

## **The Role of Student Perception in Information Literacy Learning Outcomes in the Archives-centered Advanced Writing Course**

Summary of Original Proposal  
Ranu Samantrai and Lauren Reiter (English)

Library Science and English programs agree that “archives” denotes preservations of old or historically valuable documents; however, academics working in the discipline of English also invoke “archives” in a second sense to indicate a scholar’s idiosyncratic collection of information sources through which she can articulate and answer an inquiry. Problematically, this second literary-studies sense of “archives” is not discussed in literature on “information literacy” or literature on the use of “archives” in English courses. Scholarship indicates a decades-long concern over English-class research, and it also indicates that undergraduate researchers in English classes frequently work with “archives” exclusively on library-science terms. We ask: could understanding “archives’ ” second sense be a gatekeeping mechanism preventing more robust inquiries in undergraduate English research?

This study will explore the possibility of an as-yet unidentified threshold concept—understanding various meanings of “archives”—in English classes with a research component. Researchers will investigate how undergraduates’ perceptions of their learning about the concepts, “archives” and “literacy,” compare with their librarian partners’ perceptions of their learning on the one hand and with the students’ own demonstrated learning outcomes as formally assessed in their composition projects in a service-learning writing course (W350: Advanced Expository Writing) on the other. Thus, we will examine whether and how learning might change as a result of course participation. Could opening up the possibility for students to be explicitly interpellated as makers and curators of “archives”—not just as researchers of or in them—enrich the way that English students perform or perceive themselves as researchers? We hypothesize that when English students have different interpretations of the term explicitly foregrounded, and when they inhabit various relationships with “archives,” they can metacognitively reflect on the significance of this information for their coursework. Understanding alignment between perception and learning will allow researchers to assess the need for changes to the course and/or to disciplinary approaches to “archives.”

**The Role of Student Perception in Information Literacy Learning Outcomes in the Archives-centered  
Advanced Writing Course**

Professor Ranu Samantrai (PI)  
Department of English  
College of Arts and Sciences

Laura Clapper  
Department of English  
College of Arts and Sciences

[rsamantr@indiana.edu](mailto:rsamantr@indiana.edu)  
[lclapper@indiana.edu](mailto:lclapper@indiana.edu)

Application for Phase I Funding Level

Funding period: 1 year (initially)

## Abstract

Library Science and English programs agree that “archives” denotes preservations of old or historically valuable documents; however, academics working in the discipline of English also invoke “archives,” in a second sense to indicate a scholar’s idiosyncratic collection of information sources through which she can articulate and answer an inquiry. Problematically, this second literary-studies sense of “archives” is not discussed in literature on “information literacy” or literature on the use of “archives” in English courses. Scholarship indicates a decades-long concern over English-class research, and it also indicates that undergraduate researchers in English classes frequently work with “archives” exclusively on library-science terms. We ask: could understanding “archives’ ” second sense be a gatekeeping mechanism preventing more robust inquiries in undergraduate English research?

This study will explore the possibility of an as-yet unidentified threshold concept— understanding various meanings of “archives”—in English classes with a research component. Researchers will investigate how undergraduates’ perceptions of their learning about the concepts, “archives” and “literacy,” compare with their librarian partners’ perceptions of their learning on the one hand and with the students’ own demonstrated learning outcomes as formally assessed in their composition projects in a service-learning writing course (W350: Advanced Expository Writing) on the other. Thus, we will examine whether and how learning might change as a result of course participation. Could opening up the possibility for students to be explicitly interpellated as *makers and curators* of “archives”—not just as researchers *of* or *in* them—enrich the way that English students perform or perceive themselves as researchers? We hypothesize that when English students have different interpretations of the term explicitly foregrounded, and when they inhabit various relationships with “archives,” they can metacognitively reflect on the significance of this information for their coursework. Understanding alignment between perception and learning will allow researchers to assess the need for changes to the course and/or to disciplinary approaches to “archives.”

## Project Description

### 1. Purpose of the investigation and research objectives

The purpose of this study is to triangulate data on student perception of their learning in order to assess whether an as-yet unidentified threshold concept or “bottleneck”—understanding the various meanings of the term, “archives”—may underlie some of the difficulty that undergraduates have with research and writing in English classes. Specifically, this study will explore how students’ perceptions of their learning about the concepts, “archives” and “literacy,” compare with their librarian partners’ perceptions of their learning on the one hand and with the students’ own demonstrated learning outcomes as formally assessed on the other hand. The researchers will collect data for this analysis from reflections and writing produced in a service-learning-designated<sup>1</sup> advanced writing course (W350: Advanced Expository Writing). Thus, a related inquiry of this investigation is to examine whether and how students’ learning and *our thinking about student learning* might both change as a result of participation in this course. We hope to use our understandings of student learning in W350 to improve the design of curriculum and instruction in this course and others like it.

Some preliminary research done for this investigation suggests that few or no studies have been done on students’ understanding of the meaning of “archives”—or of information literacy’s reciprocal effects on learning to negotiate various meanings<sup>2</sup> of “archives.” We suspect that this research may not have been pursued yet because librarians and English instructors rarely make explicit their often differing understandings of “archives” (widely used though that term is). This gap in research could indicate that understanding the meaning of “archives” is an as-yet not identified bottleneck (or threshold concept) for students who carry out research work for their English courses. Indeed, our early research suggests that students’ approach to research in English courses at both lower- and upper-levels remains a central learning problem, although it has been discussed for decades (Nicholas 2013). We wonder: could opening up the possibility for students to be explicitly interpellated as *makers and curators* of “archives,” not just as researchers *of* or *in* them enrich the way that English students perform or perceive themselves in their traditional role as user-researchers of archives?

In the course, students will be introduced to a variety of divergent, occasionally conflicting conceptualizations of “archive(s)” and of “literacy” and will complete assignments asking them to think within these different frameworks. Therefore, it is critical that we investigate students’ learning as well as their own metacognitive assessments of their learning. These investigations will allow us to gauge the extent to which students’ perceptions of their learning complement or diverge from their instructor-assessed learning in the course. The concepts of “archives” and “literacy” are central to

---

<sup>1</sup> This course carries a service-learning designation, but for the purposes of this research, the “service-learning” component is only a concern insofar as the students’ service to the community is to help community members by working with them to co-write documents that will become *archives*.

<sup>2</sup> Our experiences teaching literature and composition courses like W350 and our partnerships with Indiana University librarians for these courses reveal that although understandings of “literacy” generally overlap among literature and composition instructors and librarians, a dramatic difference can be found between their abstract and theoretically flexible understandings of “literacy” and undergraduate student definitions of “literacy,” which largely center on its most literal alphabetic sense. Even more stark is the difference in working definitions of “archives” among these three groups. Librarian archivists tend to conceptualize “archives” primarily as things *conserved*: old documents or documents with special historical or official relevance (i.e. within frameworks like those established by Schellenberg or Jenkinson) or as a term situated within the alternative context of “digital” conservation. English instructors, on the other hand, tend to work from assumptions about “archives” that are grounded in their discipline’s value of “close reading,” often thinking of “archives” more broadly as (frequently idiosyncratic) groupings of sources of information that reflect the interests of the archive’s curator (i.e. assumptions often in line with theories like Cvetkovish’s conceptualization of archives).

upper-division English classes. Thus, measuring the extent of alignment between two assessments (the students' assessments and the instructor's) will contribute to our understanding of the significance of the role that metacognition plays in student learning as well as our understanding of what effects might result from student anxiety about the information literacy that working with "archives" requires. It can also inform future courses' content design and delivery to facilitate greater alignment between actual and perceived learning if needed, or to perpetuate the alignment if it is discovered to be close. Furthermore, this research helps establish grounds for future research on the effects that instructors' and librarians' own implicit understandings of "archives" may have on the ways in which they actually approach "archives" both in research and in teaching.

These motivations compel us to research the following questions in this study: 1) How do students perceive their knowledge of the concepts, "literacy" and "archives," initially? 2) To what extent do students' and librarians' metacognitive reflections on learning throughout the duration of the course reflect students' demonstrated learning of the various concepts that these terms can indicate? 3) How, if at all, do instructor and course-collaborating librarians' efforts to make explicit various definitions of "literacy" and of "archives" affect student learning outcomes in the course and/or students' perception of their learning? In other words, do students become more empowered as researchers and writers?

## **2. Previous Research Results**

Phase I funding would be used in part to support extensive background research relevant to our inquiry. Our initial look at the existing scholarship indicates that there exists little or no scholarship of teaching and learning about student perception and negotiation of various meanings of "archives." Likewise, our research suggests that in the scholarship to date student learning about "literacies" has not been explored with relation to students' understandings of ways they can use and make "archives."

Research on undergraduate competency in and perceptions of information literacy standards is relatively abundant (Salisbury and Karasmanis 2011; Stewart and Basic 2014; Chen 2015). Studies on educator perception of information literacy have also been found (Saunders 2012, Smith 2013, Togia, Korobili, Malliari, and Nitsos 2015). Studies of information literacy programs are also fairly common (Baro, Seimode, and Godfrey 2013; Kultawanich, Koraneekij, and Na-Songkhla 2014; and Maybee, Carlson, Slebodnik, and Chapman 2015).

A study on faculty perceptions of "self-archiving" was found (Kyriaki-Manessi, Koulouris, Giannakopoulos, Zervos 2013), as were studies of student learning through archive use (Berry 2011, Erekson 2011, Diaz 2012) and of students' metacognitive perceptions of their learning about archives (Sheeja 2010; Matusiak 2012; Daniels, Yakel 2013), but studies of faculty and/or students' negotiation of the various meanings of "archives" have not been discovered. Similarly, the impact of information literacy on perception of "archives" has not been assessed in any literature we have seen yet. An abundance of scholarship on teaching and learning "research" exists (Griffith 1992, Deyrup and Bloom (eds.) 2013, and Baer's 2014 review of the classic Schwegler and Shannon 1982 article), but none that also considers bottlenecks like "archives."

While numerous studies treat educators' or students' engagement with archives and just as many focus on information literacy education, there is a scarcity of research on metacognitive reflections' efficacy in student negotiation of these things as contested terms. These findings suggest that both "archives" and "literacy," especially in the context of "information literacy" are significant foundational concepts for much SoTL research today. Hence the urgent need to study student perceptions of their mastery of the meanings of these terms in light of the work they do in and with archives.

### 3. Significance and Impact of the Study on Undergraduate Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

As an intensive-writing mainstay in the Department of English, W350 figures centrally in many majors' and non-majors' experience of composition in the College of Arts and Sciences. Literature and theory are frequently taught in the course, making it ideal for studying students' learning about literacy. At the same time, a growing number of instructors in our department and in the college are partnering with librarians in "information literacy enrichment" projects for their courses. This makes a study of one of the partnerships' most central terms, "archives"—crucial for the success of ongoing connections and for the responsible development of more such courses. Exploring what we mean by the terms on which we are partnered will benefit everyone involved in such partnerships. The measureable success and perceived success of students in these partnered courses and in all English courses in which "archives" figure centrally will also become more intelligible to faculty and students alike.

Our early research indicates that SoTL writing about partnerships between English instructors and libraries report findings largely, possibly exclusively, on librarian senses of "archives," not English-particular senses (Berry's study, for example, and foundational overview studies like Daniels and Yakel's that do not even differentiate literary studies-based courses from other types of courses). Findings from this research project will help the Indiana University (IU) Librarians design more meaningful curriculum to achieve their five stated information literacy standards as defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries (<http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/>); they may also expose a need for greater clarity in the standards themselves to accommodate "information literacy" within the context of the field-specificity of terms like "archives."

Because the section of W350 that we will be studying is a reproducible service-learning course intensively partnered with the IU Libraries and thematically organized around questions about the meanings of the terms "archives" and "literacy" in addition to the concepts of "home" and "belonging," this study will help us understand what is working in the course design and content and what could be improved for future iterations of this W350 topic. Conveniently, students' content-related reflections during the course can double as metadata for our further study of these terms. We hope that tracking students' metacognition about "archives" and "literacy" in their course experience will help us better gauge whether—and possibly where and how—connections between metadiscourse and discourse can expand students' self-efficacy and performance as researchers and writers.

### 4. Outcomes from the Work and How They Will Contribute to the Assessment of Student Learning at Indiana University

From the first phase of this study we anticipate four outcomes:

English Graduate Student Advisory Committee (GSAC) Website Blog: The researchers will share findings with the graduate student community through this online forum. If graduate student interest is high, a GSAC-organized brown-bag lunch session on the topics of library partnerships, "archival discourse" and "information literacy" could be held. Graduate students can teach W350, but the findings will likely apply to all the courses they teach.

Deepened Course Reflection: This W350 section like all service-learning courses at Indiana University will require the instructor, any librarian partners, and the community service organization partners to reflect and debrief. Our study conducted broadly into questions of perceived meaning of "archives" and "literacy" in this course will further the particular research of the instructor, library and community partners into the methods and organization of their joint project, since the class is designed to focus on student research *in* "archives," student *compilation of* individual "archives," and

student *co-production of* oral histories (through their service-learning)—histories that will become part of the University Archives and of a Scholar's Commons exhibit. An overview of these partners' reflections in light of the initial analysis of data we will be able to conduct will be composed and given to the Director of Composition within the Department of English. The Director of Service-learning and the Director of Crawford Apartments will also receive the overview of initial findings.

Crawford Apartments, the W350 course's service-learning community partner, has already obtained a grant to facilitate more co-written life narratives after this spring. Understanding of the efficacy of student self-assessment and of more explicit discussion of various meanings of "archives" and of "literacy" will help future instructors and the Service-learning Program more meaningfully and accurately assess student performance in this and similar courses.

Report to Libraries: Because the partnership of this W350 section with the IU libraries is extensive, the librarians and instructor have agreed to submit a report on their findings related to students' information literacy learning outcomes. See Section 3 of this application for more about how our findings can benefit the IU Libraries.

CITL Roundtable: The researchers will facilitate a roundtable discussion hosted by the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (CITL) on the role that perception plays in student information literacy. This way internal dissemination of our research results can extend far beyond the bounds of the Department of English and the IU Libraries. Dr. Laura Plummer has offered to advertise our roundtable to the Faculty Learning Communities as well.

## **5. Research methodology:**

We will use mixed methods to gather and interpret our data. We will collect data primarily through student writing: students' reflection assignments during the semester, along with their research essay and co-written life narrative (from their service-partner's oral interviews). Reflection assignments asking students to describe their understandings of "archives" and of "literacy" will provide us with data that we can triangulate with their performances on their research and life narrative assignments. The research and life narrative assignments require demonstrated information literacy and demonstrated comfort working with different understandings of "archives," not definitions of these terms. These documents will be read in light of the written reflections that the service-learning partners and library partners will share at the end of the semester regarding their perceptions of the students' understanding. This additional data will allow the researchers to analyze not only whether student perceptions of their learning matched their performances but also whether librarian perceptions of students as they embarked on the research and writing processes aligned with or possibly even affected student perceptions or student performance. In the gathering of all data, IRB and CITI protocols will be followed.

Triangulating our data in this way will allow us to explore one phenomenon—student's information literacy in the context of work in "archives"—from multiple angles, yielding numerous possible findings and implications for how we think about perception and assessment in the archives-centered advanced writing course. We will analyze passages from the student writing and the librarians' reflections, and we will quantify the themes we see emerging in the data to help us rank and interpret the significance of the various findings.

## **6. Means by Which Success of the Project Will be Measured**

The goals of the project are to understand possible relationships between students' metacognitive reflections on their learning about "archives" and "literacy"—particularly "information

literacy”—and students’ demonstrated learning outcomes as expressed in formally assessed writing assignments and as perceived by librarian research partners who will work one-on-one with the student writers/researchers throughout the semester on various projects. These goals will be measured in the following ways:

- Completion of all required components in the course of our study (including reports to our department, to Service-learning, and to the IU Libraries).
- An outline for the revision of this course’s curriculum or of the delivery of course content, a revision particularly attuned to any theoretical shifts in our understanding of the role of student or librarian perception in student learning. Similarly, revisions will account for our understanding of what (if any) changes that an explicitly expanded definitional framework for “archives” and “literacy” can make in student learning and in course assignments to facilitate that learning.
- A paper or poster presentation at a SoTL symposium at which scholarly peers’ judgment of our analysis of findings relevant to each of our related research questions will indicate scholarly success.
- An article accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed SoTL-oriented journal.

## **7. Dissemination of results**

We plan to disseminate the findings of this study in a variety of ways that demonstrate the relevance of our inquiry to many programs and audiences. Dissemination within the IU and Bloomington communities is discussed in section 4 of this application. Additionally, we intend to disseminate our results in forums such as the 2017 Moore Symposium in Indianapolis, which at least one researcher will attend. Based on feedback at SoTL-oriented events and the symposium, we intend to submit a manuscript for submission at a SoTL-focused journal like *College English* or *College Teaching*. Because we will triangulate data collected, we may find enough data to also develop other related inquiry questions on which to base a second SoTL publication, likely one with a service-learning emphasis, such as *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning*, since viewing experience as information in which students can be “literate” and understanding the transformation of experiential information into “archives” will be important objects of study for that field.

## **8. Reflective Teaching Practices**

The investigators on our team have been engaged in a variety of reflective practices. These practices relate to this project but also to our general teaching efforts. They include the following:

- Individual and team reflections on our conceptualizations of “archives” and of “literacy.”
- Individual and shared reflections on our pedagogical expectations and assumptions about teaching students about literacy relevant for archive-centered projects.
- Individual and shared reflections on metacognitive reflection’s role in students’ writing development.
- Individual reflections and shared reflections on signature pedagogies in English.

Through our reflections we have reached a consensus about the importance of how we understand the meaning(s) of “archives” and of metacognition’s role in literacy learning in our classrooms. As we begin the spring 2016 semester, we are engaging in ongoing reflection about these concepts, and we plan to continue to reflect with each other verbally and in writing throughout the semester and the duration of the research project.

## Budget Narrative

During this year of our study, we anticipate costs to total just over \$2000. These costs include the following:

- NVivo (qualitative data analysis software): IU students can purchase NVivo at a discounted rate through IU at a rate of \$70. Since Laura Clapper's computer will be used for the data storage and analysis.
- Graduate assistant: Funding from a SoTL research grant will be used to help support Laura's work as graduate investigator on data analysis during summer 2016, in the amount of a \$1,560 stipend. Research paid at \$15/hr \*104 hrs (20hrs/wk for ~5.2wks) )
- Printing: Conference paper print-outs for both investigators + print-outs of brief bios for introduction totals \$1.56 for 22.3 pages at \$0.07/page
- We intend to send both investigators to the Moore Symposium in Indianapolis in 2017. Since lodging will not be required, total costs for the trip will be restricted to the registration fees (\$80 + \$35), parking (\$10\*2 permits), travel and meal costs (\$143.44 for 2 cars' transportation calculated at \$0.55/mi. fuel cost for 130.4mi round-trip per car) and lunch costs (\$15\*2) and dinner costs at (\$30\*2)—for an overall total of \$368.44.

<b>Budget Item</b>	<b>Cost</b>
NVivo software	\$70
Graduate assistant funding	\$1,560
Printing	\$1.56
Symposium funding	\$368.44
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2000</b>

## Research Plan and Timeline

Our research timeline is as follows

Semester	Activities
Spring 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Initial data collection from section of W350</li></ul>
Summer 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Data collection of W350 (reflections finish in summer)</li><li>• Preliminary analysis using data collected during spring 2016</li><li>• Prepare and deliver reports for Dept. of English, IU Libraries, and Service-learning Program</li><li>• Revision planning for future W350 semesters</li><li>• Draft conference abstract</li><li>• Outline publication</li></ul>
Fall 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continued analysis of data collected in spring 2016</li><li>• Apply to present at conferences</li><li>• Draft publication</li><li>• Plan/present findings at IU events</li></ul>
Spring 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Present at Moore Symposium and adapt research according to feedback from attendees</li><li>• Continue to plan/present at any relevant IU events scheduled for spring</li><li>• Continue to draft publication</li></ul>
Summer 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Submission of material for publication if not possible earlier due to feedback received at Symposium and IU events</li><li>• Assess ideas for second publication, preparing and submitting relevant materials</li></ul>

# LAURA CLAPPER

## EDUCATION

---

2001-05, 2007-Present    Indiana University                      Bloomington, IN  
*Ph.D. Candidate in the Department of English*

    Dissertation: The Ethics of Contact in the Era of Globalization  
*M.A. in the Department of English*  
*Teaching certification (graduate work): English and history secondary education*  
*B. A. with high distinction: English, history majors*

2002-2003                      University of Kent                      Canterbury, UK  
*Diploma with distinction in English and American literatures*

2000-2001                      University of Colorado                      Boulder, CO

## SCHOLARSHIPS, AWARDS, AND FELLOWSHIPS RECEIVED

---

- Outstanding Associate Instructor in Fifth Year of Contract (2013)
- Claes Nobel Educator of Distinction Award (2007)
- Lillie E. Fosbrink Scholarship for outstanding achievement in English (2003)
- FLAS fellowship for study of Intensive Polish (2005)
- Award of Excellence from ETS for performance on Praxis II in Literature and Composition (2005)

## SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING (SOTL) ENGAGEMENT

---

- Presenter, 2012-2015 team coordinator for numerous Indiana University Libraries Dissertation Workshop Series presentations, Indiana University, Bloomington (IUB)
- Participant, 2012-'13 Graduate Student Learning Community: Designing SoTL Research, IUB
- Committee member, panelist coordinator for 2012 Preparing Future Faculty Conference (PFFC): "Developing a Professional Record of Research, Teaching, and Service" Panel, IUB
- Co-presenter, 2010 Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Conference Panel: "The Schaad Model: A Framework for a Flourishing Writing Center Community," IUB
- Co-presenter, East Central Writing Center Association (ECWCA) 2009 Conference Panel : "From Tutor to Tutor: Acculturating Tutor Trainees," Purdue University

## LITERARY PRESENTATIONS AND CONFERENCES

---

- Presenter, Panel Chair; African Studies Association 2015 Annual Conference: The State and the Study of Africa: Alternative Sovereignties Panel. "Fictional Sovereignties: International Narratives and the Wars Over Sudan" (Forthcoming: Nov. 19-22)
- Presenter, American Literature Association Annual Conference 2015: "'What We Talk about When We Talk about War: Othering the 'War on Terror' in Dave Egger's *What Is the What*"
- Presenter, African Studies Association 2014 Annual Conference: Rethinking Violence, Reconstruction, and Reconciliation: "Knowing Her Limit: The Everyday Violence of the Growing Girl in Tsitsi Dangarembga's *Nervous Conditions*"
- Presenter, "Ancient Texts, Global Worlds: Translation in Theory, History, and Practice" Midwest Regional Conference on Christianity and Literature 2014: "Translating Christianity in Caryl Phillips's *Crossing the River*."
- Moderator, IU's English Graduate Student Conference: "Consent: Terms of Agreement" 2013: "Domestic Demons" Panel
- Presenter, University of South Alabama: Captivity Writing Unbound Conference 2012: "Diagnosing *Nervous Conditions*"
- Moderator, IU's English Graduate Student Conference: "Collections and Collaborations" 2011: "The Secular, the Sacred, the Spiritual?" Panel
- Lecturer, IU's Comparative Ethnic and Postcolonial Studies 2010 Lecture Series: "Cyprian Ekwensi's *Jagua Nana*: A Framework for Exploring Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism and the Question of Ethical Citizenship."

## TEACHING AND TUTORING EXPERIENCE

---

### Associate Instructor, Teaching Fellow

**Instructor of Record** for W350 Multilingual, L204, W170, W131 Standard, W131 Multilingual, W131 Basic Writing, W231, W202

**Discussion leader and grader** for L111 and L142

*Indiana University* 2008- '15 Bloomington, IN

- Taught independently, designed and/or revised curriculum individually and collaboratively
- Conferenced with students in various stages of the writing process to help them improve college-level reading ability, research skills, and composition style
- Worked individually and with professors and colleagues to tailor assignments, handouts, and lessons to students at the honors and standard levels

## Dissertation Group Lead Facilitator

Writing Tutorial Services

Bloomington, IN

*Indiana University*

2012-Present

- Served as administrative coordinator for 4-6 dissertation groups per semester
- Facilitated one dissertation writing group of 7-15 members per semester
- Surveyed all dissertation group participants and conducted data analysis on survey results
- Co-drafting Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) article on applying the faculty-learning community model to dissertators' writing groups

## Assistant Coordinator

Groups Program J101: Introduction to College Composition

*Indiana University*

2012

Bloomington, IN

- Assisted in the ongoing assessment of J101 (choosing textbooks, planning curriculum, providing instructional support)
- Aided the Coordinator in the hiring of instructors & tutors for summer (e.g., publicize positions available, review applications, and conduct interviews)
- Collaborated with team to plan and conduct the pre-class workshop for J101 instructors and tutors
- Taught one summer section while helping the Coordinator plan and conduct weekly staff meetings and visit J101 classes

## Teacher, Tutor

J101

*IU Groups Program, English*

2010, 2011

Bloomington, IN

- Tutored and taught, one year respectively, students from underserved student populations of IU
- Collaborated with fellow teachers in teaching “pod” to select readings, design lesson plans, and create assignment and evaluation sheets
- Worked closely with advisors and administrators to tailor solutions to student needs and to offer assessment of students' personal and academic struggles and strengths, as well as their capacity to continue on as full-time IU students

## Graduate and peer writing tutor: all disciplines

*Writing Tutorial Services*

2002-'05, '07-'10, '11-'13

Bloomington, IN

- Differentiated composition tutorials for all subjects and levels of writing from high school to post-doctoral, including ENL tutorials and tutorials for writers with special needs



RANU SAMANTRAI

Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae

Department of English  
Indiana University  
442 Ballantine Hall  
Bloomington, IN 47405

rsamantr@indiana.edu  
(812) 323-7972  
Fax: (812) 855-9535

**EDUCATION:**

- 1990 Ph.D., English, University of Michigan  
1987 M.A., English, University of Michigan  
1984 A.B., Smith College, with high honors in English

**ACADEMIC POSITIONS:**

- 2004- Associate Professor of English, Indiana University  
Director of Graduate Studies, 2006-08  
Director, Ph.D. Minor in Comparative Ethnic and Postcolonial Studies, 2012-15  
Affiliated faculty for the Asian American Studies Program, the Cultural Studies Program, the Dhar India Studies Program, the Department of Gender Studies, and the Ph.D. minor in Critical Race and Postcolonial Studies.
- 2002-2005 Cultural Studies Department, Claremont Graduate University  
Associate Professor, 2002-05  
Chair, 1997-98, 2002-04  
Assistant Professor, 1996-2000
- 1995-96 Assistant Professor of Women's Studies, University of Arizona
- 1990-1995 Assistant Professor of English, Smith College
- 1986-89 University of Michigan  
Teaching Assistant, Classics and Women's Studies, 1986-89  
Graduate Student Mentor, College of Literature, Science and the Arts Honors Program, 1989  
Research Assistant, Program in Women's Studies, 1988-89

**ACADEMIC HONORS:**

- 2015 Individual Research Grant, Institute for Advanced Study, Indiana University
- 2015 Trustees' Teaching Award, Indiana University
- 2005-06 Faculty Fellow, Variations on Blackness Workshop, College of Arts and Humanities, Indiana University
- 2002-04 George and Romy Kozmetsky Faculty Fellowship, Claremont Graduate University (declined spring 2004)

1994-95        Rockefeller Fellowship, Center for Cultural Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz  
 1994-95        Eccles Fellowship, Tanner Humanities Center, University of Utah (declined)  
 1994-95        Jean Picker Fellowship, Smith College (declined)  
 1993-94        Visiting Scholar, Program in African and Afro-American Studies, Washington University  
 1993-94        Research Associate, Five College Women's Studies Research Center (declined)  
 1993            Smith College nominee, National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Fellowship  
 1992            Research Fellowship, Five College Asian-American Studies Committee  
 1989-90        Horace H. Rackham Predoctoral Fellowship, University of Michigan  
 1989-90        Women's Studies Predoctoral Fellowship, University of Michigan (declined)  
 1984-89        Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Mellon Foundation, Minority Fellowship in the Humanities

### **RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS:**

- Post-WWII English literature and culture, especially Black and Asian-British studies
- Postcolonial and transnational studies: diasporic cultures, nationalism, globalization
- Cultural studies: politics and aesthetics
- Transnational feminist studies
- Twentieth-century cultural theory: postmodernity, critical theory, post-Marxism, poststructuralism
- History of British literature: nineteenth- and twentieth-centuries
- U.S. transnationalism and American ethnic literatures

### **COURSES:**

#### Graduate:

Post-National + Post-Post-Colonial = World Literature?  
 British Literature Since 1900: Post-WWII England, Indiana University  
 Research in Postcolonial Studies, Indiana University  
 Postmodernism and Postcolonialism, Indiana University  
 Dissertation Prospectus Writing Workshop, Indiana University  
 Introduction to Cultural Studies, Claremont Graduate University and Indiana University  
 Postmodernity and Politics, Claremont Graduate University  
 Race and Representation, Claremont Graduate University  
 Critical Race Theories, Claremont Graduate University  
 Contemporary Feminist Theories, Claremont Graduate University  
 Intellectual History of Feminist Theory, Claremont Graduate School and University of Arizona  
 Advanced Research in Cultural Studies, Claremont Graduate University  
 Imagining England: Twentieth Century British Fiction, Claremont Graduate University  
 Pedagogy Seminar, Claremont Graduate University  
 Literary Studies/Cultural Studies, University of Arizona  
 Gender, Power and Difference, University of Arizona

#### Undergraduate:

English Literature, 1945-2010, Indiana University  
The English Stage, 1945-2010, Indiana University  
Introduction to World Literature in English, Indiana University  
Recent Writing: The Last Post of History, Indiana University  
Literatures in English, 1900-present, Indiana University  
Literary Interpretation, Indiana University  
Feminism and Postcolonialism, University of Arizona  
Fiction as Cultural Criticism, Smith College  
Literatures of the Americas, Smith College  
Literature of Exile, Smith College  
Contemporary African Fiction, Smith College  
Questioning Texts, Smith College  
Introduction to College Writing, Smith College  
Women and Literature, Smith College and University of Michigan  
Theories of Feminism, University of Michigan  
Cross-Cultural Anthropology of Women, University of Michigan  
Women and Popular Culture, University of Michigan

### **GRADUATE COMMITTEES:**

Ph.D.: 10 as chair (4 of these in progress); 9 as member  
Qualifying examinations: 12 as chair; 23 as member  
Master's degree: 8 as chair; 1 as member

### **BOOKS AND COLLECTIONS:**

After Empire: Decolonizing England. In progress.

Science Fiction Studies 37.3, special section on Octavia Butler. Co-edited with De Witt Douglas Kilgore (November 2010).

Interdisciplinarity and Social Justice: Revisioning Academic Accountability. Co-edited with Joe Parker and Mary Romero. SUNY Press, 2010.

AlterNatives: Black Feminism in the Postimperial Nation. Stanford University Press, Cultural Sitings series, 2002.

Michigan Feminist Studies 1, Editorial Collective (Fall 1989).

### **ARTICLES AND CHAPTERS:**

“Sedentary and Mobile Poetics: Paul Gilroy and the Aesthetics of Postcolonial Theory.” Retrieving the Human: Reading Paul Gilroy. Ed. Rebecka Rutledge Fisher and Jay Garcia. SUNY Press, 2014. 131-60.

“History’s Subjects: Forming the Nation in Andrea Levy’s Small Island.” Identity and Form in Contemporary Literature. Ed. Ana María Sánchez-Arce. Routledge, 2013. 70-86.

“A Memorial to Octavia E. Butler.” Co-authored with De Witt Douglas Kilgore. Science Fiction Studies 37.3 (November 2010): 353-61.

“Interdisciplinarity and Social Justice: An Introduction.” Co-authored with Joe Parker. Interdisciplinarity and Social Justice: Revisioning Academic Accountability. Co-edited with Joe Parker and Mary Romero. SUNY Press, 2010. 1-33.

“Afterword: Justice Without Truth?” Interdisciplinarity and Social Justice: Revisioning Academic Accountability, co-edited with Joe Parker and Mary Romero. SUNY Press, 2010. 353-62.

“Who Needs the Subaltern?” Scriptures: A Complex Social-Cultural Phenomenon. Ed. Vincent Wimbush. Rutgers University Press, 2008. 278-283.

“Cosmopolitan Cartographies: Art in a Divided World.” Meridians: Feminism Race, Transnationalism 4.2 (Fall 2004): 164-91.

“Continuity or Rupture? An Argument for Secular Britain.” Social Text 64 (Fall 2000): 105-21.

“Claiming the Burden: Naipaul’s Africa.” Research in African Literatures 31.1 (Spring 2000): 50-62.

“The Conditions of Democracy: Pluralism, Conflict and Crisis.” Studies in International Relations XXIV (Vienna, 1999): 49-58.

“Weapons of Culture: Collective Identity and Cultural Production.” REAL: Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature 14 (Tübingen, 1998): 131-48.

“States of Belonging: Pluralism, Migrancy, Literature.” Essays on Canadian Writing 56 (1995): 33-50.

“‘Caught at the Confluence of History’: Ama Ata Aidoo’s Necessary Nationalism.” Research in African Literatures 26.2 (1995): 140-57.

### **REPRINTS:**

“Continuity or Rupture? An Argument for Secular Britain.” Secularisms. Ed. Janet Jakobsen and Ann Pellegrini. Duke University Press, 2008. 330-352. Revised.

“States of Belonging: Pluralism, Migrancy, Literature.” Writing Ethnicity: Multiple Geographies and Cross-Cultural Consciousness in Canadian and Québécois Literature. Ed. Winfried Siemerling. ECW Press, 1996. 33-50.

### **REVIEWS:**

Review, Ian Baucom, Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity. The Modern Language Review 96.2 (2001): 477-78.

Review, Rey Chow, Ethics After Idealism: Theory-Culture-Ethnicity-Reading and Meaghan Morris, Too Soon Too Late: History in Popular Culture. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 26.3 (Spring 2001): 919-22.

Review, Eugenia C. DeLamotte, Places of Silence, Journeys of Freedom: The Fiction of Paule Marshall. Journal of Gender Studies 8.2 (1999): 249-50.

Review, Jyotsna G. Singh, Colonial Narratives/Cultural Dialogues: “Discoveries” of India in the Language of Colonialism. Yearbook of English Studies 29 (1999): 341-2.

Review, Susan Meyer, Imperialism at Home: Race and Victorian Women’s Fiction. The Modern Language Review 93.2 (1998): 482-83.



## DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Bloomington

November 18, 2015

### **Letter of Reference: Laura Clapper, SOTL Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Grant; Ranu Samantrai (The P.I. for this project)**

Dear Committee Members:

Associate Professor Ranu Samantrai and Laura Clapper have asked me, as their Department Chair, to write a letter of support for their joint application for a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning grant. I am pleased to do so. Associate Professor Ranu Samantrai will serve as the project's P.I., while Ms. Clapper will serve as the graduate research assistant.

Ms. Clapper is one of our Associate Instructors in the English Department, and I met her three years ago when she is served as one of my assistants in a large lecture course I was teaching. She is now partnering with one my department's faculty members, Professor Ranu Samantrai, to write about her experience teaching one of our W350: Advanced Expository Writing service-learning courses focused on exploring the rhetoric of home and citizenship in our country. Professor Samantrai has a deep and prolonged interested in service-learning courses, so she is a wonderful person to serve as a P.I. with this particular project.

I give them both my hearty recommendation.

Please let me know if I might be of any further help to you.

Sincerely,

Paul Gutjahr, Ph.D.  
Professor and Chair