terms that the students would see.” Katey Bignall commented, “I think it’s always a living, breathing relationship. We can do better sometimes and they can do better sometimes, but I think it’s working out pretty well.”

Carla Tracy and Ken Brill both felt that they had worked well together on collaborating with facility management, but had not yet developed many programmatic collaborations. They each had felt that during the first year and a half facility needs had consumed their time. Christine Aden, Head of Circulation, also acknowledged the precedence of facility concerns and hoped “we could move beyond just strictly building issues that we were tackling last year.”

Conversely, Jane Tiedge from International Student Life felt as though there had been no change in collaborative relationships, “There’s two specific projects that my office does in conjunction with the library and it would have been done no matter what building I was in.” As provost, Pareena Lawrence felt that maybe other parts of campus had developed deeper relationships over the past few years than student affairs and the Tredway Library staff, “even though they are co-located together, I think other parts of the campus has come closer to them than the library has and I don’t know why.”

Despite participant concerns, several operational and programmatic partnerships were occurring between student affairs and the Tredway Library. Some had occurred prior to the facility, but had been amplified by the shared space, whereas others were a direct result of the hybrid building.

**Programmatic Partnerships**

The International Street Fest is an annual event in early February. It takes place throughout many floors of the CSL and features food, performances, displays, and activities
highlighting and celebrating cultures around the world. The event is primarily coordinated through the Office of International Student Life, but the Tredway Library and Office of Student Life and Leadership have been partners. During its first year, the street fest was limited to the fourth floor area, but many wanted the event to include the library, which was traditionally closed on Friday evening. Christine Aden from the library explained that during the second year the library would remain open “a little later than we normally do . . . . They really wanted to extend into the library area.” In addition to increased hours, librarian Rachel Weiss worked with Jane Tiedge from International Student Life to coordinate displays for the event such as bestselling books from twelve different countries, and a display of soccer jerseys from around the world. Overall, participants felt the collaboration was successful.

In addition to the International Street Fest, library faculty and staff, along with the Reading/Writing Center, also assisted with international student orientation. This partnership had been formed prior to the CSL. A new program established with the CSL was a midnight breakfast during finals week. Kent Barnds explained that the CSL made the event possible because they were able to serve 1,100 students and he believed it was a, “wonderful way to build community and I think that that has positive impact on student activities and student life as well as the academic program, as well as dining.”

Additionally, librarians have worked collaboratively with Multicultural Student Life to develop educational displays and support student initiatives. Student cultural coordinators were planning a display that highlighted social movements in Latin America. Patricia Santoyo-Marin from Multicultural Student Life encouraged them to reach out to the library to create an art display in the library. Similarly, students were also creating an awareness campaign of the Palestine wall. Santoyo-Marin and the librarians meet to discuss the event and make sure “we
are on the same page.” Collectively, they supported the student project and the librarians helped to monitor the display and fixed the PowerPoint when it was not functioning. Santoyo-Marin also volunteered to assist with library displays such as a READ poster campaign.

**Facility Management Partnerships**

As mentioned prior, the bulk of collaborative relationships between student affairs and librarians have focused on facility concerns. Although some of the facility concerns are handled directly by Carla Tracy and Ken Brill, many are taken to CSL Steering Committee meetings. These meetings were regular during the first year of operation, but during the second year, at the time of my visits, they were frequently rescheduled due to staff availability conflicts. Participants felt the meetings were productive, and they learned more about each other’s areas through talking about building concerns.

When designing the CSL, the Tredway Library and Office of Student Life and Leadership (OSL) had agreed to co-staff an information desk on the fourth floor. The desk would act as the information hub for campus and visitors could return books, receive basic library assistance, learn about upcoming events, or get directions. Both student affairs professional Katey Bignall and library staff member Christine Aden discussed that they were still working together to figure out the best course of action for staffing the desk and training staff. Aden recalled during the first summer “OSL had taken on more of those [staffing] hours, and they have sort of eaten through their budget, so spring break we’re going to be staffing the desk for all of the hours the building is open.”

Additionally, both units have continued to examine the student employee experience at a shared desk and determine appropriate training and development. In the fall of 2014, OSL brought in a guest speaker for their student workers who addressed customer service skills. They
extended an invitation to student employees in the library. Christine Aden welcomed this experience for the students she supervised and found that it had left an impact on the staff. She recalled one student employee who told her the event had made her re-think her job in the library and applied the content to other areas of her life.

In addition to the information desk, other areas of the facility are shared between the units in the building. The multipurpose Gävle rooms are coordinated by OSL, but are reserved by units across campus. Katey Bignall described that during the planning stages of the CSL, OSL made a commitment to the library to have the Gävle space available for student study during every tenth week of the trimester and during finals week. Connie Ghinazzi also commented on the need for the student affairs units and library faculty and staff to work together on space management, “We collaborate because they need to use our space for a lot of events in the summer, so orientations and luncheons with parents and all of that. They want to showcase this is a really cool space.” Bignall summarized, “when you share a space, an actual physical space . . . if something happens, let’s talk about it, let’s not blame each other, there’s no reason to. Let’s just try to work together.”

During the time of my interviews, the campus was also in the process of updating their emergency preparedness plans. Library staff members had been appointed as point people for the building, and discussions had begun on how the diverse building occupants would react and work together in case of emergencies. These discussions were just beginning, but provided a common reference point for building constituents to discuss how students utilized their facility, especially after traditional business hours. Finally, Virginia Johnson from the Reading/Writing Center also noted that in addition to collaborating on space, they have shared services, “OSL has
been really gracious to say use some of our printing things. Everyone has offered something. We have offered editing services.”

**Future Collaborative Partnerships**

Practically all participants discussed initiatives that librarians and student affairs professionals could collaborate on in the future. Many pointed out that student programming was an area ripe for partnerships. Although minimal collaboration had existed with student programming in the past, participants were hopeful that new mutually beneficial initiatives would emerge. Both Katey Bignall and Christine Aden commented that they had hoped to bring programmatic collaborations as their next step in developing relationships across the department; Bignall said, “bringing them into our programming a little bit more and having us come into their programming a little bit more and also on each other’s terms.” Librarian Rachel Weiss felt that student affairs had a lot to offer library-programming initiatives. She discussed,

Library events sometimes can get thrown into this weird box, people assume if something is going to be educational, it has to be dry, and I don’t think that’s the case at all. Especially people who are involved with student life will have a good sense of what excites students and what’s going to motivate them to come to one of the billion things that they can go to in a given week.

She had already been thinking about events they could work together on such as a *Long Night Against Procrastination*, an initiative started in Germany that is geared to kick starting student projects earlier in the semester by providing overnight one-on-one academic support and activities in a central location. Weiss also thought about working with units in the building to celebrate National Novel Writing Month in November, but lamented, “It falls at a really weird
time in our [academic] calendar.” She also discussed a potential PostSecret exhibit/event that is based on a popular collection of postcards that people mail in anonymously with their secrets.

Alisha Smith, Assistant Director of Residential Life expressed interest in bringing librarians into the residence halls to participate in social and academic programming. She described being involved with a programmatic collaboration with librarians at a previous institution called Snacks in the Stacks, where students visited snack stations through the library to learn about the facility. Overall, she felt that combining social and academic initiatives were beneficial to students:

I think anytime we can bring more academic initiatives into our halls and more staff and faculty into our spaces, the better. I think that students want to get to know the people that they see academically. When you become more than the librarian and you’re also the person who taught me hand knitting, it’s like, “I can come and talk to you about my research paper now.”

Librarian Amanda Makula also thought the new digital repository, Augustana Digital Commons, had the potential to spark collaboration with student affairs. She felt it would be “a great way for students to promote themselves professionally, looking for a job, that kind of thing.”

In addition to programming, participants also envisioned a future that integrated the training and development of student employees throughout the building. As the Director of Multicultural Student Life, Patricia Santoyo-Marin had referred many of the cultural coordinators to librarians in the past and wanted to continue to encourage these students to “hone their research abilities.” Librarian Connie Ghinazzi realized that she knew little about the work of student employees in OSL, “I still don’t have any clear idea of how many students are working and doing things there, and it would be great to have a better idea of that.” She
concluded that it would be beneficial to compare the skills of all student employees and see how units in the building could help each other enhance skill-development of student employees.

Some participants also thought that the campus initiative to improve the first-year experience would provide an opportunity for student affairs and librarians to work in tandem to support students. Additionally, others wanted to build future partnerships by developing a greater awareness of each other’s work through a shadowing program.

**Summary**

The Center for Student Life has served as a catalyst to encourage collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians, but is not a panacea. The facility itself has numerous strengths including acting as a symbol for seamless learning on campus and encouraging collaboration. In addition, through intentional design and constituent engagement the facility has strengthened the student experience and enhanced the library’s collection. Increased interaction between librarians and student affairs professionals have prompted some collaborative initiatives including the International Street Fest, awareness-raising displays, and shared student employment training. Each of these initiatives provide a foundation for future intentional collaborative programs that are aimed at enhancing student learning.
CHAPTER VI: MENTAL MODELS

One of the research questions in this study explored how mental models influenced collaborative relationships regarding student learning between librarians and student affairs professionals at Augustana. As discussed in Chapter II, mental models are defined as “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (Senge, 2006, p. 8). Mental models can be shared within organizations or groups of individuals and have the ability to affect organization effectiveness.

For this study, I explored participants’ mental models of student learning, and the mental models of librarianship and the field of student affairs. In order to unearth these mental models participants were asked to define and provide examples of student learning, unearth misconceptions of their professions, and describe their knowledge and understanding of each other’s profession. Participants shared personal assumptions and thought processes of each topic. I found that participants shared a common understanding of student learning, but participants lacked knowledge of each other’s profession, which resulted in mental models that were either non-existent or stereotypical.

Mental Models of Student Learning

As Kuh et al. (2005) pointed out there are many conceptions of student learning. Prior research indicated that a significant barrier for collaboration in higher education was individuals’ varied perceptions of what constitutes student learning (Kezar, 2001; Kuh, 1996; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994; Schroeder, 1999a; Schroeder, 1999b; Schroeder, 2003). Due to this, I investigated student affairs professionals’ and librarians’ mental models of student learning to determine if the two fields conceptualized student learning through a similar lens.
I found that unlike many of the prior studies, participants expressed common definitions, assumptions, and generalizations of student learning. Overall, participants viewed student learning as an on-going holistic process that included both personal development and academic skill building. Special Collections Librarian Samantha Crisp described the holistic nature of student learning. She stated,

Ideally they’re not just learning how to regurgitate things from a text book or learning about the subject matter of their major, they’re learning how to be independent adults and they’re learning how to engage with their community and learning how to work together on things.

Student Affairs Professional Patricia Santoyo-Marin, echoed similar sentiments, “student learning is not only limited to the classroom, it is something that comes in through interactions with peers/students, with faculty/staff, with custodial folks, with other student leaders on campus.”

Similarly, numerous participants from both professions discussed personal development as a vital aspect of student learning. Research and Instruction Librarian Amanda Makula stressed the importance of self-awareness and learning, “Learning about themselves, becoming more self-aware, gaining more perspective on their place in the world, and how their actions impact others in their communities and in the broader world.” Santoyo-Marin described using a framework of racial identity development to guide her work and noted that many students had to advance through stages of personal awareness to grow as individuals. Alisha Smith from housing also saw the conduct process as a component of student learning as a way to encourage personal growth and self-awareness.
Many participants from both professions also used similar verbiage to describe their understanding of student learning. Participants drew on Augustana’s strategic plan, mission, and learning outcomes to shape their personal definition of student learning. These institutional statements provided a common language for participants to discuss student learning (See Chapter VIII for more information). Collectively, participants often used the concepts of growth, change and curiosity to describe the nature of student learning. Ken Brill and Connie Ghinazzi likened student learning to personal change and transformation. Ghinazzi stated, “if you’re willing and open to changing something and that you allow experiences to or classes or clubs or meeting new people whatever to modify how you think about things or modify your behavior, then that’s learning.” Likewise, Evelyn Campbell, Connie Ghinazzi, and Virginia Johnson all saw student passion and curiosity as an essential element of student learning.

In addition, many participants indicated that as educators, it was their duty to inspire life-long learning and develop skills that students could take with them throughout their lives. Librarian Amanda Makula stated, “it's not like they're not going to do all their learning here, of course – this is just going to set them on a path, so that they're forming these – habits of mind. They're forming these habits of mind that they can use for the rest of their lives hopefully.” Many other librarians and student affairs professionals saw their role as promoting life-long skill development.

Although there were large commonalities between the mental models of student affairs professionals and librarians in this study, some subtle differences did emerge. Student affairs professionals were more likely to utilize guided reflection to enhance student learning outside the classroom, whereas librarians frequently spoke of cultivating critical thinking and information
literacy skills across the curriculum. Ultimately, these differences were minor and were overshadowed by a common understanding of student learning.

**Mental Models of the Professions of Librarianship and Student Affairs**

A predominant theme that emerged during this study was a lack of knowledge about the work and role of each other’s profession by both student affairs professionals and librarians. Many librarian participants admitted that they were unaware of the day-to-day work of their student affairs colleagues. Participants were hesitant to speculate about each other’s profession, but were quick to define the common mental models that they faced in their own profession.

All librarians discussed the common stereotypes of librarianship including the perception that they are quiet and spend their day “sit[ting] around reading old books or looking at old documents.” They noted that contrary to popular belief, most librarians never shelve books because their specialized responsibilities have more variety and include teaching information literacy skills, conducting research, and serving patrons. The librarians indicated that these common misconceptions were minimal at Augustana, but still believed that there was an overall lack of understanding of their role.

Librarians also commented that many people were unaware of their teaching responsibilities, or the qualifications needed to become a librarian. Rachel Weiss described, “People don’t realize that we get Master’s degrees and many of us, actually I have two Master’s degrees, so I have a specialization and many of us do. That’s very common.” Similarly, librarians felt many lacked an understanding of the issues and philosophies that guide their work. Carla Tracy explained,

People are always surprised when I or the other librarians start talking to them about the major issues that libraries get involved in . . . [librarians are] fighting for openness of
information and access for everyone not based on your wealth or your prestige, or what school you are in enrolled in— but based on your right to have information.

Like librarians, student affairs professionals also discussed some common misconceptions of their work. Participants drew on two common and opposite extremes; their positions were seen as either “all just fun or games” or that they are “out to get students” because of their role in conduct. Katey Bignall explained,

They kind of view it as, “You just bring comedians, or movies. You just work with Greek life because they have a lot of fun and parties and you’re just kind of there.” I would say a fair amount of faculty kind of feel that way.

Similar to librarians, student affairs professionals felt that there was a lack of understanding about their work. Ken Brill discussed, “I think there’s a lack of understanding about what people in student affairs do. In part I think that’s the fault of the student affairs people.” He further explained that it is essential for student affairs professionals to approach their work from a student-learning lens instead of a service lens. Failure to put learning at the center of the student affairs profession makes the work less relevant and harder to translate to faculty colleagues.

Other participants noted that many colleagues were not aware of the advanced degrees they obtained for their position, or were aware of the fundamental tenants of student development through student engagement.

When librarians were asked to describe their assumptions of the work in student affairs, many felt ill-equipped to answer the question, but others indicated that they witnessed student affairs being busy and stretched thin at Augustana. Librarians also hypothesized that a majority of student affairs professionals’ were focused on advising/supporting students and providing programming opportunities. One librarian commented,
So I’m sure, they’re working with student groups and working with students, and I imagine especially in multicultural and international, they support students emotionally and spiritually. In addition to dealing with student organizations and events and all of that planning and stuff, they also have to be there for students because they’re supporting specific cultural cohorts on campus and that’s really important.

Other librarians discussed student affairs roles in the residence halls, supporting sororities and fraternities, and developing the first-year experience.

A majority of participants in student affairs also expressed that they had limited knowledge of librarians’ daily work, but viewed the librarians at Augustana as both hardworking and innovative. Since the opening of the CSL, Katey Bignall indicated that she had gotten to interact with and know the librarians better, which had challenged any preconceived notions she had of librarians. She explained that the more she learned about individual librarians, the more she became of their diversity and found that many wanted to “come up and join in the fun.” Ken Brill also commented, “I learned at the Christmas party that they are way more fun than I thought they were . . . when we had our Christmas party with them, I walked out and said to Katey and our secretary ‘who would have thought.’” Brill also described the librarians as innovators and idea people.

The data from this study showed that student affairs professionals and librarians lacked complete mental models about each other’s professions. This lack of mental models could prove to be both beneficial and detrimental to building collaborative relationships. Largely, the participants did not subscribe to common misconceptions of the other field. Individuals from both professions described the other as hardworking, innovative, and student-centered but were unable to describe daily duties, values, or missions. This lack of foundational knowledge could
provide a clean slate to construct a shared understanding and common goals. On the other hand, the lack of knowledge signals that the two units have been operationally invisible to each other; without such a foundation, the possibilities for collaboration may be invisible to the constituents.

In the case of Augustana, the CSL has acted as a catalyst to encourage interaction and learning between student affairs and librarians. Although participants recognized they knew little of their student affairs/librarian colleagues; they also described increased interactions, a desire to learn, and had begun to hypothesize shared values. Christine Aden, Alisha Smith, Amanda Makula, Mary Tatro, Katey Bignall, and Samantha Crisp all surmised that both units had similar goals, but also felt that they needed to learn more about each other to validate this assumption. Librarian Amanda Makula said,

I think I need to know more about Student Services. It always seems like they're doing a lot, and they're moving forward. From what I have seen, it seems like they have similar values, and we could probably build on that.

Additionally, as the leaders within the building, both Carla Tracy and Ken Brill possessed a more comprehensive knowledge and scope of each other’s work. Carla Tracy noted that when the CSL began both units had a “superficial understanding” of what each other did and described, “Just being in the same building together has caused us to be more aware of one another’s work.”

**Summary**

Student affairs professionals and librarians have similar mental models of student learning that can be used a foundation for collaboration. Conversely, the participants in this study indicated that they lacked a basic understanding of each other’s roles and responsibilities, and thus lacked any guiding mental models of each other’s profession. This disconnect is a
double-edged sword because it recognizes that the two professions have had little past interaction but does provide collaborators with a *clean slate* to construct shared values. Ultimately, librarians and student affairs professionals at Augustana have the potential to build shared mental models that guide future collaborative endeavors. The next chapter will discuss barriers to collaboration between these two groups and in turn, address strategies to promote collaborative initiatives.
CHAPTER VII: BARRIERS AND STRATEGIES

One of the primary research questions in this study was to explore the barriers to collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians and subsequently investigate strategies for increased collaboration. This chapter will explore the results of these questions. The strategies and barriers, which emerged, were highly related to each other. For instance, a common barrier to collaboration was a lack of professional knowledge about each other’s profession, and thus the strategy to increase collaboration was to increase formal and informal knowledge sharing experiences. The barriers and strategies discussed in this chapter arose from the data, separate from the eight features of the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHE), which will be discussed in the following chapter, that comprise the theoretical model for this study.

Barriers

The barriers to collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians fell into three thematic areas (a) lack of time, (b) lack of knowledge and interaction between the professions, and (c) individual resistance to collaboration.

Lack of Time

Numerous participants in this study cited lack of time as the primary barrier to collaboration. Although most participants felt that collaboration was highly valued on campus, many felt stretched thin and were unable to dedicate the time they desired to build collaborative relationships. Patricia Santoyo-Marín, Director of Multicultural Student Life, surmised,

We are so busy and we are so passionate about what we do, that we are always running around and maybe sending a quick email – sitting down and chatting and getting to know each other – doesn’t come as easy with someone in your same division.
Additionally, Evelyn Campbell, Vice President and Dean of Student Services, described that developing collaborative relationships to enhance student learning was a highly time intensive process that often competed with short-term student needs:

> Finding time to help create these learning opportunities that didn’t exist before . . . it is very, very, time consuming. So I think in some ways, creating time for that, valuing the time is needed for that, because a lot of that is thinking – it’s not out there planning programs – it is a year and half or two year process, where you don’t see anything for a couple years, yet we have students here who want a program Sunday night.

Both Carla Tracy and Ken Brill commented on how the “building issues” had consumed a lot of their time working together. Although they suspected these would begin to subside as they settled into the CSL, these facility needs took precedence over more learning-focused initiatives.

Participants from both student affairs and the library recognized that both units were always on the go and at times understaffed. Carla Tracy recalled the limited staff in the Office of Student Life and Leadership. She stated,

> They only have two professionals and all of these students who are doing the work.

> Which in one way, is a great thing, and is a good idea, but obviously it makes it much harder when there is only two of them. And they have a boatload of other things to do.

Similarly, Alisha Smith from housing stated, “It’s time consuming to build relationships and especially if they’re understaffed and you’re understaffed, what are you gonna do?”

Other participants reasoned that increased emphasis needed to be put on strategic planning and prioritizing collaborative initiatives to account for limited time. One participant remarked,
Augustana always tries to do everything at once. And with perfect good will, because we are enthusiastic and excited about these collaborations, and all the ideas that come from these collaborations, but I wish we had some way of prioritizing them.

Librarian Connie Ghinazzi echoed the need for strategic planning and stressed that they needed to build collaborative relationships around current values, future priorities, and student needs.

Participants also indicated that the trimester system was an obstacle for collaboration. They found that the pace of each term coupled with added administrative functions was a contributing factor to their lack of time for collaborative endeavors. One respondent stated, “It [trimesters] just intensifies everything and makes it so hard to get anything done, because it seems like it’s always week nine and ten and the students are always nuts, and everything is going on. And advising, constant advising.” The term system required staff to perform many administrative functions such as advising, processing paperwork, and billing three times a year as opposed to two, which limited their time to reach out across campus. As a new employee, Rachel Weiss described her transition to the trimester system and recognized that it could be a barrier to building partnerships:

When I came here [I heard] the trimesters described as a “sprint” and that’s really what it feels like . . . . It can be limiting that everyone is really busy with lots of stuff and wearing many hats. I think those things work together.

Frequently participants alluded to week nine and ten of each term being a chaotic time for students, faculty, and services. Students flocked to the CSL in preparation for final exams, which kept both the librarians and student affairs professionals busy. Similarly, many felt consumed during the first two weeks of each term as they helped students settle in, and in the case of the librarians, taught an increased number of classes. This meant that 12 weeks out of the
academic year were “off-limits” compared to eight weeks in a traditional semester system. This coupled with the fact that the majority of librarians were on nine-month faculty contracts limited the time available for building collaborative relationships.

**Lack of Professional Knowledge and Interaction**

Participants from both professions noted that they were unaware of each other’s duties and professional foundations. Some were completely unaware of the work of the other profession and acknowledged that this was a key barrier to collaboration. Forrest (2005) had hypothesized that the reason for few collaborations between student affairs professionals and librarians was a lack of awareness of each other’s role and responsibilities. The data from this study support that hypothesis.

As discussed in Chapter VI, participants did not have collective mental models or assumptions about the other profession. Similarly, participants reported having limited interactions, but the creation of the CSL had begun to encourage relationship building and connections between librarians and student affairs professionals. To a large degree, librarians and student affairs professionals had functioned oblivious of each other until the creation of the CSL. The CSL project provided participants an opportunity for increased interaction, which fostered an initial awareness of each other, but many felt they were beginning to “know how much they did not know” about each other.

**Lack of knowledge.** Librarian Samantha Crisp reflected on her limited awareness of student affairs during her undergraduate experience. She recalled, “I had a minimal to nonexistent relationship with student affairs” and hypothesized that it contributed to her current unfamiliarity with the profession. Since coming to Augustana, Crisp was impressed with the intentionality the campus took in promoting holistic learning and student success. She
acknowledged that student affairs was playing an active role in this mission, but was unaware of the specifics. Crisp stated, “I think if I had a better understanding of how student affairs operates and how it functions in the daily lives of college students, I would have a better understanding of how I could collaborate with them.”

Crisp also pointed to her limited tenure at Augustana as reason for her lack of awareness about student affairs, but more experienced librarians expressed similar sentiments. Connie Ghinazzi also believed that the two units needed to learn more from each other: “We’ve never gotten together with Katey and Ken [Office of Student Life and Leadership] . . . just sit down and let’s talk about how we serve students. We’ve never done that. That would be a great thing to do.”

Similarly, Carla Tracy reflected that she had only begun to gain an awareness of the professional foundations of student affairs, a few years earlier, through a workshop sponsored by ACRL. Librarians Rachel Weiss and Stefanie Bluemle also recognized that their limited awareness of student affairs was a barrier. When asked to describe a typical day for student affairs, Bluemle could not provide a response and recognized, “Probably just the fact that I blanked when you asked me what their typical day is like [is a barrier]. So maybe just not knowing enough about what we do day-to-day – which can affect everything from a big project down to “When would be a good time to schedule a meeting with that person?”

Similarly, Rachel Weiss explained that ignorance between librarians and student affairs professionals was the biggest barrier to collaboration, “Ignorance is a hard thing to get past, especially if you’re not in the same building, I would imagine those conversations just never happen, probably, at a lot of places.” Similar statements were made by Katey Bignall and
Patricia Santoyo-Marin regarding a lack of knowledge about librarianship. Santoyo-Marin stated, “I don’t think we can really collaborate without understanding each other’s area.”

**Lack of prior interaction and relationship building.** Many participants drew a clear link between their inadequate knowledge of each other’s professions and their lack of prior interaction. Participants in student affairs felt they needed to learn more about the work of librarians and wanted to focus specifically on building individual relationships. Katey Bignall, in the Office of Student Life and Leadership, believed she was beginning to develop deeper relationships with her librarian colleagues, and indicated this was necessary for collaboration. She described,

> I’m a relationship person. I really think meeting people and understanding what their passions, what their desires, why they do the job that they do, is really impactful, because if you understand and respect where they’re coming from, and they can get an understanding of where you’re from, then the collaboration can be much easier.

Since the opening of the CSL, Katey had been interacting with librarians on a regular basis and had begun to develop relationships. She now had a better understanding of the diversity and strengths of the librarian staff, whereas before her perspective had been limited.

Conversely, Alisha Smith’s housing office was located outside of the CSL and she reported, “To be honest, I’ve had no interactions with librarians since [coming to] Augustana.” Smith believed that the librarians were a “hard-working group” and she assumed “there’s a lot of potential for collaboration, we have very similar goals” but the lack of interaction had prevented collaboration.

Patricia Santoyo-Marin had felt welcomed by the librarian faculty, but also acknowledged that relationship building often took a backseat to immediate tasks. She explained
that relationship building was time intensive and “sitting down and chatting and getting to know each other – doesn’t come as easy with someone in your same division. At the end of the day, we are under two different divisions.” Jane Tiedge had expressed the most familiarity and interaction with individual librarians and their daily work. As the Coordinator for International Student Life, Tiedge had worked closely with librarians on a few initiatives that contributed to her understanding. Similarly, she also reported developing friendships with librarians through her tenure at Augustana. It is likely that this familiarly with each other fueled collaborative initiatives such as the international street fest and librarian involvement in international student orientation.

**Organizational silos.** Some participants also cited organizational silos as the root cause for limited interactions between librarians and student affairs professionals. Often participants discussed that these silos were more permeable at Augustana, but anticipated it was a large factor for other institutions.

Kent Barnds, Vice President of Enrollment, Communication and Planning, reflected on the history of higher education in America, “I think that’s the greatest barrier, is that we just have sort of created fiefdoms and kingdoms [in higher education].” He discussed how historical specialization of the disciplines had contributed to decentralization on college campuses. He expanded, “In the early 50s/60s [we adopted] this idea that we should all be mini universities. There is frequently greater loyalty to discipline than there is to the college . . . that’s naturally sort of antithetical to collaboration.”

When discussing organizational silos, most participants provided a caveat that these organization barriers were minimal at Augustana, yet a few participants acknowledged their continued existence and personal propensity for “tunnel vision.” Alisha Smith stated,
I think a lot of times we get so silo’d, they get silo’d at state schools, large schools, silo’d at small schools . . . . So, if we don’t know what we do, we don’t know how to help each other, because we’re just so ingrained day-to-day.

Similarly, Samantha Crisp admitted that much of the time, “I rarely leave the library and I only see the librarians and I’m so focused on my job and my role on my campus that I tend to lose the bigger picture.”

Overall, the lack of knowledge and interaction between librarians and student affairs professionals emerged as a significant barrier. Participants within the CSL had cited some preliminary examples of overcoming this challenge, but more formal information sharing and intentional relationship building would be needed to fully overcome this barrier to collaboration.

Ken Brill had recalled that early in his career he had expected faculty to come to him eager to collaborate, but eventually recognized “they don’t even know what you do.” Librarians also discussed reaching out to traditional teaching faculty to teach them their professional purpose and how they could be helpful, yet neither student affairs professionals or librarians had considered this intentional outreach to each other until the CSL. The CSL has provided a vehicle to build these relationships and learn about the values, background, and perspectives of each profession.

**Individual Resistance to Collaboration**

The final barrier to collaboration between student affairs professionals and librarians that emerged from this study was individual resistance to collaboration. Participants described a wide degree of resistance that included personal fear of change, feelings of loss, and a lack of personal buy-in. Most prominently, participants referred to their failed collaborative relationships with dining services when discussing this barrier. Many study participants felt that
one member of the dining leadership, who they perceived was opposed to partnerships, caused the bulk of the resistance. One participant said, “I think the root of most of our problems is individual people who just sort of clash on an individual level.” Although, dining was neither a student affairs nor library organization entity, some felt that their collective failure to collaborate with dining affected collaborative progress between the two units. This perspective is supported by past research, which has shown that a negative collaborative venture can thwart future attempts (Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

Additionally, although the participants in this study were largely supportive of collaboration, some acknowledged that fears of change, uncertainty, and loss as a barrier to collaborative projects. Librarian Amanda Makula described that in many ways collaboration was inherently uncomfortable, she stated “kind of being in your safety zone of doing what you know – it is more comfortable.” Her initial reaction to the CSL was one of curiosity and concern; she admitted that at first she had trouble visualizing how it could logistically function. When the CSL project began, Connie Ghinazzi recognized that instead of being on the cutting edge of progress, they were venturing into unknown territory and described it as “being on the bleeding edge” because the concept was untested and fundamentally stressful. Librarians described that Carla Tracy, who acknowledged these emotions and provided constant communication, minimized their individual concerns for change.

**Strategies**

Two strategies emerged as the most prominent tactics to increase collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians (a) increase formal and informal knowledge sharing experiences, and (b) identify common ground and create mutually beneficial goals.
**Increase Formal and Informal Knowledge Sharing Experiences**

A reoccurring theme that emerged in this study was a mutual lack of interaction and shared knowledge between student affairs professionals and librarians. Participants recognized this as a key barrier to forming collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and librarians, and subsequently described the need to interact, communicate, and learn from each other as the primary strategy to facilitate collaboration. Connie Ghinazzi summed it up by stating,

First off, you have to know people. I mean you have to know who’s the director for res-life and the kind of things they might be doing and who might be point people on the student services side that would be most interested in this kind of thing so spend a little time with them.

Not surprisingly, those participants who were more actively involved in the creation and daily management of the CSL described a higher degree of knowledge and understanding of each other’s work and values. Whereas, those participants, who were less involved in the CSL project, expressed a strong desire for more engagement between the two units, and articulated their ignorance about each other’s profession.

Head of Circulation, Christine Aden, who has worked closely with the Office of Student Life and Leadership to oversee the daily management of the CSL, described the value of their initial conversations “Once we started to communicate and see their perspective, and they saw our perspective, it opened up wonderful conversations.” Student affairs professional, Katey Bignall also recommended that the first step to collaboration with librarians was to “get to know why they do their job and how you can help out and how they can help you out.” She concluded,
“If you understand and respect where they’re coming from, and they can get an understanding of where you’re from, then the collaboration can be much easier.”

Although most participants believed any type of interaction or communication was beneficial, many noted that they needed to have a better understanding of what each other does, learn each unit’s value, goals, how they aim to serve students, and the foundational or theoretical foundations of each profession. Collectively, participants proposed a variety of solutions to increasing this interaction such as regular formal meetings, one-on-one relationship building, and social events.

**Identify Common Ground to Create Mutually Beneficial Goals**

Throughout the course of this study, participants hypothesized that Augustana’s Tredway Library and the Division of Student Life shared many of the same goals and values. Most frequently, participants discussed that each unit was student-focused and always strived to put student needs ahead of organizational or personal initiatives. This consistent focus on putting students first was seen as an essential strategy to promote collaboration between librarians and student affairs professionals. Librarian Samantha Crisp stated, “We’re very similar in that we both have students’ best interests in mind from all different perspectives.”

Participants discussed that although they assumed they had similar goals, they needed to actively come together to create tangible shared goals that were mutually beneficial. Director of the Library, Carla Tracy described this as a critical component of the CSL project, “Ken [Brill] and I did sit down and talk once about trying to establish some goals and objectives. Even two goals! Anything so that it would give it some shape, and put some clarity to what we’re actually working toward.” She further explained that setting goals for collaboration was encouraged by senior administration and something that needed to be readdressed to promote future partnership.
Similarly, Ken Brill found that for collaboration to be successful, all parties must find value and benefits in the outcomes. He recommended three steps to successful collaboration for his student affairs colleagues; first have the confidence to reach out to others with an idea, be “willing to change the idea once you hear other people’s ideas and perspectives,” and ensure everyone gets something out of it.

In the case of the CSL, the building partners were working together, to create mutually beneficial shared goals. During construction, there were discussions about amplified music in the Brew coffeehouse. Together constituents agreed that although social programming was a priority, so was the need for collaborative study space. Collectively, they developed a policy to allow amplified music in the venue on the weekends and late nights so they could achieve both goals.

Participants also discussed that both units had a commitment to student programming and together they could diversify their programs and reach a wider audience. Ken Brill, Associate Dean and Vice-President, Student Life, Leadership and Engagement, stated:

I think that they have a niche of students that are really connected to the library. That niche of students demographically looks very different than the niche of students that are connected with our space. I am really hoping we can bring those niches together and make them learn from each other.

Similarly, student employees from the Tredway Library and Office of Student Life and Leadership staffed the shared information desk on the fourth floor. At the time of interviews, the units were beginning to discuss ways to work collaboratively to lessen the employment costs for each unit while maintaining high levels of customer service. Some participants also pointed to
student employment as a future area focus for collaborative engagement because they could all
benefit from each other’s knowledge and training of student staff.

Finally, even small gestures of sharing services promoted collaboration. Virginia
Johnson from the Reading/Writing Center described that each office in the CSL had offered up
services to the other departments, “The OSL has been really gracious to say use some of our
printing things. Everyone has offered something. We have offered editing services.” The
ability to first find common ground and use this to devise mutually beneficial goals is a
foundation for promoting effective collaboration between student affairs and libraries.

**Summary**

The data from this study revealed both barriers and strategies to collaboration between
student affairs professionals and librarians. Participants indicated that the amount of time
required for collaboration was a key hindrance to collaborative efforts. The quick pace of the
trimester system, which required participants to spend additional time on administrative
functions, exacerbated the lack of time.

Additionally, participants found that their limited knowledge of each other’s daily work
and infrequent interactions were a barrier to pursuing collaborative initiatives. Many indicated
the CSL acted as a catalyst to increase interactions between the two units, but a majority of the
participants believed they needed to learn more about each other’s values, goals, and positions.
Finally, participants described individual resistance to collaboration as an overall barrier. Some
were disenchanted by dining services’ failure to participate in collaborative discussions, and in
turn, lost their momentum and excitement for collaboration. Others reflected on their personal
resistance to collaboration, a barrier that was minimized by dedicated leadership and information
sharing.
Although some barriers to collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians existed at Augustana, two key strategies also emerged. Participants indicated that in order to collaborate to advance student learning they must increase formal and information knowledge sharing experiences such as professional development sessions and networking events. Additionally, both units must actively work together to identify areas of common ground to create goals that are mutually beneficial for both units.

In the next chapter, I will review the findings of this study through the lens of the eight features of the SMCHE. Some of the data presented in this chapter will be reviewed again through the perspective of SMCHE to provide additional strategies and framework to advance collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. The final chapter will summarize the findings from Chapters IV-VII and discuss how student affairs and academic libraries could work collaboratively to advance student learning. Recommendations for Augustana and implications for practice and future research will also be explored.
I next utilized the eight features of the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHE) to analyze the data from this study (Kezar, 2005b; Kezar & Lester, 2009). As discussed in Chapter II, the eight key features include: (1) mission, vision, and educational philosophy, (2) values, (3) social networks, (4) integrating structures, (5) rewards, (6) external pressure, (7) learning about collaboration, and (8) sense of priority from people in senior positions. Of the original eight features, seven emerged as prominent themes for organizing collaboration between student affairs and libraries.

The one original feature that did not emerge from the data in this study was rewards. One participant briefly referred to the intrinsic rewards that arose from collaboration, but it did not rise to the level of a theme. Additionally, participants approached the seventh feature, learning about collaboration, from a broader perspective. Not only did participants discuss their experiences learning about collaboration, but also a majority of participants indicated that successful collaboration necessitated learning about each other’s disciplines and duties. Due to this, the feature will be re-classified as learning about collaboration and each other. I will review each of these features and provide a summary of how the data from this study aligned with the theoretical model.

**Mission, Vision, and Educational Philosophy**

Augustana had many guiding documents that influenced participants’ commitment to student learning and collaboration such as: an institutional mission statement, campus-wide learning outcomes, strategic plan, and a CSL vision statement. Both librarians and student affairs professionals frequently referred to these documents when discussing collaborative
relationships or initiatives. Kezar and Lester (2009) found an institution’s mission, vision, and educational philosophy to be critical components for fostering collaboration in higher education. An institution’s mission and philosophy creates a “sense of purpose for members of campus” and many look to these philosophical statements to guide their priorities.

Although Augustana’s mission statement does not specifically address collaboration, it describes a commitment to a holistic approach to student learning. The statement reads,

Augustana College, rooted in the liberal arts and sciences and a Lutheran expression of the Christian faith, is committed to offering a challenging education that develops qualities of mind, spirit and body necessary for a rewarding life of leadership and service in a diverse and changing world (Augustana College, 2016, para. 1).

Director of the Library, Carla Tracy referenced the mission statement when describing her personal outlook on student learning. She stated that at Augustana they seek to enhance the intellectual, social, and personal lives of students and stated, “The mission statement of the college says to grow in mind, body, and spirit, and that is really true.”

Residential Liberal Arts

In addition to referencing the institutional mission statement, participants frequently discussed the importance of Augustana as a residential liberal arts institution in relation to the imperative to collaborate. A theme that emerged from the data were a campus-wide commitment to the liberal arts philosophy expressed in the mission. Many participants felt that as a small residential liberal arts institution, they had a greater imperative to collaborate. During the creation of the current strategic plan, Pareena Lawrence, provost, recalled that the faculty had “doubled down and said, ‘we want to be a residential undergraduate only liberal arts college.’” This led to a discussion about what made Augustana unique and challenged faculty to examine
the role student affairs played in promoting student growth and development. She said, “[We discussed] how do our other partners play a role in helping shape our students’ character as well as development and so on, and that’s how this conversation started, the important role res-life plays, or student life plays.”

Student affairs professionals and librarians also linked the value of a residential liberal arts college with the need to collaborate across organizational lines. Alisha Smith thought that the concept of the CSL exemplified a residential liberal arts experience, “The idea of having the library there [in the CSL] helps tout what we are, which is residential living campus and learning takes place where you eat.” Vice President Kent Barnds agreed that the CSL is “an excellent model for a liberal arts college.”

**Augustana 2020 and Learning Outcomes**

In addition to the campus mission statement, Augustana’s current strategic plan, also known as *Augustana 2020* and its accompanying learning outcomes were consistently cited as a rationale for collaboration. The strategic plan was finalized in 2014 and identified three strategic thrusts: (a) “Enhanced preparation to ensure students have distinguished career and graduate school successes,” (b) “Integrated experiences to facilitate transformative learning,” and (c) “Affordability and value to increase access and expand opportunities” (Augustana, 2005, p. 1).

Participants commonly referred to the second strategic directive as *The Integration Agenda*, and cited it as a rationale for building collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. The integration agenda emphasized the role of the residential liberal arts experience and provided an action plan for developing an “intentionally designed holistic education” that connects the curriculum and co-curricular experiences (Augustana, 2005, p. 1). Ken Brill described that a large portion of his job is to advance
integration between student affairs and academic affairs and work “toward creating a more integrated seamless learning community for our students.” Although the concept of the CSL was devised before the strategic plan was completed, some saw the building as a physical representation of the integration philosophy.

In addition to the strategic plan, Augustana’s learning outcomes provided participants with a common definition of student learning and a commitment to collaboration. The nine institutional learning outcomes are divided into three thematic areas. The first theme is intellectual sophistication and includes disciplinary knowledge, critical thinking/information literacy, and quantitative literacy. The second theme, interpersonal maturity, comprises collaborative leadership, intercultural competency, and communication competency. The final theme is personal conviction and includes creative thinking, ethical citizenship, and intellectual curiosity. Participants viewed the management of the CSL as a model of collaborative leadership for students.

Many participants drew upon these learning outcomes to define student learning. Katey Bignall commented that the focus on the learning outcomes allowed faculty and staff to clearly identify student learning outside of the classroom but noted that there was still a deficiency in being able to wed learning that occurred within the classroom with the co-curricular environment. She cited this deficiency as a reason to continue to work across organizational boundaries. Kent Barnds also noted the holistic nature of the outcomes:

One of the things I like most about our student learning outcomes is that they are not exclusively classroom based learning outcomes. I frequently talk about the importance of teamwork and multicultural understanding, intercultural understanding. Those are not things that are taught in the classroom. Those are things that are learned, developed,
cultivated outside of the classroom. So I think we sort of have an enlightened view and have connected our student learning outcomes to the residential liberal arts college experience.

Collectively, the strategic plan and learning outcomes gave participants a framework and justification to focus on building collaborative relationships to enhance student learning.

**CSL Vision Statement**

Although the institutional level documents allowed participants to make meaning around the concept of student learning and collaboration, the CSL foundational documents more specifically addressed the expectations for the CSL’s collaborative environment. This document conveyed a commitment for student affairs professionals and librarians to work collaboratively to benefit the student experience. The vision statement, also referred to as *Augustana Agora*, envisioned a facility that would be “the destination that centers our students’ out-of-classroom experiences—learning, social interaction, reflection and recreation in a single building.” The vision also set the stage for collaboration between building entities, “The building will preserve the individual purposes of each center, but will allow for proper coordination to ensure high function” (Brill, et al., 2010, p. 5).

In summary, throughout the course of this study participants cited many institutional guiding documents to support their commitment to holistic student learning and describe the imperative for collaboration. Kezar and Lester (2009) found that employees at liberal arts colleges think about and utilize the institutional mission at higher rates than their colleagues at other institutional types. Study participants supported this claim by exhibiting a deep belief in the mission of Augustana as a liberal arts institution, and a commitment to the current strategic plan, learning outcomes, and CSL.
In order to further the commitment of collaboration between student affairs professionals and librarians at Augustana, an additional guiding document may be needed to articulate a vision for future collaboration. Many participants felt that the CSL management had been a successful collaborative endeavor, but struggled to identify a path for formalized partnerships in areas such as programming, supporting first-year students, and integrating student employment training. Also, with the addition of the Learning Commons and the reallocation of student study rooms, some participants questioned if the collaborative vision for the facility was still being upheld by senior administration. A document that proactively addressed procedures for future space allocation and decision-making processes would represent a commitment to the collaborative operation of the CSL.

Values

Kezar and Lester (2009) identified three values that were repeatedly found in highly collaborative campuses: student centeredness, egalitarianism, and innovation. Similar to Kezar and Lester’s findings, many participants in this study felt that Augustana exemplified each of these values. Student-centeredness and egalitarianism were more commonly discussed than innovation, but both librarians and student affairs professionals saw each other’s unit as innovative and identified the CSL project as a creative and pioneering endeavor. In fact, one participant joked that the CSL was beyond cutting edge and was on the bleeding edge of progress. Additionally, participants consistently stated that collaboration itself was a primary value at Augustana. Finally, a value that was unique to this study, but was pronounced was an institutional commitment to the library. Ultimately, four values arose as themes in this study: student-centeredness, collaboration, egalitarianism, and love of the library.
**Student-Centeredness**

The participants at Augustana consistently voiced and demonstrated a commitment to putting students first. This student-centered approach has been woven into institutional documents and was frequently described by participants. Student affairs professional Alisha Smith described student-centeredness as a top value in the Division of Student Life, she recalled, “We’re definitely student centered, and I would say more so than any other place I’ve worked; ensuring students have what they need to the best of our ability to be successful.” She further discussed how the campus values student initiative and promotes students to “be the captain of their own ships.” Students participated in the planning of the CSL project, including representation on the steering committee.

Librarians, student affairs professionals, and senior administrators frequently spoke of their desire to focus on the needs of the students instead of departmental needs. Patricia Santoyo-Marin stated, “It’s understood that at the end of the day, we all have the same mission to serve our students.” The student-centered philosophy was supported by the campus-wide commitment to the undergraduate residential liberal arts mission. Librarians noted that they served many constituents on campus, but always saw their work with students as primary. Additionally, librarians saw the downsizing of the print collection as a way to better serve students by providing more user-friendly resources and additional collaboration spaces. Pareena Lawrence stated,

Every student who comes to Augustana SHOULD graduate from here. I feel it’s my obligation to the students to help them be successful. They have their obligation and they absolutely must meet their end, but I need to do everything to help them be successful.
This student-centered ethos was witnessed in interviews, observations, and document analysis. The shared commitment to student success guided many campus collaborative efforts and was frequently discussed in the CSL project.

**Collaboration**

Study participants repeatedly indicated that a prevailing value at Augustana was its commitment to collaboration. Many connected this commitment to the recent strategic plan and learning outcomes discussed earlier in this chapter. Vice President and Dean of Student Services, Evelyn Campbell explained,

[Collaboration] is very important, because our strategic plan 2020 is built around the idea of collaboration . . . . We really believe the only way we can – maybe not the only way, but a significant way, we can educate our students equal to and better than the competition, is if we really learn how to use the out-of-classroom experience in a way that we really haven't fully used before.

Although others saw collaboration as an integral part of the campus culture, librarian Amanda Makula recalled how central the idea of collaboration was to the library staff: “Collaboration is very valued, and I cannot even imagine anyone going off and doing their own thing. It would be really weird . . . . It would just be so foreign to this environment.” Similarly, many participants felt that collaboration was highly valued because it is a necessity on a small campus. Alisha Smith, Assistant Director of Housing, stated,

[Collaboration] is vitally important, because we are a small staff. We have a lot of expectations. I do more for students in my role than I’ve ever done in any other role in an institution before, so the expectations are high but the resources are somewhat low.
Egalitarianism

Hierarchical reporting structures and organizational boundaries were less prevalent at Augustana, which paved the way for increased collaboration. Participants indicated that as a campus they valued equal participation from all members of campus. Patricia Santoyo-Marin explained,

Hierarchy is respected, but at the same time, it is not imposed or restricting. I think it is embracing ideas as they come from all different levels of our membership of our team. It is understood that at the end of the day, we all have the same mission to serve our students.

Similarly, librarian Rachel Weiss described that the campus was open to trying new ideas and found boundaries permeable.

This egalitarianism spirit was prominent through the creation of the campus strategic plan. Pareena Lawrence described the strategic planning process as a truly campus-wide effort that included input from over 300 faculty/staff members who “invested in the process.” Augustana had also moved from hosting an annual faculty retreat to an all-campus retreat that brings together faculty, staff, and administration to discuss key campus issues. Provost Lawrence described,

We start the year with a full campus retreat. So everybody is part of it. We do workshops, we stress on what’s the common theme this year, what are we going to be working on this year, what are some of the things coming forth this year that we all are excited about, and then we make sure we get input.

From these retreats, cross-functional campus working groups were formed to further investigate campus concerns. The CSL was also created through a consensus-building approach. Many of
the initial discussions about what would go in the building were moderated by an external consultant that met with each unit and then facilitated discussions with all units about how they could work together to use space for numerous functions. Many decisions were made as a collective committee.

Participants in this study were often unsure and unconcerned with reporting lines and felt they were universally valued. The Reading/Writing Center, which reports to the associate provost, was often mistaken by participants as being within the library or student affairs organizational units. Reading/Writing Center Director Virginia Johnson stated, “I am happy with that [some people think we are both student affairs and academic affairs] . . . I don't know the point of making such distinctions.” Many units had been building non-hierarchical relationships with each other and participants often expressed mutual respect for their colleagues in other units. Pareena Lawrence summed up this campus value by stating, “It really is this sense of ‘We’re in this together,’ and acknowledging each other’s roles as equally important roles.”

**Love of the Library**

The final value that emerged from this research was a campus-wide commitment to the library. Although this value is more specific to the context of this case, it was consistently mentioned throughout the study. Many participants acknowledged that the library was Augustana’s best building and had successfully served as the *living room of campus*. Associate Dean and Vice President of Student Life, Leadership, and Engagement, Ken Brill explained, “I admired the success of the library . . . nobody wanted to mess with that. We wanted to make sure that whatever we did, we didn’t wreck that.” Throughout the CSL project, all members of the planning team committed to putting the integrity of the library first. Kent Barnds recalled,
“One of the first things we [as a committee] decided is that we did not want to do any material damage to the mission of the library. That was a conclusion that everybody agreed with.”

Study participants commented that the library was universally loved by faculty, staff, and students. President Bahls noted that prior to the CSL, “the social center of the college was the library.” Amanda Makula found that the CSL only formalized the activities that were already occurring in library spaces, “We were going to recognize what was happening anyway and we were going to embrace it and go with it, instead of resisting it.” Many librarians expressed that they always knew that the library was valued on campus and this was evident throughout the construction of the CSL.

Social Networks

Social networks are people intentionally connected “through some form of interdependency such as values, preferences, goals, ideas, or friends” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 99). Creating and leveraging social networks are fundamental to enhancing collaborative efforts in higher education. Participants in this study found that simple social interactions were important to developing collaborative relationships between librarians and student affairs professionals.

Participants found that informal social events had allowed them to understand each other and build relationships to a larger degree than formal interactions. Many pointed to the annual Christmas party as a key turning point in building collaborative relationships with each other. During the first year of the CSL, the librarians invited all of the building’s professional staff to their annual Christmas party. The informal nature of this event allowed the participants to get to know each other on a more personal level and dispel any potential stereotypes.
Student Affairs Professional Ken Brill recalled, “I learned at the Christmas party that they are way more fun than I thought they were. Literally, a year ago, we had a Christmas party with them, I walked out with Katey and I said, who would have thought?” Katey Bignall also commented on how important this event was in getting to know individual librarians. She found that it deepened their relationships and gave them a common experience, she exclaimed, “I love our group now. They are a lot of fun. We do white elephant at Christmas and things get a little cut-throat. They are all kinds of fun personality.” Librarians also commented on how the Christmas party had brought them together and been a vehicle to begin building one-on-one relationships.

Similarly, Vice President and Dean of Student Services Evelyn Campbell emphasized the need to develop social networks through what she coined as “forced communication.” She stated,

I coined the phrase when I started this job, “forced communication.” And I really am a believer that putting people in the same place at the same time, even for social activities, for lunch or dinner, something like that – actually will result in collaboration, because the conversations eventually will go to the shared common interests, which for most of us, if it is a work setting, or even social, is going to be work. Campbell further explained that she saw her role as the senior student affairs officer to promote and encourage social networks within her staff and across organizational lines.

Whether it is very formal, having staff meetings when we're going to discuss things – or even just having lunch, where my hope is that because ten of you are sitting together that don't usually sit together . . . stuff will just come up.
Many of the study’s participants believed that relationship building would be the key to enhance collaboration between student affairs professionals and librarians. They had acknowledged that their increased interactions and social functions had set a foundation, but also recognized that they needed to dedicate more time to developing relationships. Librarian Connie Ghinnazi stated, that they needed to develop social networks by sitting down and chatting, “See what are the needs in your job to help students in terms of the kind of skills that we might bring to it and how might that complement each other.” Participants also found that shared meetings such as the CSL Steering Committee, or simply inviting each other to regular staff meetings enhanced their social network.

Through the creation of the CSL, Ken Brill and Carla Tracy had developed a deeper relationship and had a better understanding of each other’s work than other participants had. Their relationship had evolved into a collaborative social network where they regularly shared information to enhance success of the CSL and each other’s organizational missions. Brill noted that he had worked with librarians on various college committees in the past, but this project had shown him that the librarians at Augustana were innovative and “wonderful idea people.” He had developed a greater understanding and respect for Tracy and her management of the library. Each had begun to rely on each other to navigate institutional communication channels and power dynamics. During the addition of the Learning Commons and reallocation of space, the two had begun to share notes and work together to find common ways to reimagine space.

Librarians and student affairs professionals displayed mutual respect, trust, and a desire to focus on relationship building, all of which are precursors for forming truly collaborative social networks (Adler, 2001; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Adler (2001) found that trust within a social network is the most important factor especially when there is a lack of extrinsic rewards.
Since extrinsic rewards were not discussed by participants in this study, one may assume that trust plays a large role at Augustana.

Carla Tracy felt that the current relationships between student affairs and librarians were “fairly informal . . . just based on mutual trust, liking, etc. It’s a positive relationship without a real framework.” Other participants also described a high degree of mutual respect for their colleagues and valued each other as educators. Ken Brill discussed that the CSL was being operated “with respect and collaboration” and this degree of respect allowed them to create building policies through consensus. As discussed on page 193, the creation of the CSL amplified sound policy, which considered the needs of all constituents, was a demonstration of mutual respect. Collectively, participants had cultivated trust, and built a foundational social network, but needed to take further steps to solidify their relationship.

**Integrating Structures**

Integrating structures are organizational units that support collaborative work (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Participants in this study discussed many integrating structures or initiatives that enhanced collaboration. The most prominent example of an integrating structure was the CSL itself and its accompanying committees. The CSL planning committee and subsequent steering committee are cross-functional groups that brought together various librarians and student affairs professionals to create and manage the facility. The steering committee meets approximately every six weeks to share information and review any building concerns. At the time of the interviews, the committee had been meeting less frequently and participants saw the need to return to a more regular meeting structure because it provided valuable interaction time and ensured units had a formal channel for information sharing.
In addition to the CSL, there were many campus-wide integrating structures that promoted collaboration. The integration agenda of the strategic plan, described earlier in the chapter, had produced a formal relationship between academic affairs and student affairs. Ken Brill described that a large portion of his job had been to work with the associate provost on endeavors that would enhance seamless learning. Together Ken Brill and the associate provost meet regularly to share information and tackle campus-wide issues. Brill described,

There is a very strong partnership between academic affairs and student affairs. We meet once a month with the senior student life professionals and the senior academic affairs professionals. We’re really in touch with what we’re doing together as well as what we’re doing apart from each other, so we have a much deeper understanding of what each other is doing. That’s been a really great experience.

Although this relationship did not have a direct impact on collaboration between student affairs professionals and librarians, this intentional integration from senior administration had indirectly impacted the library and student affairs staff. Lower-level staff had witnessed the integration within their overarching functional units, recognized the need for collaboration, and began discussing ways they could reach across organizational lines. Connie Ghinazzi recalled, “Getting these two sides together, the academic and the res-life, the social part of what the students are doing here, is critical.” Ken Brill summarized, “we’re seeing that integration comes to life where people that typically haven’t been in contact and in touch with one another and supporting one another are elbow to elbow operating collectively together.”

Similarly, the creation of Augustana’s annual campus-wide retreat and regular campus working groups brought together librarians and student affairs professionals to “address the big
questions on campus” and brainstorm innovative solutions. Connie Ghinazzi described her role on one of these teams: 

We’ve got working groups that right now are looking at first-year experience and I’m on the advising team for that, others in the library are on the other teams and then we’re going to have an all-day workshop the first day of break that will pull those working groups together to see what’s come out of that.

Participants frequently discussed these work teams as a way for student affairs and librarians to learn more about each other and build collaborative relationships. Participants frequently discussed three work teams: first year experience, academic advising, and assessment. Additionally, the campus was beginning to host rapid improvement events that would identify a specific functional problem, such as the payroll process, and bring together staff/faculty from across the institution for an intense session where they explored the problem, identified outside forces, and recommended solutions. Both the long-term working groups and short-term rapid improvement events were allowing student affairs professionals and librarians to work collaboratively to solve campus issues.

**External Pressure: “Perfect Storm”**

Many external pressures contributed to the creation of the Center for Student Life. As discussed in Chapter IV, the impact of the United States financial crisis and subsequent lack of donors tabled the initial proposal for a stand-alone student center. This new financial reality led Augustana to consider new ways to deliver services, while also attempting to reduce the institutions core costs and consider the merger of dining services. Similarly, the college had been looking for ways to appeal to prospective students and find ways to better retain students, which included allocating additional space to student functions and designing a state of the art
facility. Meanwhile, discussions had arisen about the changing nature of academic libraries and how they could be redesigned to meet the needs of modern students. The campus was also in the early stages of strategic planning where they were beginning to review research and literature on the power of integrating the co-curricular and curricular environments.

These four external factors (a) financial climate, (b) recruitment/retention concerns, (c) changing nature of libraries, and (d) increased research on connecting the curricular and co-curricular environments, acted as drivers to create and shape the Center for Student Life. Together they combined to form a “perfect storm” of pressures that produced the collaborative facility and influences the campus strategic plan and subsequent commitment to integration.

Evelyn Campbell, Vice President and Dean of Student Services, recounted some of these factors coming together to create the CSL,

So there we were – without the budget to build this building that we had approved – research telling us that integration was the key to successful student learning – and us trying to figure out ‘if we can’t do a stand-alone building, what do we do?’ Somehow all of that came together to create this idea of a building which would represent this new blend of learning, collaboration, blended learning, integration.

The participants in this study frequently spoke of the financial pressures that resulted in the CSL, and many saw these financial concerns as an on-going reason to collaborate. Similarly, participants discussed student needs as a reason to pursue collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. Each recognized that they needed to be committed to student success, retention, and learning. They saw that both the fields of librarianship and student affairs were evolving as students changed. Librarians had been very cognizant that students used libraries in a different way than previous generations and were committed to
innovation to meet the changing needs. Both saw that each field was adapting to meet the changing needs of students and saw each other as a way to gain continuous insight into students and how best to serve them. Ultimately, the changing needs of students acted as a continuous external pressure to encourage collaboration between student affairs professionals and librarians.

**Learning About Collaboration and Each Other**

Kezar and Lester (2009) identified learning as one of the key features of collaborative campuses. In this context, they defined learning as “both developing awareness of the benefits of collaboration and acquiring the skills necessary to effectively collaborate” (p. 195). All of the participants in this study where able to articulate the benefits of collaboration and many described this as both a personal value and a campus commitment.

The participants who had more professional experience described learning how to collaborate through trial and error. Ken Brill and Carla Tracy were both able to reflect on the skills they had developed during their career, which increased their ability to collaborate. As discussed in Brill’s profile, he recalled,

> Early on, I always thought that it was the faculty members who needed to come to me. Somewhere along the way, I realized, first of all, they don’t even know what you do. Secondly, you probably need to go to them and then I also learned that if you go to them, you have to have a compelling reason why, and there’s gotta be some value for them as well.

Carla Tracy and Connie Ghinazzi also discussed the need to be proactive when forming collaborative relationships.

> Tracy identified that for librarians the key to effective collaboration was “being good librarians, being aware of our opportunities for being part of the conversation, and being
proactive about it – not waiting for someone to ask us, just going out there and being proactive.” She further explained that librarians should not “try to imitate the faculty” but develop their unique set of skills that can be useful in collaborative relationships. Both Ken Brill and Katey Bignall also felt that in order to be a successful collaborator you must first have the knowledge and confidence in your own position. Katey Bignall explained that collaboration required you to be “pretty strong in what your knowledge of your own job is . . . really being able to say, this is why we do this.”

In order to create an environment for effective collaboration, Carla Tracy discussed the importance of assembling a team that was naturally excited and committed to forming partnerships. Librarian participants pointed out that essential criterion when searching for a new staff member was a demonstrated passion and excitement for innovation and collaboration. Connie Ghinazzi said, “We hired people who had this sort of proactive approach to librarianship.” Tracy expounded,

We tend to hire people right out of school. We do not require experience, but what we require is an attitude and a sharpness, a devotion or excitement about what they are doing . . . . Smart people can gain skills, but it is very difficult to change attitudes, to give somebody passion they don’t have – that is impossible.

Although most participants where already well versed in the benefits of collaboration, participants lacked specific knowledge about the work of their counterparts. As discussed in Chapter VI, there was a lack of a collective mental model of each other’s professions. The librarians and student affairs professionals at Augustana had been operationally invisible to each other until the creation of the CSL, but since the building opened, they had increased interaction and awareness. Participants from both professions felt they needed to learn more about each
other’s field. Librarian Samantha Crisp was eager to learn more about student affairs and how they could collaborate, she stated, “I think if I had a better understanding of how student affairs operates and how it functions in the daily lives of college students, I would have a better understanding of how I could collaborate with them.”

Carla Tracy recognized that she had little knowledge of the theoretical foundation of student affairs work and thought librarians could benefit from increased awareness:

I always knew that they were grounded in principles of young adult development – but I never knew how much it informed what they did, in a very conscious way. And I was not surprised, but I was very interested in the richness of that.

Likewise, student affairs staff lacked knowledge of issues of importance to the library community such as the information access and the breadth of information literacy. Carla Tracy reflected that many people were unaware of the larger issues librarians faced. She stated,

People are always surprised when I or the other librarians start talking to them about the major issues that libraries get involved in . . . [librarians are] fighting for openness of information and access for everyone not based on your wealth or your prestige . . . but based on your right to information.

This lack of understanding about each other’s profession was the primary barrier to collaboration in this study. Creating formal and informal ways to share information about each other’s work, values, and how each aims to serve the student will pave the way to increased collaboration.

**Sense of Priority from People in Senior Positions**

Prior research has indicated that support of senior administration has been a key strategy to advance collaborative partnerships (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Kezar 2002; Kezar 2003a; Kezar 2003b; Kezar, 2005a; Schroeder, 2003). Although prominently discussed by participants
in a national study on academic and student affairs collaboration, Kezar (2003a) believed that the effects of senior-level support should be further investigated to determine if it is a key feature or a product of other features. In this study, I found that the support from both senior-level and departmental leadership affected the ability and willingness for librarians and student affairs professionals to collaborate.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, many saw collaboration as a fundamental value at Augustana and partially attributed this to the sense of urgency from senior-level administration through the strategic plan. Librarian Connie Ghinazzi stated that Provost Pareena Lawrence “is very proactive with that [collaboration/integration] and her associate deans are really strong in that area. Similarly, Ghinazzi thought that Vice President and Dean of Student Services, Evelyn Campbell was also skilled and supportive of collaborative initiatives.

During the creation of the CSL, the president explicitly stated that the building should be designed with collaboration and integration in mind. As outlined in meeting minutes, he set forth a charge to the committee that he was “not interested in a plan that merely houses the library, student center and dining center under one roof. It is essential that the plan realize a genuine integration of the three components” (Boyd, 2010a, p. 2). Participants who were active in the planning committee saw this statement as an expectation for collaboration between building constituents. Carla Tracy explained,

This building has a vision and the only way we can make this work is if it is more than the sum of its parts. It is not an office building, it is not a classroom building, it’s the living room, the family room, and the dining room for our students. And the only way we can make it work is to realize the potential is to always work out of that vision.
These participants were equally disappointed that dining services had not lived up to this vision, and were furthermore dismayed that senior administration was not doing more to encourage collaboration. Similarly, some questioned if the process to re-allocate study rooms to office space without consultation from all building partners was usurping this vision. These two concerns had caused select participants to question senior administration’s commitment to collaboration, which also diminished their individual desire to build collaborative relationships. One participant feared that the student affairs and library staff could be inadvertently pitted against each other since they had learned about building changes at different times and from different sources. In conclusion, participants’ perceived support or lack thereof from senior administration influenced their own sense of priority to engage in collaborative relationships.

Although participants found that support from senior-level administration was helpful to advancing collaboration, they more frequently referenced the importance of leadership at the departmental level. Specifically, participants from both student affairs and the library pointed to Carla Tracy’s unwavering commitment to embark on innovative and collaborative endeavors. As the Director of the Tredway Library, Tracy played an important role in the creation of the CSL. Ken Brill explained, “Carla [Tracy] was the huge champion . . . either it was really deep in her heart and that was the passion that drove her, or she’s just risky.” Similarly, Katey Bignall recalled that when the CSL was proposed although Tracy may have had some initial concerns to losing space she, “was truly ready to say, ‘Let’s collaborate.’”

Many of the librarians recounted looking to Tracy’s leadership during the CSL project. Stefanie Bluemle stated,
I became more skeptical for a while and kind of worried, but then seeing that Carla
[Tracy] was really dealing with it . . . seeing some of her confidence . . . I think put me
back to a place where “if she thinks this can work, then I can think it can.”

Additionally, all members of senior administration recognized the importance of Tracy’s
consistent leadership in the CSL and her continued dedication to collaborating with student
affairs. Evelyn Campbell described Tracy’s “deep commitment” and vision of the changing
nature of libraries as an important factor in the success of the CSL. Similarly, Kent Barnds
thought, “without [Tracy’s] leadership, we could have never gotten to where we are.” Tracy has
remained committed to strengthening the relationships between the library and student affairs
units and her influence has been an important factor in advancing collaborative relationships
between librarians and student affairs professionals at Augustana.

**Stage Model of Collaboration Summary**

The data from this study largely supported Kezar and Lester’s (2009) findings. With the
exception of rewards, each of the organizational features they discussed was present at
Augustana. Four features arose as essential to collaboration in the study (a) mission, vision,
educational philosophy, (b) social networks, (c) integrating structures, and (d) learning.
Participants spoke of each of these features frequently and consistently. The first three of these
features were also prominent in Kezar and Lester’s (2009) findings of highly collaborative
campuses.

The feature of learning was slightly altered from the original conceptual model. Kezar
and Lester (2009) had defined the feature of learning as understanding the benefits and strategies
of collaboration. In this study, I found that participants had already obtained these skills, but still
needed to learn about each other’s work to create an environment for collaboration. In this
study, librarians and student affairs professionals were operationally invisible to each other. Due to this, an increased emphasis must be put on learning to facilitate partnerships. It is likely that this feature is more necessary to facilitate collaboration with these two groups due to their historical lack of interaction.

In addition to the features, Kezar and Lester (2009) created a three-stage developmental model to display the cycle of collaboration as illustrated in Figure 5. The three stages included (a) building commitment, (b) commitment, and (c) sustaining commitment. I chose to keep the model in a three-stage cyclical design to illustrate that a burgeoning collaboration has the capacity to affect future collaborative initiatives. Successful collaborations between student affairs and libraries have the capacity to multiple causing a spiral like effect that produces many new collaborative efforts. Conversely, an unsuccessful collaboration between the units may halt the cycle and drastically reduce the number of effective collaborations.

I also added institutional, environment, context, and external factors to the center of the model. Unlike Kezar and Lester’s model that was applied to institutions, this model is directed at two organizational units within the larger context of a higher education institution. Due to this, the greater institutional context and culture, in addition to the pressure affecting the institution, have the capacity to influence collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and librarians.

Based on the data from this study, Augustana is currently in the commitment phase of the cycle. Figure 5 displays key features in each phase they were exhibited. There were slight deviations from Kezar and Lester’s (2009) original model including the appearance of mission and integrating structures in stage one (as opposed to emerging in stage two) and the delay of learning and social networks until stage two (as opposed to being essential in stage one).
Figure 5. Stage Model of Collaboration between Student Affairs Professionals and Academic Librarians. Adapted from *Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration: A Guide to Campus Leaders* by A. J. Kezar & J. Lester, 2009, p. 216. Copyright 2009 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
In the building commitment phase, Augustana was able to first harness their mission, new strategic plan, and learning outcomes to build a commitment to collaboration. They reacted to external pressures to collaboration and utilized their history as a small residential liberal arts campus to convey their commitment to collaboration. As a campus, they also capitalized on their shared values of student-centeredness, collaboration, egalitarianism, and love of the library. The librarians and student affairs staff also shared these values, which formed the foundation to promote collaborative relationships between these two groups.

In Kezar and Lester’s original conceptual model the feature of integrating structures was not seen until the sustaining collaboration stage, although Augustana utilized this feature early to build commitment. The CSL facility was created to be a model for seamless learning, and was seen as a symbol for a campus commitment to collaboration. The CSL served as a catalyst to advance student affairs professionals and librarians to the commitment phase, where they are now beginning to learn more about each other and develop social networks. Similarly, the use of campus-wide integrating structures such as the campus retreat and integrative working groups appeared early and led to increased interaction and the creation of social networks that began to emerge in stage two.

Sense of priority from people in senior positions was prevalent in both the building and commitment phases at Augustana. Participants continue to look to the college’s senior leadership to support collaboration. This was evident in participants’ disappointment that senior administration had not stepped in to encourage collaboration from dining services. Equally or more important, was the sense of priority from leadership within the library and student affairs units. Participants looked to the leadership of Carla Tracy and Ken Brill to begin more formal collaborative ventures. During the spring of 2016, Tracy and Brill have begun discussions of
how to best model this commitment and facilitate collaboration among their units. From my analysis, the librarians and student affairs professionals have not yet reached the sustaining commitment phase in this developmental model, thus it is unknown which features will be displayed in this phase. The lack of rewards as a prominent feature in this study may be because this will be developed during the sustaining commitment phase. Kezar and Lester (2009) found that rewards were prominent in both stage two and stage three, but this may be altered for student affairs professionals and librarians. Alternatively, the context of a small-private institution may change the impact or availability of rewards.

In summary, the findings from this study largely support the features addressed in the SCMHE. Specifically, collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians utilized similar features, but some had different degree of importance and emerged at different phases of development.
CHAPTER IX: OVERVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

Collaboration is an ever-increasing imperative in higher education. Higher education is under scrutiny to increase efficiency and enhance outcomes. There have been continued calls from within the higher education community to collaborate across organizational lines to advance student learning (AACU, 2002; AAHE et al., 1998; Keeling 2004, 2006; LEAP, 2007). Research conducted over the last two decades has indicated that colleges with higher levels of collaboration, especially between student affairs and academic affairs, have more engaged students who achieve greater outcome gains (Kuh, 2005; Nesheim et al., 2007).

Although the research on collaboration in higher education is expanding, limited research has been conducted on collaborative efforts between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. This study seeks to fill this gap by exploring how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning. In this chapter, I will briefly review the literature, methodology, and findings. I will discuss the overarching themes that emerged from the data that could inform future collaborative efforts between student affairs professionals and librarians and recommend strategies for partnerships. Finally, I will review recommendations for Augustana, and the implications for practice and future research.

Literature Review

In this section, I will first review the definition of student learning followed by an overview of collaboration in higher education and its benefits and challenges. Next, I will provide an overview of the eight features in the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHe). This model served as the theoretical framework for this study. Finally, I will review some of the existing literature on collaboration between student affairs and libraries.
Collaboration and Student Learning

Researchers have found that students learn best when they are able to integrate knowledge from numerous experiences both in and outside the classroom (Love & Love, 1995; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Initiatives such as *The Student Learning Imperative* (SLI) (ACPA, 1994) *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) and *Learning Reconsidered 1 and 2* (Keeling, 2004; Keeling, 2006) have all advocated for increased partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs on campus. Through the intentional creation of seamless learning environments, students are able to draw connections and “apply what they are learning in class to their lives outside the classroom” (Kuh, 1996, p. 136).

In this study, student learning is defined as “a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development” (Keeling, 2004, p. 2). This definition supports the holistic nature of learning and encourages integration of in- and out-of-classroom experiences. Collaboration is characterized as “individuals and groups working together toward a common purpose with equal voice and responsibility” (Kezar, 2003, p. 138). Both collaboration and partnership imply a process of building shared values and goals through relationships, whereas coordination and cooperation are limited to task management.

Ample evidence is available to support the need for increased collaboration in higher education. Collaboration has proven advantages including enhanced cognitive complexity (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993), innovation (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Kuh et al., 2005), organizational learning (Senge, 2006), improved service delivery (Wohlstetter et al., 2004), increased employee satisfaction (Steffes & Keeling, 2006), and cost efficiency (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Collaborations between student
affairs and academic affairs have shown to improve student satisfaction, increase student-faculty interaction, improve academic achievement, achieve learning outcomes, heighten student success, and increase persistence (Kuh et al., 2005; Nesheim et al., 2007; Schroeder, 1999b).

Although the strengths and need for collaboration is clear, many barriers exist to creating fruitful partnerships in higher education. Higher education has become increasingly specialized in the last 100 years, which has resulted in fewer shared goals and a lack of a common language (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Kezar, 2009). Schroeder (1999b) stated, “Universities are characterized not by a sense of community, but rather by a constellation of independent principalities and fiefdoms, each disconnected from the others and from any commitment to institutional purpose or transcending values” (p. 9). This structural shift in higher education has made partnerships across campus less viable and led to a reduction in knowledge and interaction between campus constituents such as student affairs professionals and academic librarians (Forrest, 2005; Swartz et al., 2007).

An additional challenge to collaboration is competing mental models. Mental models are “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (Senge, 2006, p. 8). They can be shared within organizations or groups of individuals and unearthing these operating assumptions is crucial to forming mutual understanding and respect. Mental models can unconsciously guide behavior and “determine what people attend to, what they hold dear, and what they emphasize in their own work with students and others . . . they dictate the relative value one gives to facets of the undergraduate experience” (Kuh, Siejel, & Thomas, 2001, p. 48). In fact, different mental models about the nature of student learning and value of out-of-class activities are among the most significant barriers to collaboration between student and academic affairs.
Evidence suggests that student affairs practitioners and academic librarians are unaware of each other’s roles and responsibilities, which may result in inaccurate mental models about each field (Schroeder, 2003). Tag, Buck and Mautino (2007) acknowledged that with increased access to information technology and services (e.g., Internet, Google) there is a significant lack of knowledge among both faculty and students about the library, its resources, and librarians themselves.

**Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education**

Various models have explored the development process of collaboration (Kanter, 1994; Mohrman et al., 1995; Ring and van de Ven, 1994). Although, only one model, The Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education (SMCHE) (Kezar, 2005, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009), was designed specifically for collaboration in the context of higher education. The SMCHE served as the theoretical framework for this study.

The model is comprised of three stages: building commitment, commitment, and sustaining commitment. Throughout each of these phases, eight features are present that impact an institution’s ability to collaborate. The features include:

- *Mission, vision, and educational philosophy:* The first feature describes an organization’s purpose and aspirational goals. Mission creates a “shared vision and sense of purpose for members of campus” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 61). This feature can be used to commit an organization to collaboration.

- *Values:* “Values are beliefs that guide behaviors and shape underlying assumptions” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 85). Organizational values have shown to impact operation and success (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Some values have been proven more effective for developing collaboration such as innovation, egalitarianism,
and student-centeredness. Shared values instill a sense of purpose in organizational members and define actions.

- **Social networks:** Social networks are people intentionally connected “through some form of interdependency such as values, preferences, goals, ideas, or friends” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 99). Networks supporting collaboration were identified as a crucial component for organizational change. Harnessing the power of pre-existing social networks on campus sped up collaborative ventures by creating a critical mass and leveraging institutional knowledge and influence. Highly collaborative campuses also nurtured network building by planning social and education events, supporting individuals prone to networking, developing incentives, capitalizing on committee work, altering physical spaces, and opening up meetings to a wider audience (Kezar & Lester, 2009).

- **Integrating structures:** This feature describes the creation of new or restructured organizational elements that support collaboration such as cross-functional teams, interdisciplinary centers, enhanced technology, or restructuring. Integrating structures formalize and provide stability for collaborations (Kezar & Lester, 2009).

- **Rewards:** Kezar and Lester (2009) defined a reward as “something given in return for performance of desired behavior” (p. 147). Highly collaborative campuses were found to balance intrinsic and extrinsic rewards such as changing the tenure and promotion process to support collaboration, creating grants and individualized incentives, and highlighting personal benefits such as meeting new people and increased job satisfaction.

- **External pressure:** External pressures are characterized as forces outside the organization that influence internal functioning. A variety of external pressures affect institutions of higher education including governmental agencies, funding sources, accreditation, and
public support. Collaborative universities used external pressures to highlight the importance, value, and need of partnerships (Kezar & Lester, 2009).

- **Learning about collaboration:** As an organizational feature, learning refers to “communicating the need and importance of collaboration” and “how to collaborate” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 195). Learning was achieved through informal networks, formal workshops, observing successful collaborations, and designing a variety of approaches to meet a specific population need.

- **Sense of priority from people in senior positions:** Although collaborations is most likely to be successful when championed by faculty or staff, senior leadership must be able to support collaboration by modeling collaborative behaviors and incorporating collaboration into strategic initiatives (Kezar, 2005a).

**Student Affairs and Academic Library Partnerships**

Student affairs and academic libraries have many commonalities that make them ideal candidates for collaboration. As evidenced by professional statements from both the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), both professions are grounded in enhancing student learning outside the classroom and recognize the need for outreach and collaboration to further this mission (ACRL, 2011a; ACPA, 2012; ACPA & NASPA, 2015; Forrest, 2005). In addition, both professions share many of the same goals and attributes. Both are in a position to advocate for all students, both function outside of the traditional classroom, (Forrest, 2005; Love 2007) and each profession is evolving in the face of changing technology and students demands (Swartz, Carlisle, & Uyeki, 2007). Love (2009) noted that both professions also “aim to equip students with tools and resources needed to
succeed in their studies and with their evolving personal, social, emotional, and academic endeavors” (p. 21).

During the last decade, librarians have advocated for increased collaboration between student affairs and academic libraries. A growing number of journal articles in library publications have addressed library-student affairs collaboration and described successful partnerships in areas such as first-year programs and orientation (Boff, Albrecht, Armstrong, 2007; Boff & Johnson, 2007; Cummings, 2007; Forrest, 2005; Kuh, Boruff-Jones, & Mark, 2007; Tag et al., 2007; Tenofsky, 2006), career services (Hollister, 2005; Scott & Verduce, 2012; Song, 2007), co-curricular programming (Crowe, Hummel, Dale, & Bazirjian, 2012; Cummings, 2007; Kahl & Paterson, 2012; Maio & Shaughnessy, 2012), multicultural student services, (Love, 2007; Love & Edwards, 2009; Love, 2009), and academic integrity (Accardi, Garvey-Nix, & Meyer, 2012; Swartz et al., 2007).

All but one article (Hoag & Sagmoen, 2012) was published in librarianship journals. Although there is a plethora of research regarding student affairs and academic affairs partnerships, there is often only a cursory mention of the library in student affairs publications. I estimate that university libraries may be playing a larger role in these partnerships, yet they have been overlooked in the literature because of a focus on collaboration with traditional teaching faculty. This study seeks to fill that gap.

Methodology

A qualitative case study approach was chosen to investigate how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning. Case study methodology lends itself to the study of a “real-life, contemporary context or setting” (Creswell, 2013, p. 97) and “interpreting observations of educational phenomenon” (Merriam, 1988, p. 2).
This methodology is defined by the selection of an identifiable bounded case, and is often used to explore a unique phenomenon that serves as a vehicle to increase understanding of a more complex phenomenon such as organizational collaboration (Jones et al., 2014).

**Case Context**

In this study, the unit of analysis was at the institutional level. I chose to conduct the study at Augustana College in Rock Island, IL. Augustana is a small private, liberal arts institution that recently opened the Center for Student Life (CSL), a joint library-student union facility. The shared facility along with a strong campus-wide commitment to student learning across the curriculum and co-curriculum makes Augustana a unique case to explore collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. This research was grounded in a social constructivist theoretical framework, which is based on the assumption that individuals construct reality through their experiences and reality is co-created (Broido & Manning, 2002; Creswell, 2013).

**Research Questions**

The transcendent research question for this study was: How do student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning? Additionally, three sub-questions were explored (1) What strategies are utilized to facilitate collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals?; What were the barriers to collaboration?; (2) How has the existence of a shared facility affected collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians?; and (3) How do the mental models of each profession at the institution influence collaborative relationships regarding student learning?
Participants

The participants in this study were selected using a criterion purposeful sampling approach. Information-rich participants were chosen from Augustana’s Division of Student Life, Tredway Library, and senior administration. The study had a total of 18 participants comprised of eight librarians, five student affairs professionals, four senior administrators, and one faculty member who oversaw the Reading/Writing Center, an additional unit housed within the CSL. Refer to Table 1 for a full listing of participant names, titles, organizational classifications, etc.

Data Collection and Analysis

The case study methodology demands the collection of a vast array of data from multiple methods (Jones et. al, 2014). For this study, I collected data from interviews, observations, and document analysis. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with each participant during one of three campus visits over the course of an academic term. Two formal observations were conducted which included a library staff meeting and student life staff meeting. Interview data were transcribed and coded using open and axial coding to first break the data apart and then re-categorize data into themes.

A document analysis was performed on all available materials pertaining to the creation of the Center for Student Life and collaborative ventures between the Division of Student Life and the Tredway Library. Fifty-five documents (363 pages) and various online resources were analyzed including mission statements, strategic plans, campus master plan, CSL planning committee minutes, building designs, budget estimates, and electronic communications.

First, all documents were reviewed and triaged for general understanding and then re-examined to create a chronological timeline of events. The timeline was then used to construct a detailed account of the CSL. Next, all documents were cataloged chronologically and utilized
throughout the writing process to triangulate interview and observational data. The final phase of data analysis employed theoretical proposition to compare the findings from all data sources to the SCHME.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness was enhanced by collecting data from a variety of methods and triangulating the data across multiple methods (interview, observations, and document analysis), time periods, and participants. Throughout the process, I utilized a peer reviewer to scan my raw data, provide feedback, and ensure findings were supported. Participants engaged in frequent member checking, which included review of transcripts, participant profiles, and case descriptions. Recap meetings with leadership from both the library and student affairs were performed during each site visit. Finally, all participants were encouraged to respond to the accuracy of my findings and interpretations and asked to identify any missing themes.

**Summary of Findings**

This study investigated the following transcendent research question: How do student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning? In order to answer this question, three sub-questions guided the study. In the following sections, I will summarize the findings from each of these sub-questions.

**Strategies and Barriers**

As discussed in Chapter VII, several themes emerged to answer the first research question: What strategies are utilized to facilitate collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals? What were the barriers to collaboration? Table 2 provides an overview of these findings. Participants felt that the primary barrier to collaboration was a lack of time. They indicated that they often were caught up in the day-to-day tasks of their job, which
left little time for new collaborative initiatives. Similarly, participants recognized that collaborative efforts were especially time consuming because they required extensive relationship building. Additionally, participants noted that the trimester system contributed to the lack of available time for collaborative initiatives.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies for Collaboration</th>
<th>Barriers to Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase formal and informal knowledge sharing experiences</td>
<td>Lack of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify common ground and create mutually beneficial goals</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge and interaction between the professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual resistance to collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overarching theme in this study was that student affairs professionals and librarians lacked professional knowledge of each other. Especially before the CSL, the two groups had limited interaction and were operationally invisible to each other. Many found that the CSL had brought a greater level of awareness regarding each other’s roles, but still felt that they had a limited understanding of each other’s daily tasks and goals. This was a substantial barrier to collaboration. The final barrier that emerged from this research was impact of individuals who were resistant to collaboration. At Augustana, participants expressed frustration with their failed attempts to collaborate with dining services, and cited this as a barrier to future collaboration. In addition, individual participants described personal fears of change that acted as a barrier to outreach.

In order to overcome these barriers, two strategies emerged that would promote collaboration between these two groups. First, there must be an increase in the formal and
informal knowledge sharing experiences among student affairs professionals and librarians. Social events were pivotal in building relationships between these groups and providing increased opportunities to network in a social environment could enhance and formalize these bonds. This could be achieved through lunch gatherings, social outings, or informal networking. Additionally, formal activities such as joint staff meetings and retreats that are focused on information sharing and goal setting would allow staff to learn more about each other’s goals, values, and professional foundations.

The second strategy that emerged was the need to identify common ground and to work together to create mutually beneficial goals. Librarians and student affairs professionals in this study shared many of the same values including a commitment to seamless student learning. These shared values should be explored deeper and used to set the foundation for mutually beneficial goals that will allow each unit to better serve students. By working together on areas such as programming and student employment, participants noted that they can impact more students and draw of each other’s collective strengths.

Shared Facility

The second sub-question in this study asked: How has the existence of a shared facility affected collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians? As detailed in Chapter V, several themes emerged that would shed light on this question which are listed in Table 3. Participants found that the CSL was a symbol of seamless learning not only for student affairs professionals and librarians, but also for the greater campus community. By being a one-stop shop for student services, the CSL has enhanced the student experience and become a central gathering space for students. As a result, this has brought different populations of students together in a unified space. In addition, the downsizing of the
library’s collection has enhanced the mission of the library. Participants also indicated building challenges including difficulty collaborating with dining services and a lack of physical space.

Table 3

*Effects of a Shared Facility on Collaborative Relationships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Themes</th>
<th>Collaborative Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbol of seamless learning</td>
<td>Programmatic partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified and strengthen the student experience</td>
<td>Facility management partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged collaboration</td>
<td>Future collaborative partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced the library mission and collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty collaborating with dining services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of physical space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The building has sparked various collaborative partnerships that included shared programming such as an international street fest and educational displays. Building partners have worked collaboratively to manage the facility through a steering committee and shared information desk. Finally, many participants had begun to brainstorm future collaborative initiatives that would deepen this partnership.

Through the shared facility at Augustana, academic librarians and student affairs professionals were increasingly able to build collaborative relationships. Participants began gaining awareness of each other and were realizing how little they knew about each other and their work, but hypothesized that they had similar goals and values. Although the existence of a shared facility acted as a catalyst to collaboration, it was by no means a panacea. The data indicated that student affairs professionals and librarians must actively engage in formal and informal relationship-building activities in order to create mutually beneficial goals to collectively advance student learning.
Mental Models

The final sub-question in this study examined how the mental models of each profession influenced collaborative relationships regarding students learning. The results of this study, as discussed in Chapter VI, indicated that both professions at Augustana share a mutual understanding of student learning, but limited past interactions between the professionals in the fields have caused them to be operationally invisible to each other; therefore, preventing collaborative relationships. Participants had defined student learning as a holistic process that included both personal development and academic skill building. Many participants also defined student learning through the lens of Augustana’s learning outcomes. The definitions of student learning by both student affairs professionals and librarians used common phrases such as growth, change, curiosity.

Conversely, although participants were able to define misconceptions of their own profession, many participants struggled to identify the other’s job duties or professional foundations. Prior to the CSL, the professions had limited interaction with each other that had rendered them operationally invisible to each other. This lack of awareness was a barrier to collaboration because participants were unsure of the breadth and foundation of each other’s work and did not know what types of partnerships would be mutually beneficial.

Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education

In addition to the above themes, numerous organizational factors also influenced the burgeoning collaboration between student affairs and the library at Augustana that were reflected when applying the SMCHE. The institution-wide commitment to campus learning outcomes, a strategic plan that emphasized integration, and shared values have brought these two units closer together. Additionally, integrating structures such as campus-wide retreats, cross-functional
committees, and the CSL steering committee served to increase interaction between the two units. Senior leadership, along with departmental leaders such as the director of the library, encouraged and modeled collaborative behavior. Each of these factors mirrored those found in the SMCHE.

Discussion: Working Together to Advance Student Learning

The participants in this study identified many benefits for collaboration between student affairs and academic libraries. All participants saw value in working with the other unit and believed fostering collaborative relationships would result in better service to students. Participants discussed the ways they could further enhance their partnership and identified key benefits that each unit could offer the other. Figure 6 provides a summary of these findings and a discussion of each follows.

Insight into Students

Participants from both professional backgrounds discussed how they each had insight into students that could benefit and complement the other. Librarian Samantha Crisp stated,

I feel like we tend to get the more academic impressions of students, we see how they learn, we see how they study and we see how they observe information, whereas student affairs sees how they interact with each other, how they try and shape their lives in college outside of classes, how they interact with their community, and how they want to see themselves when they get out of here.

Amanda Makula also indicated that together the two units would be able to offer more insight into students, “they have more of the social side of things, and we have the academic, so if we put the knowledge together, we can hopefully understand the students better.” This theme of being able to better understand students through collaboration was a common theme throughout
the research. Librarians felt that by working collaboratively with student affairs professionals they would be able to better understand the life of students outside the classroom.
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**Figure 6:** Benefits of collaboration between student affairs and libraries. Copyright 2016 by Beth Hoag.

Director of the Library, Carla Tracy specifically pointed out that librarians could benefit from knowledge of student development theory. Walter and Eodice (2007) came to a similar conclusion, “What those in student affairs have learned from student development theory can inform the work of information professionals” (p. 221). Similarly, student affairs professionals thought that librarians would have more knowledge of students’ academic habits, strengths, and weaknesses, so they could better serve students and connect the co-curricular to the curricular. Katey Bignall discussed that she wanted to learn more about the methods librarians use to help students find information and problem-solve. She explained,
Thinking about how they get students to think about things . . . you get a student who comes to you and says, “I have no idea where to start on this paper, but I need to do research” and you help them ‘tease’ through that to get to what they really want. I feel like sometimes I get that same kind of thing, like, “I have to do a program, but I have no idea where to start.” And I always go to my comfort zone. Learning that from them of like how can I help students better ‘tease’ that out and get to what they want, would be great.

Librarians’ knowledge of teaching pedagogy and informational literacy skills could prove very beneficial to student affairs professionals as they advise and direct students. Many of the collaborations between student affairs and libraries discussed in the literature were focused on teaching information literacy skills in first-year programs. Information literacy skills are interdisciplinary and promote life-long learning skills (Kuh & Gonyea, 2003) which align with the work of student affairs professionals. As the breadth and availability of information grows exponentially, students need to have the ability to critically evaluate information both in and outside of the classroom. Teaching students to find reliable sources for a research paper can also be used to advise students on how to choose a comedian, or to identify credible sources for a cultural display.

By sharing some of the fundamental tools of each profession and having open discussion about how each interacts with students on a daily basis, both student affairs professionals and librarians can develop a more holistic view of students.

**Better Support for the “Whole Student”**

In addition to gaining a better understanding of students through collaboration, participants felt that by working together they would be better able to serve the “whole student.”
Christine Aden said, “I think the greater the interaction between the two departments, I think that the better we can support the students both on a personal and academic level.” Both librarians and student affairs professionals noted that they should consider referring students to each other more often. Mary Tatro reasoned that since librarians are connected to all of the academic units, student affairs professionals could connect a student who was struggling with coursework to the corresponding librarian for academic assistance. She stated, “If they see that there’s a student that maybe is kind of struggling in an area . . . then they can definitely ask the librarian who works with those divisions.” Virginia Johnson and Patricia Santoyo-Marin also pointed to referrals as an effective way of using the skills of both professionals to more holistically serve the student body.

Similarly, Christine Aden reflected that although the Dean of Students area handles many confidential student concerns, there was potential for the two units to work more closely to address the students who may be struggling personally or emotionally. Augustana had recently begun using academic early alert software to flag students who were missing class or showing signs of academic decline. Aden thought that librarians and student affairs professionals could use this system along with faculty to support students inside and out of the classroom. Additionally, Evelyn Campbell described that just the act of the two units working more collaboratively would send a message to students about the inter-connectedness of learning and living. Campbell explained, “they [librarians] can help the students see how learning goes on outside the classroom, and in the same way, we can help students see that life can be lived while you are learning.”
Linking the Two Bridges

Student affairs professionals and librarians each had separate social networks on campus that could be better leveraged to enhance collaboration and student learning. Throughout the study, members of each profession identified themselves as a bridge to other parts of the academy. Most frequently, librarians were seen as being a bridge to faculty and student affairs staff were described as a bridge to students. Although each unit felt connected to both students and faculty, they recognized that each other had stronger ties to the population they were loosely connected to on campus.

Connie Ghinazzi described librarians as “generalists in a world of specialists on a college campus.” She recognized that through teaching interdisciplinary classes in the Liberal Studies First Year sequence, librarians were able to develop relationships with faculty from a wide variety of disciplines. Ghinazzi further noted, “They [faculty] don’t know what each other’s doing, but we know what all of them are doing because we’re working with all of them, so we can get ideas across that way.” Stefanie Bluemle thought that this broad knowledge of the academic faculty and curriculum would be something libraries could offer student affairs, “[Librarians] get a view of every single department on campus. And you get this big picture view of what students are doing academically . . . I think that is something we can offer.”

Many of the librarians interviewed discussed their work with faculty and were proud they had been able to work collaboratively and build relationships with faculty across disciplines. Student affairs professionals also recognized the depth of these relationships and saw librarians as a bridge to faculty. Alisha Smith said, “They [librarians] are like the first door to faculty . . . gatekeepers if you will.” Evelyn Campbell explained that librarians are able to be an advocate for student affairs to the faculty,
I think the spillover is, when Carla [Tracy] says things, like . . . "I am working with Ken and he is a good guy" – when she says stuff like that to the faculty, it elevates our competence. I think before, they thought we were all babysitters, and now they at least realize, “oh they contribute in some ways.”

Due to the nature of their work, student affairs professionals work closely with students on a daily basis and are able to build relationships with a diverse group of students. Participants in this study found that student affairs had the ability to act as a bridge to academics and specifically to librarians. Virginia Johnson described,

There is a certain amount of energy and credibility that student affairs have with students that might help make bridges between student life and the academic life. I think students affairs is in a position to create bridges in that regard.

Similarly, President Bahls indicated that one of the benefits student affairs professionals could offer librarians was a better understanding and connection to the modern student.

Symbolically both units can act as a bridge to promote student learning on campus by connecting students, student affairs professionals, librarians, and faculty. Student affairs can benefit from the established bridge built between librarians and faculty, and librarians can capitalize on the bridge forged between student affairs and students. Student affairs professionals and librarians already possess many of the skills to build relationships but have not connected these two bridges to capitalize on student learning.

**Programming**

One of the key benefits that student affairs professionals can offer academic librarians is their experience and background in student programming. All of the student affairs units housed within the CSL actively work with students to put on social and educational events for the
student body. Although the librarians also host programs, they are typically on a smaller scale due to a lack of resources and knowledge. Many of the librarians were impressed with the innovative student programming that was being done through student affairs units, and thought they could learn from and support such programs. Amanda Makula stated,

They probably have a lot of wisdom – they do all kinds of events – they probably know what types of things students like, what they'll come to, what are some of the obstacles towards getting students to being involved in that sort of thing . . . how to promote something, how to draw them in. That would all be helpful for us to know more about.

Rachel Weiss described that often people assume library events are dry, and working with student affairs could decimate that stereotype. She further explained, “People who are involved with student life, have a good sense of what excites students and what’s going to motivate them to come to one of the billion things that they can go to in a given week.” Alisha Smith and Jane Tiedge also felt that student affairs could work to enhance and complement programming within the library. Smith described the possibility of working together on a Snacks in the Stacks event that had stations throughout the library which gave students a library tour in a fun and engaging way. She discussed, “Helping them [librarians] see that they can add that social aspect and we can drive the population there and vice versa.”

Although many of the librarians looked to student affairs to provide guidance on programming initiatives, Ken Brill discussed how he saw the librarians as being able to create innovative programming ideas. He concluded,

I don’t think they have a lot of discretionary funds to do things, but I think they are wonderful idea people. I think if we can get those ideas churning together, with some of
the funds that we have available, I think that we are going to be able to create some pretty cool opportunities.

Student programming is a benefit that student affairs professionals can offer librarians to enhance their efforts. Additionally, by working together to create joint student programs they have increased capacity to reach a wider diversity of students.

**Professional Development and Resources**

Librarians have the ability to contribute to the professional growth of student affairs professionals. Through their training, librarians possess the skills to efficiently and effectively locate resources. These skills could be very beneficial to student affairs professionals who are looking to stay current in their field, investigate new initiatives, or review emerging theory and best practices.

At a previous institution, Alisha Smith recalled working with a librarian who would pass on useful resources about retention and other topics relevant to her position. She believed that in the current economic climate, where professional development funds are being slashed, librarians could be a resource for professional growth. Patricia Santoyo-Marin and Jane Tiedge also identified resources as a primary benefit that librarians could offer student affairs professionals. Rachel Weiss recognized that the librarians could support student affairs units “in the same [way] we support academic departments” which could include teaching students and staff to develop information literacy skills, and supporting research initiatives of staff. In addition, both fields could engage in professional development activities that are based on the skills and expertise of the other. For example, a professional development session in which each unit discusses emerging hot topics in their respective fields or across higher education would facilitate peer learning.
Building as a Service

Prior to the CSL, Augustana did not have a traditional student union and the Tredway Library acted as a de facto student union. Library leadership had viewed the building as “the living room of the campus;” a philosophy that had been initiated by former President Tredway when the building was opened in 1990 (Tracy, 2013). This distinction as the campus living room has been historically attributed to student unions. In 1971, Porter Butts defined the role of the college union as the “living room” of the college campus and this philosophy is still promoted by the Association of College Unions International (ACUI) (ACUI, 2016; Butts, 1971).

Additionally, the physical environment of a campus library has always been an integral part of its service. Academic libraries have evolved throughout history as patron needs and the ability to access information has changed. Recently, libraries have shifted from a “book-centered” model to a “learning-centered” model (Bennett, 2009, p. 181; Tracy, 2013). No longer are libraries warehouses of physical materials, but they are intentionally designed to promote student learning. Librarians have been acknowledging the changing nature of “library as place” throughout the 21st century (Montgomery & Miller, 2011), and at Augustana this concept was woven into the library strategic plan (Tracy, 2013).

The importance of a physical environment to the success of a unit’s larger mission and service is a shared history between both student affairs and libraries. Student affairs professionals frequently examine the role of the physical environment on student learning, safety, engagement, and daily functioning (Strange & Banning, 2001). Prior to the CSL, the Tredway Library was serving this mission in multiple ways by acting as the library and as the student union. The library facility was frequently used for quiet study, collaborative learning, campus events, and as a meeting place. The librarians in this study frequently discussed the
importance of creating intentional learning environments by paying attention to the details of the physical environment. Unlike student affairs professionals at other institutions, those at Augustana did not have experience managing a student union space, but were cognizant of creating environments for student engagement.

In the case of Augustana, librarians felt they could offer student affairs an insight into managing a building that was an essential component of their service. Carla Tracy explained, “I think in our case we can offer them some tips, points, ways of looking at the importance of the building as a service.” Tracy further elaborated, “The building is a part of our service and to a degree, it is for OSL as well.” Ken Brill reflected that the librarians were more aware of the impact of the physical space. He recalled how little knowledge he had about creating/placing facility signage, but how important it had become for the student and public use of the space. He recognized that librarians’ past experience molding physical environments for learning would be a benefit for him and student affairs.

The data from this study indicated that at Augustana, student affairs professionals would receive the most benefit from discussions of the physical environment as a service. Although due to student unions’ historical focus on the importance of place, it is likely, this could evolve into a reciprocal relationship. This mutual learning may also be more likely to take place at institutions with a pre-existing student union. In addition, many student affairs preparation programs offer classes on creating campus environments for student success. Student affairs professionals with experience in residential life, recreation, and/or cultural center/multicultural affairs consistently assess the accessibility and environment of their physical space. Through discussion, the two professions may discover that they share a desire and expertise to create physical environments to promote learning and use this as a foundation for collaboration.
Recommendations for Augustana

At Augustana, student affairs professionals and academic librarians have been interacting more than ever before. They have begun to recognize how little they know about each other, but have also begun to identify some common ground. In order for student affairs professionals and librarians to deepen their partnership, they will need to engage in collective conversation about each other’s roles, values, and responsibilities. It is important that all parties begin by identifying things they have in common such as a shared dedication to student learning and success. The following are a list of proposed recommendations to encourage collaboration between student affairs professionals and librarians (a) formalized information sharing and informal networking, (b) CSL Steering Committee and commitment to on-going collaboration (c) programming, (d) shared student employment training, (e) evaluate trimester system and prioritize time for collaboration.

Formalized Information Sharing and Informal Networking

I recommend creating opportunities for both formalized information sharing and informal networking that are accessible to staff at all levels. During the construction of the CSL, the leadership of each unit had communicated on a regular basis. This had caused leadership to build relationships and learn more about each other, but these gains were not trickling down to other staff. When designing future activities, it is important to create opportunities for staff at all levels to interact including student employment through unit leadership.

To kick-start the information sharing, I recommend holding a retreat for all librarians and student affairs professionals. This event could include activities designed to learn more about the foundations of each other’s professions. In this study, participants were interested in learning more about student development theory, advising students (challenge/support), privacy/access to
information, and information literacy. Staff/faculty could present mini workshops on each of these topics. Additionally, activities such as speed-networking, a fast-paced activity to interact with multiple people, could be employed to help staff/faculty interact with each other and learn more about the professions (See Table 4 for networking questions). Each department could create a TED Talk style presentation on their key initiatives, mission, and goals for the year. The results of this study could be shared and discussion groups formed on the results. The retreat could also include team-building activities, strategic planning, and the formation of work teams.

Table 4

*Speed Networking Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Networking Questions for Student Affairs Professionals/Academic Librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did you choose your profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is one common misconception about your job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and discuss a hot topic in library science/student affairs right now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your position in five words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should I know about your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your greatest professional accomplishment at Augustana?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your favorite part of your job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe a typical day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe a project/program/initiative you are currently working on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify two professional values you possess. Describe why they are important to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I wasn’t a librarian/student affairs professional I would be . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relieve stress I . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My favorite hobbies include . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is one thing you learned about today that you want to know more about in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is one thing you learned today that surprised you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior research suggested that informal learning and colleague-to-colleague conversations were “the most powerful learning experience and motivator” (Kezar, 2005a, p. 56). Many participants in this study also commented on the power of relationships and pointed to events such as the annual holiday party as a way to learn more about each other in a social environment. Thus, leadership must consider ways to provide ongoing opportunities for networking. Creating opportunities such as bi-annual joint staff meetings, monthly lunch-and-learn events, and end of term socials would encourage social interaction. More formalized measures such as creating cross-functional teams on joint projects/initiatives or developing formalized liaison relationships could also be employed to create integrating structures that sustain collaboration.

**CSL Steering Committee and Commitment to On-Going Collaboration**

At the time of the study, the CSL steering committee was meeting less frequently than during the prior year. I recommend re-instating this committee and planning monthly meetings, to address building initiatives, concerns, and strategic planning. The committee acted as a formal integrating structure that facilitated collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. Kezar (2005a) found that these formalized structures were an important key to sustaining collaboration, and such a structure would benefit both units as they enhance and sustain their partnership.

The committee should work with senior administration to develop a mutually agreed upon charge, role, and decision-making scope for the committee. This should include an on-going commitment to collaboration for the space. The committee should revisit the *Augustana Agora* concept and develop a new mission statement that is reflective of the new units and the building’s mission.
Further discussion about the decision-making power of this committee is needed in consultation with senior administration. Currently three vice president oversee the units within the CSL (vice president and dean of student services, provost and dean of the college, and vice president of administration). These three positions must work together with the CSL steering committee and commit to vetting all building changes through the committee. Due to the success of the building, it is likely that there will be continued encroachment on the space by other entities. Since the building is an important component of the service provided by both the library and student affairs, it is essential that this committee be consulted for any proposed changes.

I suggest creating a set of by-laws for the steering committee that outlines representation from all units, and sets forth procedures and requirements for any major facility changes. Representation for the committee should include all building entities and have representatives from the general student body. The by-laws could address the mission, membership, and voting procedures of the committee. The committee could act as a sounding board to address concerns within the building and advocate building needs. Additionally, since no one unit manages the building, this committee should be tasked with identifying and addressing facility concerns and the anticipation of future needs.

A primary concern regarding the CSL has been the encroachment on student study space. Since the creation of the building, numerous group study spaces have been re-allocated to office space. Additionally, since the dining space has been inaccessible for open study space, there is considerable less space in the facility for students to study or congregate than originally planned. The need for open student space was a primary reason for creating the facility and if common
student space continues to be re-distributed it will harm the mission and purpose of the shared facility and weaken the learning environment for students.

The CSL Steering Committee and vice presidents should look for ways to add student common space to the building. The most likely solution to this scenario is to revisit the usage of dining space. The committee should work with dining services to identify ways to open parts of the facility to students during non-peak hours in order to meet the needs of the facility. This will require a commitment to collaboration from dining services and must be supported by senior level administration.

**Programming**

Participants in this study identified programmatic initiatives as a next step to enhancing collaboration. I recommend the units collectively identify one or two new programming initiatives to begin this process. Prior research has suggested that collaborative partnerships be rooted in the mission/goals instead of focused on the final product (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Raspa & Ward, 2000; Schroeder, 2003; Stein & Short, 2001; Swartz et al., 2007). Thus, I recommend that the units first construct a shared vision, goals, and expectations before selecting collaborative programmatic initiatives. See Table 5 for a list of collaborative programs that were discussed in the literature or by participants in this study.

**Shared Student Employment**

In the CSL, the Office of Student Life and Leadership and the Tredway Library both staff the fourth floor information desk. At the time of the study, students from both units were employed at the desk, but they were not cross-trained. A joint training and development program could be created for all student employees in the CSL. This could include the International and Multicultural Student Ambassadors.
All student employees in the building could undergo training in team-building, emergency management, customer service, diversity awareness, programming, and information literacy. Students could then gain additional training within their home unit.

Additionally, seasoned student employees from all units could advance to the role of building manager, an advanced employment position that monitors all aspects of the building after hours. These positions could be hired jointly and trained on both student union and library functions including charging books, laptop checkout, and sound system set up. This approach would require additional training and discussion regarding supervision and budgeting, but would represent the collaborative spirit of the facility.

**Evaluate Trimesters and Prioritize Time for Collaboration**

An unexpected finding in this study was the potentially adverse impact that trimesters had on collaboration. Many participants indicated that the largest barrier to collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs was a lack of time. They described their schedules as hectic and felt stretched thin. In addition, participants felt the trimester-based schedule accelerated the academic year and caused them to spend more time on administrative tasks such as advising, processing paperwork, and billing. One respondent stated that the trimester system “intensified everything” and made it difficult to take on new innovative projects. Participants indicated that the pace of the trimester system, coupled with having to perform certain administrative functions three times a year versus two reduced the time available for outreach and collaboration.
Table 5

*Student Affairs and Academic Libraries Collaborative Programmatic Initiatives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Collaborative Programmatic Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Slam/Poetry Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banned Books Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls Traveling Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Scavenger Hunts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Nights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Swap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering at Each Other’s Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Gaming Day in Your Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haunted Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snacks in the Stacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Programming/Displays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Social Justice Awareness Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midnight Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Night Against Procrastination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hack-a-thon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Student Employment Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive/Student Organization History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although it is likely that the lack of time will persist as a barrier to collaboration, it is worth exploring how a change in the academic calendar may free up some additional time for collaborative endeavors. As staff at Augustana continues to have conversations about the academic calendar, they should consider the impact academic scheduling has on fostering collaboration not only between academic librarians and student affairs professionals, but campus-wide.

Similarly, Vice President and Dean of Student Services, Evelyn Campbell acknowledged that building collaborative relationships to advance student learning was a time-consuming endeavor and they needed to prioritize time for engaging in partnerships. She stated, “Finding time to help create these learning opportunities that didn’t exist before . . . it is very very time consuming. So I think in some ways, creating time for that, valuing the time is needed for that.” Augustana has already designated and prioritized time for campus-wide collaborative initiatives including the annual campus retreat and cross-functional working groups. Similar steps must be taken to prioritize the time needed for relationships building between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. This could include the aforementioned retreat, monthly networking events, or regular CSL steering committee meetings.

**Implications for Practice**

Just like at Augustana, professionals or institutions wishing to develop these partnerships must begin by creating opportunities for interaction and information sharing between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. Many of the recommendations identified for Augustana and discussed earlier in this chapter could also be applicable for other institutions. Professionals can utilize the case description of Augustana to assess the transferability of the data and apply recommendations that are appropriate for their institutional context.
It is likely that at institutions that do not have a shared facility, the professionals from both student affairs and libraries may have even less knowledge of each other’s values, duties, and organizational goals. Institutions without a catalyst such as the CSL may need to begin by first describing the need for such partnership and connecting to the institution’s guiding documents. Next, professionals must look across divisional lines to find advocates and create integrating structures. In addition, graduate preparation programs from both student affairs and librarianship could enhance their programs by exposing students to each other’s profession and facilitating interaction in training programs.

**Connect to Institutional Guiding Documents and Campus Needs**

Augustana was primed to start collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and librarians due to the pre-existing campus-wide commitment to student learning outcomes and integration. Campuses without such strong institutional pressures will first need to make the case for collaboration between the two areas. This can be achieved by connecting the need to collaborate with institutional guiding documents and/or campus needs. As demonstrated by the participants in this study, their desire to work together was often supported by the Augustana strategic plan, mission, and learning outcomes. Participants often referred to these documents as justification for collaboration.

For those who wish to make in-roads for collaboration between student affairs and libraries, first conduct a review of institution-wide documents such as the campus mission statement, vision, undergraduate learning outcomes, and strategic plan to ground potential initiatives. Furthermore, investigate the foundational documents and strategic goals of each unit to identify mutual goals and interests.
Practitioners should also identify external pressures or current campus needs to lay the foundation for partnerships. For example, if the institution has concerns regarding retention, student engagement, or budget shortages, partnerships could be designed to specifically tackle these problems. Prior research has indicated that collaboration in higher education is more successful when there is a common reference point, institutional problem, or triggering event (Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Kezar & Lester, 2009; Schroeder, 2003). By relying on institutional documents and common concerns, participants can also create a common language for collaborative endeavors between the two units.

**Identify Advocates**

Practitioners must identify advocates for collaboration within the ranks of student affairs and libraries. In this study, Carla Tracy, Director of the Library acted as a key advocate for collaboration. She was actively involved in the creation of the CSL and worked with her staff to build support and minimize fears. Participants in this study described Tracy as a “forward-thinking,” “innovative”, and a “champion” for collaboration. Looking for these values and attributes in potential collaborators may help to identify advocates with whom to begin discussions of collaboration.

Similarly, student affairs professionals may also consider identifying librarians who are classified as either an outreach or a first-year experience librarian. At Augustana, outreach was a designated part of Connie Ghinazzi’s duties, and all librarians worked with the first year liberal studies courses. These roles allowed them to have prior experience with collaboration across organizational lines. For librarians looking to outreach to student affairs, identifying professionals that are connected to specific initiatives that align with your departments interests such as programming or cultural awareness would be a good starting place.
Furthermore, student affairs professionals and academic librarians should look for individuals who act as boundary spanners. Boundary spanners are “organizational members in higher education institutions who cross boundaries to enact their roles in the surrounding environment” (Bess & Dee, 2012, p. 95). In this study, Carla Tracy and Ken Brill both acted as boundary spanners as they connected with many units across campus. Prior research indicated that highly collaborative campuses harnessed the power of these boundary spanners to create and enhance partnerships (Kezar, 2006; Kezar & Lester, 2009; Kuh et al, 1994; Lawrence, 2007). Boundary spanners are often veteran employees who have experience working in cross-functional teams and have developed connections over time, although boundary spanners may also include new employees with prior experience with and excitement about collaboration (Kezar, 2006). Katey Bignall, Samantha Crisp, and Rachel Weiss were all new professionals at Augustana who expressed an excitement for collaboration that could be harnessed to promote collaboration.

Although the support of senior leadership was prevalent at Augustana, there is also evidence to suggest that collaboration between student affairs and libraries can be a grassroots effort. At Augustana, entry and mid-level professionals began existing programmatic partnerships including the International Street Fest and multicultural awareness displays. Eventually, support of departmental and divisional leadership, is needed, but successful partnerships with entry and mid-level staff will provide increased justification for larger intentional partnerships. This has also been supported by anecdotal accounts of collaboration between student affairs and libraries found in the existing literature (Cummings, 2007; Hoag & Sagmoen, 2012; Hollister, 2005; Kraemer et al., 2003; Love, 2009; Love & Edwards, 2009; Maio & Shaughnessy, 2012; Scott & Verduce, 2012; Song, 2007; Tag et al., 2007).
Integrating Structures

In this study, the CSL acted as the primary integrating structure for collaboration between student affairs and libraries. Moreover, the CSL steering committee, campus-wide retreats, and cross-functional working groups also acted as integrating structures. The data from this study found that these structures were essential in facilitating interaction and encouraging collaboration, which was supported by prior research (Kezar, 2005a; Kezar & Lester, 2009).

Once student affairs professionals and librarians have identified common goals and found advocates in each other’s ranks, creating integrating structures will help to formalize these relationships. Dahl (2007) recommended expanding the liaison model already utilized by many library units to collaborate with academic units in order to outreach to co-curricular units. By identifying formal liaisons between student affairs units and librarians, this structure facilitates deeper relationship building and formalizes burgeoning relationships.

Liaison-relationships are just one example of creating integrating structures between the two units. Cross-functional teams could be established based on shared goals or concerns, similar to the CSL steering committee at Augustana. In addition, student affairs professionals and academic librarians could capitalize on institutional initiatives that may be cross-functional including assessment initiatives, student retention committees, or first-year experience working groups. The specific type of integrating structure formed will be dependent on institutional and organizational context and priorities. Finally, new technologies and social media could also be harnessed as an integrating structure to promote collaboration between student affairs and libraries. Participants in this study discussed how each unit was actively engaged in social media to outreach to students, but had not yet considered using these tools to promote information
sharing. Institutions where student affairs professionals and librarians are more physically distant may find these tools more useful in sustaining collaboration.

**Graduate Preparation**

In addition to the implications for practitioners, adaptations should be considered for graduate preparation programs in both librarianship and student affairs. One of the major findings of this study was that librarians and student affairs professionals have a limited understanding of each other’s roles, values, and responsibilities. Many participants hypothesized that librarianship and student affairs had similar goals, but were unsure due to a lack of knowledge. Even with the catalyst of the CSL, participants were just beginning to “know how much they didn’t know” about each other.

Both student affairs professionals and academic librarians could benefit from formalized instruction about the other field, which could be weaved in existing graduate preparation programs. Student affairs graduate curriculum often does not address academic libraries, nor does library curriculum provide an overview of student affairs (Walter & Eodice, 2007). A discussion of libraries could be included in courses about college environments, administration, or through a topic-based class. History of libraries and student affairs could be included in the history classes for both fields. Institutions that have both a college student personnel (CSP) and master of library science (MLS) program could allow students to take elective courses in the other discipline or develop networking events between the two groups.

**Implications for the Literature**

The existing literature base on collaboration in higher education noted many proven advantages to collaboration that were also witnessed in this study including improved service delivery (Wohlstetter et al., 2004), employee satisfaction (Steffes & Keeling, 2006), and
organizational learning (Senge, 2006). Many participants in this study noted that working with individuals outside of their department allowed them to learn more about the organization. In addition, one participant found that working outside organizational boundaries increased their satisfaction at work, and many spoke about being able to provide students with a better experience through collaboration.

This study confirmed that organizational barriers, more commonly known as silos (Keeling et al., 2007), still persist at institutions such as Augustana, although these barriers are more permeable on smaller campuses. Prior research on collaboration in higher education has found that competition and feelings of inferiority may act as barriers to collaborative progress. Although not a major theme in this study, some elements of competition specifically over re-allocation of space arose. Feelings of inferiority were almost non-existent in this study, indicating that librarians and student affairs professionals at Augustana were confident in their role and value on campus. Further research is needed to see determine if feelings of inferiority is a barrier to collaboration in other contexts.

Much of the prior research on mental models noted that faculty and student affairs professionals approach their work through a different cultural lens and define student learning differently (Kezar, 2001; Kuh, 1996; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994; Schroeder, 1999a; Schroeder, 1999b; Schroeder, 2003). This study found that librarians and student affairs professionals have very similar conceptions of student learning and therefore this was not a barrier to collaboration. This supported Santiago-Vargas (2010) hypothesis that mental models regarding student learning are more similar than prior research indicated.

The results of this study support prior claims that a successful collaboration can spawn new initiatives, and that a negative collaboration can thwart future attempts (Kezar & Eckel,
The work between Ken Brill and Carla Tracy during the creation of CSL led to numerous small partnerships and increased dialogue between the two units. Similarly, failed collaborative attempts with dining services halted some building-wide communication.

This study marks a starting point for continued inquiry into collaboration between student affairs professionals and librarians. Although, anecdotal accounts of collaboration between these two entities exist, this is one of the first systematic inquiries into these relationships. The existence of a shared facility between libraries and student affairs may become more prevalent due to constrained budgets and space shortages on campus. Additional accounts of these stories are needed in the literature base. The programmatic partnerships discovered in this study will add to literature surrounding collaboration between librarians and student affairs professionals in the areas of multicultural student services and co-curricular programming. Overall, this study supports the prior anecdotal accounts of successful partnerships between student affairs and libraries.

**Implications for the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education**

As discussed in Chapter VIII, the data from this study largely supported the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education that was developed by Kezar and Lester (2009). Kezar and Lester had identified eight features that appeared in a three-stage developmental model. The three stages included (a) building commitment, (b) commitment, and (c) sustaining commitment.

All but one feature, rewards, played a role in the development of a collaborative relationship between student affairs professionals and academic librarians. It is possible that the concept of rewards will emerge later as these two groups enhance and sustain their partnerships. Alternatively, the context of a small private institution may change the impact or availability of rewards. Unlike the other features, rewards may be more dependent on the institutional context.
Further research on rewards as a feature should be conducted at small institutions to assess the necessity and effectiveness of rewards in creating and sustaining collaborative relationships.

Similar to Kezar and Lester’s (2009) findings, this study found that some features were more critical to creating a context for collaboration. This study identified four features that were essential to enhancing collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians (a) mission, vision, educational philosophy, (b) social networks, (c) integrating structures, and (d) learning. The first three of these features were also prominent in Kezar and Lester’s (2009) findings of highly collaborative campuses.

In this study of collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals, I found that learning also played a central role to promoting partnerships. Kezar and Lester (2009) had identified learning as “communicating the need and importance of collaboration” and “how to collaborate” (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 195). The participants in this study had already achieved a common understanding of student learning and understood the benefits of collaboration; although, several participants lacked a working knowledge of each other’s professional duties, values, and goals. Kezar and Lester (2009) acknowledged that learning would encompass “content-specific information about how to work with particular individuals and units on campus,” but they primarily focused on developing skills such as interpersonal communication, conflict management, and rethinking processes (p. 196).

The data from this study indicate that academic librarians and student affairs professionals have had few instances to interact with each other and a greater emphasis needs to be placed on learning about each other, not just about how to collaborate. Furthermore, the feature of learning should exist not only in the building commitment phases, but also throughout the developmental process. I recommend that the theory be re-examined based on the data from
this study and learning be present in each of the three phases of development. In addition, learning should encompass both learning about collaboration and learning about each other’s profession.

Finally, I intentionally included the final feature, *sense of priority from people in senior positions* in this study in order to examine if it emerged as a feature in its own right or if it was dependent on other features such as integrating structures. I found that sense of priority from people in senior positions was prevalent in both the building and commitment phases at Augustana. Participants continued to look to the college’s senior leadership to support collaboration and to change agents such as Carla Tracy and Ken Brill. The data from this study suggests that this feature should remain in the model but be renamed to encompass advocates outside of senior administration. I recommend adapting the name of the feature to: *sense of priority from change agents*. Overall, the findings of this study supported Kezar and Lester’s (2009) Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education with some minor adjustments.

**Implications for Future Research**

There has been limited research regarding collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians and most of what existed prior to this study is anecdotal. This study provides a baseline for investigating such relationships, and there are several future research topics that could be explored.

This study employed an in-depth instrumental case study analysis to study collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians at one institution. Although the data from this study can inform policy and practice at other institutions, the design may limit transferability. Further cross-institutional and quantitative research is needed to explore these relationships in more depth and across institutional type.
A large-scale quantitative study could be achieved by developing a survey instrument based on the features in the SCMHE model (Kezar & Lester 2009). Researchers could also use a quantitative or mixed method design to further explore the knowledge/understanding of each profession, inventory existing collaborative initiatives, and/or identify strategies and barriers.

The participants in this study were delimited to include professional student affairs staff, librarian faculty, and senior administration. Further research on how other stakeholders, such as students and traditional teaching faculty, are affected by collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians is needed. A study that investigates student outcomes of collaborative efforts between student affairs and libraries would contribute to the literature base.

Collaboration is an on-going process that requires considerable amounts of time and effort. Due to this, more longitudinal research is needed regarding collaboration between student affairs and libraries. The data for this study were collected over a period of three-months. Although archival data were utilized to supplement the interviews and observations, a longitudinal analysis could shed more light on the evolution of collaborative relationships between student affairs and libraries. I recommend conducting a follow-up study to assess how the collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and librarians at Augustana have changed over the course of several years.

Finally, additional research is needed regarding collaborative relationships between academic librarians and student affairs professionals at institutions without a common reference point such as the CSL. Prior research has shown that collaboration is more successful when a common problem, project, or triggering event exists. In this study, the CSL acted as the common
project that was a catalyst to interaction. Further research on institutions without such a facility or unifying initiative is needed.

**Summary**

As institutions become more learning-centered, there will be an increased need to collaborate across organizational boundaries. Partnerships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians are one such method to encourage and demonstrate a seamless learning environment on campus. In this study, I explored how student affairs professionals and academic librarians collaborate to advance student learning. In addition, three sub-questions guided this research:

- What strategies are utilized to facilitate collaboration between academic librarians and student affairs professionals? What were the barriers to collaboration?
- How has the existence of a shared facility affected collaborative relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians?
- How do the mental models of each profession at the institution influence collaborative relationships regarding student learning?

A single institution case-study design was employed to investigate these questions. Augustana College, a small liberal arts college in the Midwest was used as the case for this research. Augustana was an ideal candidate for study because they had demonstrated a campus-wide commitment to student learning outcomes and recently opened a shared library/student union facility.

The professions of librarianship and student affairs have similar conceptualizations of student learning that can serve as a foundation for building collaborative initiatives. The data from this study suggest that both fields subscribe to similar mental models of student learning.
This included a definition of learning that was holistic and encompassed student development and academic skill building.

Three themes emerged as barriers to collaboration between student affairs professionals and academic librarians including (a) lack of time, (b) lack of knowledge about the professions, and (c) individual resistance to collaboration. Furthermore, two key strategies were identified to foster collaborative relationships between these groups (a) increase formal and informal knowledge sharing experiences, and (b) identify common ground and create mutually beneficial goals.

The existence of a shared facility increased interaction between student affairs professionals and academic librarians but was not a panacea to promoting partnerships. The increased interaction caused participants to recognize that they had been operationally invisible to each other prior to the facility and were now beginning to realize how little they knew about each other’s profession. Participants reported that the facility was a physical representation of the campus-wide commitment to seamless learning.

This results from this study indicated that academic librarians and student affairs professionals can work together to advance student learning from a multitude of perspectives. By working together, they have a greater insight into students and are better able to support the “whole student.” In addition, a formalized relationship between these two units can be mutually beneficial, as each unit could advance their departmental missions through collaborative programming, employment, and service outreach. Librarians provide a bridge to faculty that may validate the student affairs mission on campus and pave the way for increased learning partnerships campus-wide. Similarly, student affairs acts as a bridge to the student body, which may enforce and enhance the relevance of libraries for today’s student.
Implications for practice include creating opportunities for formalized information sharing and informal networking between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. Practitioners seeking to develop these partnerships should look to guiding institutional documents such as the campus mission statement and strategic plan to ground their efforts. Burgeoning partnerships should also seek to address individual campus needs. Librarians and student affairs professionals should seek out advocates for collaboration and create integrating structures to formalize and sustain collaborative efforts. Graduate preparation programs in college student personnel and library science could explore pathways for students to learn about each other’s profession.

Additional research is needed regarding collaboration between student affairs and academic libraries. This would include a multi-institutional analysis to explore these relationships across institutional type. A survey instrument based on the features of the Stage Model of Collaboration in Higher Education could be created to quantitatively assess collaboration between the two professions. Investigations that examine the student outcomes of collaborative initiatives between student affairs and libraries could also be explored.

Conclusion

Ultimately, student affairs professionals and academic librarians have the potential to create deep and meaningful partnerships that advance student learning. The results of this study indicate that both professions have similar goals and objectives, but lack a common understanding of each other’s work. Through the creation of a hybrid student union/library facility, academic librarians and student affairs professionals at Augustana College have begun to engage in collaborative relationships that strengthen seamless learning. This study adds to the literature base regarding collaboration in higher education and draws attention to two professions
that may have appeared to be unlikely collaborators. The results of this study indicate that partnerships between student affairs and libraries can be mutually beneficial and enhance learning across the curriculum and co-curriculum.
REFERENCES


http://www.myacpa.org/sites/default/files/taskforce_powerful_partnerships_a_shared_responsibility_for_learning.pdf


Happ, B. (2013). *Bob’s letters* [Collection of electronic correspondence from project superintendent]. Copy in possession of author.


Kraemer, E. W., Keyse, D. J., & Lombardo, S. V. (2003). Beyond these walls: Building a library outreach program at Oakland University. *The Reference Librarian, 39* (82), 5-17. doi: 10.1300/J120v39n82_02


APPENDIX A:
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Protocol: Collaborative student-learning focused relationship between student affairs professionals and academic librarians.

Date of Interview: __________________ Time of Interview: _____________________
Location of Interview:_______________________________________________________
Interviewee:_______________________________________________________________

Hello __________ . Thank you for agreeing to meet with me. I plan to audio record our conversation, so if it is all right with you I will turn on the recorder now. Thanks again for agreeing to participate in my dissertation research project. For this project, I am studying the collaborative student learning focused relationships between student affairs professionals and academic librarians at Augustana College. I will be asking a series of questions and taking notes in addition to the audio recording. The interview will likely last 1-1.5 hours. We are able to take a break at any time.

After the interview, I will transcribe the conversation and send you a copy of the transcript to review. You may make corrections or edits as you see fit. Is it all right to email this information to you? __________

From the informed consent document you read, are there any questions about the study, my role, or the procedures? __________

Introductory Questions

- Tell me about your position. Describe a typical day/week.
- How do you define student learning? How does this definition of student learning influence your work?

Collaboration

- How would you describe the relationship between the Division of Student Life and the Tredway Library?
- Tell me about a time when you collaborated with student affairs/library to advance student learning.
- In what ways do you hope to collaborate with student affairs/library in the future?
Mental Models

- What were your perceptions or assumptions about working with student affairs/libraries? How have these changed?
- How would you describe the values/culture of Division of Student Life/Tredway Library? How do you think this is similar or different to Division of Student Life/Tredway Library?
- What do you feel are common misconceptions about your job?
- What has surprised you about working with student affairs/libraries?

Strategies and Barriers

- What strategies facilitated collaboration with student affairs/libraries? Can you provide an example?
- What are the barriers to collaboration with student affairs/libraries? Can you provide an example?

Center for Student Life

- How was the CFL created?
- Describe your involvement, if any, in the creation of the Center for Student Life.
- What were your initial reactions when this building was proposed? How have they changed?
- Why do you think this type of facility was created?
- What do you see as the strengths of the Center for Student Life? Challenges?
- How has the creation of this facility affected your work? Has it affected collaborative relationships with student affairs professionals/academic librarians?
- What did you learn about librarians/student affairs professionals through the creation of this facility?

Closing Questions

- Is there anything else I should know?
- Is there anyone else you think I should speak with?
- Would you be willing to participate in a follow up interview in person or via email or skype?
APPENDIX B:  
OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Observed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time of Observation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Notes</th>
<th>Reflective Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation Elements: physical setting, participants, activities and interactions, conversation, subtle factors, and your own behavior (Merriam, 2009)

On back of the page: Sketch meeting location including participants
APPENDIX C:
INFORMED CONSENT

12/4/2014

Informed Consent for Faculty/Staff at Augustana College

Title of Project: A Case Study of Academic Librarians and Student Affairs Professionals in Collaboration

Principal Investigator: Beth Hoag, Doctoral Candidate
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University
hoagb@bgsu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Kenneth Borland
Professor, Higher Education and Student Affairs
(419) 372-9397; kborland@bgsu.edu

Introduction: Thank you for your interest in the research study: A Case Study of Academic Librarians and Student Affairs Professionals in Collaboration. This research is being conducted to fulfill requirements for a Ph.D. You are being asked to participate in this research due to your employment at Augustana College in either the Tredway Library or Division of Student Life. All participants must be at least 18 years old.

Purpose: The purpose of the research is to learn how academic librarians and student affairs professionals collaborate to advance student learning.

Benefits: Participants will benefit from participation by engaging in self-reflection activities that will clarify their individual role and collaborative relationships. Participants will have access to the final product to aid in departmental strategic planning. The results of this study may be used to create or enhance collaborative ventures between academic librarians and student affairs professionals. Additionally, the findings of this study could provide a starting point for the creation of professional development programs and strategies aimed at enhancing collaboration.

Procedure: The research will involve one-on-one interviews, observations, and document analysis. Interviews with each participant will be 60-90 minutes in length. Follow up interviews and/or request for historical documents may be requested from participants. Follow up interviews will be requested if more time is needed to address the interview questions or if clarification is needed. Interview sessions will be digitally audio-taped. Observations will take place in university meetings, retreats, and events.

Voluntary nature: Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions or discontinue participation at any time without penalty.
I have obtained permission to conduct research at Augustana from the Director of the Library and Associate Dean of Student Services. Although Augustana College supports this research participants are not required to participate as part of their job duties. Deciding to participate or not will not affect your relationship with Bowling Green State University.

**Confidentiality Protection:** In the final results Augustana College will be named. This increases the risk of readers identifying individual participants and therefore confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, although, all attempts will be made by the researcher to protect the identity of individual participants if requested. Participants will have the opportunity to choose their own pseudonym, or if requested, be self-identified in the research. Participants may be directly quoted in the dissemination of final results. Confidentiality from other participants cannot be guaranteed in group observational settings.

In order to maintain the confidentiality of data, electronic data will be stored on a password-protected computer, and backed up on an external hard drive stored in a safe in the researcher’s home. All hard copy interview notes and physical consent forms will be void of identifying information and stored in a safe at a locked residence. Only the primary researcher, peer reviewer, and advisor will have access to the primary data. Original data will be destroyed within a year after the publication of the study.

**Risks:** This study contains minimal risk. The risks associated with this study are no greater than those encountered in normal daily activities. The nature of this study makes it difficult to disguise the institution because of its unique features; therefore, the college will be named in the study, which increases the risk of readers identifying individual participants.

**Contact information:** If you have further questions about the research or your participation, please contact Beth Hoag at hoagb@bgsu.edu or Dr. Kenneth Borland, dissertation advisor, at kborlan@bgsu.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research.

---

I have been informed of the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits of this study. I have had the opportunity to have all my questions answered and I have been informed that my participation is completely voluntary. I agree to participate in this research.

______________________________  __________________
Participant Signature       Date
APPENDIX D:

HSRB APPROVAL LETTER

DATE: January 30, 2015
TO: Beth Hoag
FROM: Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board
PROJECT TITLE: [556928-2] Odd Bedfellows or Perfect Partners: A Case Study Analysis of Academic Librarians and Student Affairs Professionals in Collaboration
SUBMISSION TYPE: Revision
ACTION: APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE: January 26, 2015
EXPIRATION DATE: January 5, 2016
REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review
REVIEW CATEGORY: Expedited review category # 7

Thank you for your submission of Revision materials for this project. The Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is available as a published Board Document in the Review Details page. You must use the approved version of the consent document when obtaining consent from participants. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that you are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures, those modifications must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the modification request form for this procedure.

You have been approved to enroll 20 participants. If you wish to enroll additional participants you must seek approval from the HSRB.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must also be reported promptly to this office.

This approval expires on January 5, 2016. You will receive a continuing review notice before your project expires. If you wish to continue your work after the expiration date, your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Good luck with your work. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at 419-372-7716 or herb@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence regarding this project.
APPENDIX E:

PARTICIPANT ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

Note. Solid lines indicate a direct report, dotted lines indicate an indirect report
APPENDIX F:

AUGUSTANA’S AGORA: A CONCEPT

The agora in ancient Greece was a multi-functional gathering place where learning, communication, commerce, politics, and philosophy flourished. It functioned as “an integrative center” for “activities that were crucial for the Greek way of life.”

The agora at Augustana College is also an integrative center that brings together functions that are crucial to the life of the college—the library, the student center, and the dining center. It is envisioned to be the destination that centers our students’ out of classroom experiences – learning, social interaction, reflection and recreation -- in a single building.

The agora will be the study, the family room and the dining room for every student at the college. The building will preserve the individual purpose of each center, but will allow for proper coordination to ensure high function. The agora will become the place to be, as well as the place to be seen and to see others. It will be a destination offering many choices for many people and should invite synergy among complementary activities.

Augustana’s agora will offer an array of inviting social spaces designed specifically for students, contemporary dining ventures that encourage discussion of ideas, and learning environments where students, faculty and staff, working both individually and collaboratively, have access to intellectual resources and information both physically and digitally. The agora will reinforce our values as a residential college of the liberal arts and sciences and could establish a model for other colleges to consider as we discover the inherent harmonies and synergies among dining and discovery, laughing and learning, and study and silence.

Finally, the agora which will be at the heart of our campus, will be a place—the place—where our community will grow as it is nurtured, challenged, and supported through intellectual, social and cultural communication and collaboration (Brill, et al., 2010, p. 5).