12-19-2013

Moving Forward: A Discussion on the Revision of the ACRL Information Literacy Standards for Higher Education

Ellysa Stern Cahoy
Penn State University, ecahoy@psu.edu

Craig Gibson
Ohio State University, gibson.721@osu.edu

Trudi E. Jacobson
University at Albany, tjacobson@albany.edu

REFLECTING ON THE STANDARDS [TRANSCRIPT]

MOVING FORWARD

A discussion on the revision of the ACRL Information Literacy Standards for Higher Education

Ellysa Stern Cahoy
Penn State University

Craig Gibson
Ohio State University

Trudi Jacobson
University at Albany

ABSTRACT

The first PA Forward Information Literacy Summit was held in State College at the Pennsylvania State University, University Park campus, on Wednesday, July 24, 2013. This summit brought together K-12 and academic librarians from Pennsylvania to discuss current issues in information literacy. This text is a transcript of a discussion between Ellysa Cahoy, past chair of the of the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards Committee, and the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards Review Task Force, and Craig Gibson and Trudi Jacobson who are currently co-chairs of the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Revision Task Force. This Revision Task Force is charged with reviewing and revising the current ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, that were originally adopted by ACRL in 2000. This discussion was about the process by which the Standards came to be under review, some of the issues involved in the review, and the time line for the review and librarian feedback and comment on the process. The PowerPoint presentation which accompanied this discussion, as well as other documents mentioned during the presentation are attached to this transcript as supplemental files.

Linda: All right, let's get started with the second keynote address. It is my pleasure to introduce our next three speakers. We'll be talking about possible changes to the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards. Interestingly enough, all three of our speakers have won the Miriam Dudley Instruction Librarian Award. I'm not sure, but we think that this is a record for the number of Miriam Dudley awardees in one presentation. If you know otherwise, tell me.

Ellysa Stern Cahoy is Education and Behavioral Sciences Librarian in the Penn State University Libraries, University Park, a former children's librarian and school library media specialist. Ellysa has published research and presented on information literacy, evidence-based librarianship, and library instruction and personal archiving. In 2012, she was awarded a $143,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to fund the exploration of faculty's personal scholarly archiving practices and needs. Ellysa is past Chair of the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards Committee and chaired the initial ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards Review Task Force. In 2013, Ellysa received the Miriam Dudley Instruction Librarian Award.

The next two speakers are participating via Skype. Craig Gibson is Associate Director for Research and Education at the Ohio State University where he is responsible for reference and research services, outreach and engagement, the library's instruction program and departmental libraries. He's been Associate University Librarian for Research, Instruction, and Outreach at George Mason University Libraries, and has held other positions in instruction and reference services at Washington State University and Lewis Clark State College. His current research interests focus on engagement measures for academic and research libraries. He's taught in the ACRL Immersion Program since 2000, has been editor of the ACRL Publications in Librarianship Series since 1999, and is currently Co-Chair of the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Revision Task Force. Craig received the Miriam Dudley Instruction Award in 2008.

Trudi Jacobson is the head of the Information Literacy Department at the University at Albany. She has been involved with information literacy initiatives for a number of years within ACRL, including serving as Chair of the Instruction Section from 2002 to 2003. She was a member of the previous Information Literacy Competency Standards Review Task Force and co-chairs the current one with Craig. She received the Miriam Dudley Instruction Librarian Award in 2009. Her current research interests involve metaliteracy, and she invites you to visit and contribute to metaliteracy.org, including Badging for Metaliteracy Abilities. She and her frequent research collaborator, Tom Mackey, are just finishing a book manuscript, in which they extend their discussion of the topic beyond their 2011 College and Research Libraries article. In the fall, they will be offering a Metaliteracy MOOC. Watch for that. I'm signing up. Trudi is also very involved in advancing Michaelson's Model of Team-Based Learning By Librarians, and she wrote about TBL in *Communications in Information Literacy* in 2011.

Again, we're going to ask you to hold your questions until the end, and I am going to turn it over to Ellysa.

Ellysa: Thank you so much, Linda. We're going to say hi to our two esteemed

speakers, Craig and Trudi once again. Thank you for joining us here on Google Hangout today. I'm going to speak for the first part of our presentation, and then we're going to bring Craig and Trudi back on. Before I let them relax for a few minutes, I did want to mention, in addition to Linda's great introduction, that there are two readings that I really recommend you read. One is by Craig and one is by Trudi. They're two of my favorite writings on informational literacy. The first one is by Craig. He edited a book called *Student Engagement In Information Literacy*. It was published in 2007. It is an amazing book. Whether you're K-12, academic, or public, it presents multiple perspectives on how to really engage and involve students in information literacy. Craig's introduction, alone, is something I refer to often from that book - fabulous.

Student Engagement In Information Literacy is one, and then Trudi's work that I have printed out and saved so many times – you know you have that one article that you just save and print repeatedly and just amass copies of it? That's Trudi's article, "Reframing Information Literacy as a Metaliteracy." I really recommend that you check out that article as well. No matter what level you're at, what type of librarianship you're in, it's fascinating and it helps you think about information literacy as an umbrella for a lot of different literacies that all inform how we develop critical thinking skills in students. So guys, I'm going to say goodbye for now and then we will be right back to you in a few minutes.

It really wouldn't be an Ellysa Cahoy presentation without so many layers of technology in it that you wonder if the presentation is going to work at all. This is true - I am serious - and I have no one to blame but myself. I'm going to start out the

first part and talk with you about the ACRL Information Literacy Standards and our process for revising them. I was the Chair of the first Task Force that said, "Should we even do this? Should we even revise these standards?" I was absolutely fascinated by Eileen and Allison's presentation before because it was a perfect precursor to what we're talking about now. You saw how Allison, Eileen, and their group consulted the AASL K-12 Information Literacy Standards, they consulted the ISTE Nets Standards, which are information, science and technology for educators. Those are really cool standards, too, both for K-12.

Now we're going to talk about the ACRL standards, which are very complementary and again, nationwide standards for information literacy for higher education. We want those to connect with and apply to the K-12 audience, too. Just out of curiosity, can I see who in here is a school librarian? Raise your hand if you're a school librarian. That's pretty good, so that's about 60, 70 percent. Raise your hand if you're an academic librarian. Whoa, so we've got like 50/50 in here. Any public librarians? All right, special prize, there you go.

Let's get started.

These are the main areas that we're going to talk about today [See slide #2 of the PowerPoint presentation attached to this transcript as Supplemental File 1]. We're going to talk about how we went about updating the standards. The other reason that I really liked Eileen and Allison's presentation is because you saw standards in action there. You saw how you take national standards, you bring them down to inform the state level, and then you actually have them embedded into the curriculum. That's what we're really trying to do here with the ACRL Standards, as well, is look at from

191

the top level, how do we design our programs in higher education to really develop critical thinking and information literacy in our students? Without the ACRL Standards, we'd have a lot more trouble articulating information literacy at the highest levels of our institutions. The ACRL Standards have been built into many mission statements for not just academic libraries, but also for colleges, as well. This is just like those AASL and ISTE Nets Standards. This is a really important mission statement for where we are right now and how we're moving forward. That's why we had to involve the best thinkers in information literacy like Craig and Trudi.

I'm going to talk to you about my first Task Force that I chaired with Trudi and the areas of development that we recommended, the things that popped out at us that have changed about information literacy. And then Craig and Trudi are going to talk to you about the outline for the revision process and the timeline for change, which is really fast. Again, just like Eileen and Allison, you've got to move fast with this stuff because otherwise, it's going to be outdated before you even get it out there.

Questions at the end or if you have something burning - which if you do have a burning question about an information literacy standard, you're my soul mate, but there probably aren't many of you. If you do have one, feel free to come up.

I chaired the Review Task Force. Just to give you a little bit of an idea about the ACRL standards, if you type "ACRL Information Literacy Standards" into Google, you're going to get to them as a PDF. They were adopted in 2000. They were the first information literacy standards. They were definitely a framework. They were a set of learning outcomes, all

cognitive learning outcomes, nothing based on the more emotional, affective learning sides of things, really just about how students think, process, receive information. You can see that they were also focused in those four categories, finding, evaluating, using and citing information. There is a social responsibility piece tacked on at the end, I believe, too, just as Eileen and Allison were talking about this morning.

Widely adopted, widely used, and there are also numerous discipline-specific standards in ACRL, including this past year, ACRL approved the Visual Literacy Standards, which went through the Information Literacy Committee and were based off these Information Literacy Standards. We have them for science and technology, anthropology, literatures in English, lots of them, all based off this main document. This main document has informed curriculum development and learning goal development at the local level, too.

As we know, since the year 2000, the world has changed. This is what we were confronting as we came upon this revision idea. Could we revise this document, these standards, because so much had been built off them? Would it be possible to do that without breaking down everything that had already been built? Would it also be possible to do that, building in some of these different innovations that have happened? When you think about everything that has come about since the year 2000, students have become content creators in their own right. Anyone can publish now. Especially our students are publishing different types of projects, multimedia projects, podcasts, videos. Students are curating their own content. They're now building their own information collections on their laptops, on their mobile phones, on multiple devices. These are all

192

Communications in Information Literacy 7(2), 2013

things that were not happening in 2000 when those first standards were created. We're in a very different world now as far as information sources, information creation, and information sharing. There began to be a groundswell of opinion that perhaps we needed to update the standards to reflect that very fact.

I used to Chair the Information Literacy Standards Committee, which is a standing committee in ACRL, which kind of oversees – they're like the governing body for the ACRL Information Literacy Standards. The Task Force that I chaired to review the standards reports to that committee, and the Task Force that Craig and Trudi are chairing now also reports to that committee. The ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee reports to the ACRL Board. That's who ultimately approves all this stuff.

You can see that our charge was to make a recommendation, to either retain the standards as is and for the next five years – that had already happened once that they got retained for five years – revise them, or completely do away with them entirely; rescind them if they're determined no longer useful. Our committee decided unanimously that we should revise them. I'm going to show you what our major recommended areas of revision were for these. You do have on your flash drive, which was in your coffee mug (which is a weird place for a flash drive but we didn't want you to lose it) - your flash drive has on there the recommendation paper that the first Task Force wrote saying here are the areas that should be addressed in the next iteration of Information Literacy Standards. [See attached Supplemental File #2] It also has in there Trudi and Craig's Task Force's work plan, so you can see where they're headed, as well. [See Supplemental File #3]

I did want to mention before we get into our recommended areas for development, some of the standards that we thought were really influential and that we consulted as we were thinking about new models for information literacy. The first one has already been mentioned this morning by Eileen and Allison, the Standards for the 21st Century Learner. Some of the things that we really liked about these standards were, number one, they really implement affective learning in those standards. It was a challenge as far as assessment goes. I know when these standards first came out, I think 2009 maybe, people said, "How in the world are we going to assess how students feel about this process?" I think they have dispositions in action now, and so they've started putting out some strategies for how you can assess effectively. Actually if you're interested in how you can assess affective learning, my colleague, Emily Rimland, just published an article on using clickers to assess affective learning. What journal is it in? It's in portal: Journal of Libraries and the Academy, forthcoming in October. Affective standards are included in the AASL standards and also they went broader because these are more recent standards, digital, visual, textual, technological literacies all embedded within there.

The other one that I wanted to mention to you is a pretty recent new information literacy model. It comes out of the UK. It's SCONUL, the Pillars of Information Literacy. They incorporate data curation, data management, handling information, different types of literacies. You can see here is their model, too, which I thought was really interesting and also really simple, which is awesome and a goal to make an information literacy model simple so that you can scaffold and build off it. What I really love about this model is that

193

"manage" is one of the main pieces of this model. These are all supposed to be interchangeable and all work with one another. I like that they're looking at students as managers of information. That's SCONUL Seven Pillars of Information Literacy. We looked at those standards, we were inspired by those, and then we made the following recommendations to ACRL about the current standards. We said they need to be revised. And number one, just like SCONUL did, we have to simplify them.

That goes hand in hand with number two, no library jargon. We want these to be adopted widely. We want these to go across disciplines. Just as Eileen and Allison were talking about principals and administrators, we want anybody at any level of education to be able to read these and completely understand what's going on. We say sometimes these are owned by librarians. In reality, these academic standards should be owned by everybody. We wanted to sort of take the library out of it and really make these standards that can be broadly applicable and could be seen as relative to the curriculum in any college. We wanted there to be affective emotional learning outcomes in here, so the standards were not just cognitive anymore. I did put in another reminder for myself that you've got to read Trudi's article on that, "Reframing Information Literacy As a Metaliteracy". We wanted the acknowledgement of metaliteracies in the standards.

We also mandated that there be a move beyond a focus on format. Not talking about how to use microfiche, how to use books, how to look in an index, that kind of stuff. Go beyond that because information, itself, is almost now independent of format. You can access a book in so many different types of media now. It's really more about

evaluating the information source, itself, than the body that it came in. We talked about student as content creator and also the role of student as content curator.

Finally, we asked that these standards reflect upon and provide continuity with the K-12 standards because our current standards, while they did use those when they were building the original ACRL standards, they still were a little bit in isolation. We want these to show much more of an explicit connection to our K-12 colleagues.

What I am going to do next is I'm going to move on to Trudi and Craig's portion of the presentation. They are going to tell you what came after that first review Task Force said, "Yes, we have to do this, we have to revise these." Just as Eileen and Allison said, when you are doing stuff like this, there were a lot of people who were upset and angry that we were even considering this. There's a lot of tenuous feelings about documents that have been around for a long time, but it's time to move forward. I think now we are at the point, especially with Craig and Trudi's Task Force, that we're ready to move on, we're ready to begin the process of authoring new standards.

I do want to mention to you before I forget that I know Craig and Trudi will be very interested in hearing your thoughts on where the standards should be headed in the future, how you think they should reflect upon the past ACRL standards. We welcome that type of discussion, and they'll tell you how they've also been seeking feedback in other avenues. I'm going to turn on their audio now. You guys are now being projected. Can you hear me OK?

Trudi: Yes.

Communications in Information Literacy 7(2), 2013

Craig: Yes.

Ellysa: Excellent. OK, so Trudi and Craig, I am going to advance the Power Point for you. We're right here now on the first slide of your presentation. You let me know how you want to move forward, OK?

Craig: Hello, everyone. This is Craig Gibson. We could look at the slide with the charge. This is the charge to build on what Ellysa was telling everybody earlier, the charge we developed and that was approved by the ACRL Board. It does reflect the best thinking that came out of the previous taskforce, but in some ways, we had some work to do to think about how we would actually answer the question, do we really have standards as we've had them in the past, such as the original set of standards that were developed in 1999 and 2000? We do acknowledge all of the good things that that previous set of standards actually has served, but given what Ellysa acknowledged and Trudi from the previous task force, there has been a lot of change in the last 10, 12 years, and I think this charge kind of points us in the directions that we need to go. I won't actually read it to you, but you can see what's in it, particularly relating to the different kinds of literacies that we need to be thinking about in the future, the multiple literacies, the student as content creator and this idea of information fluency bringing together technology and information skills, itself.

If you can go to the next slide, it just acknowledges us, the two co-Chairs of the Task Force. The Task Force members, we had a lot of discussion about who should be on it. Obviously, we want it to be as inclusive as possible to reflect higher ed technology. People who have different expertise and different specializations. Some of the names on there, you may well

recognize from the field, but we have other people, Ellie Fogarty, for example, from the Middle States Commission, whom those of you in Pennsylvania, you will be very familiar with. And Allan Gyorke, who is a Chief Technology Officer, Jordan Horowitz from the Institute for Evidence-Based Change in San Francisco and Bill Robinson, who's the head of a Teaching and Learning Center. We thought that it would be really important to involve people who would have a wide range of expertise, as well as librarians. I think we've accomplished that. We've already had some very, very good discussions with them and with our whole group.

Our work has already begun. We began work back in the spring, and we've had a conference call with this group, at had at ALA, a meeting of the group, as well as an open forum, which we thought was very productive. We've already begun to refine what we're going to do. Trudi will be talking about that in a little while.

Just going forward, we'll be issuing an interim report on our progress in September, and then there will be a draft online by December. We'll be having monthly conference calls among this group. We have a wiki site up, we've been sharing information. There's been a lot of productive discussion happening already. There will be an open hearing at the Midwinter conference. Then if you keep going through the slides here, Ellysa, there will be a deadline for comments in February and then there be a draft set of standards due in March. The Standards Committee will be reviewing those in April. Then the Board, itself, will be receiving the document that we produce. Whether or not we call it standards may be a question, but there will be a document that will be shaped in the next several months. The key question I'll

be leaving Trudi with is how we actually shape this as we go forward. So, that's the timeline.

Ellysa: Thank you, Craig.

Trudi: Ellysa, if you could move to the next slide please? Thank you. You're going to be hearing echoes of what Ellysa said quite a bit in what I talk about about the work of the group so far. You'll remember that one of the things she mentioned that the previous group said was to simplify the standards. You'll see that we've had a lot of discussion points. We're keeping in mind that simplification, but there's so many elements that this is going to be a really interesting balancing act.

We thought we would start or use as our scaffolding the information literacy threshold concepts. One of the people who is on our Task Force is Lori Townsend. You may be familiar with the articles that she and two others have written, really important articles. This might be something that we thought would sort of underpin what it is that we're doing. These threshold concepts, if you're not familiar with them, have to satisfy a number of criteria unique to the discipline. Once somebody understands one of these threshold concepts, you really just can't go back. She and her colleagues are having a Delphi process that some of us have been involved with trying to determine whether the threshold concepts that they have developed are truly the threshold concepts for information literacy. A lot of work is being done on that. Lori is on this Task Force, and I think that's going to be really helpful.

We've agreed upon a number of key elements. These include the fact there are sort of a network of these understandings, core ability, affective and metacognitive

domain issues. Ellysa mentioned earlier that the previous standards really had a focus on the cognitive, and so we really want to broaden that. We'll be keeping that in mind throughout our discussions. She also mentioned that librarians really can't 'own these' if we want this to be something where there's a lot of buy in. It really needs to be this collaborative effort. Her point about no jargon sort of resonates here. We want this ultimate document that we come up with to speak to everybody that will be involved with it. That would be perhaps a pre-12 through 16, as well as a broader audience within the university and college setting.

This web of related literacies, some of you may be familiar with the idea of trans-literacy, which really sort of looks at a variety of different formats. I think we're trying to keep in mind sort of the metaliteracy idea rather than discrete individual literacies. There are so many of those that we need to concentrate on what's common to all of them. Ellysa mentioned formats. Format really doesn't matter quite as much anymore. Is it a book? Books can be in so many different formats. I think that with these different literacies, there's a lot of commonalities, and we need to look at that aspect of it.

Moving to the next slide, Ellysa had mentioned student as content creator and content manager, and that's very much been a part of our discussion. We've also looked at how students are participating in these environments where they are creators, as well as consumers of information. What do they really need to know to be responsible in this participation? We've talked about sort of general and discipline-specific aspects of what's important within information literacy, the connection to the Standards for the 21st Century Learner, as you've heard a lot about already. Also, a

connection to workforce readiness and lifelong learning is another important component. Thinking about all of these, wanting to sort of simplify what we're doing and get to connect a lot of these as well as a few other things I'm going to talk about just now.

On our next slide, these were issues that were raised as important, but I think we still need to have a fair amount of discussion about what we're going to do. The modular format, we talked about there's really different audiences. One of the things that we were considering was the fact that we might want to have different components that would really speak to different audiences. One of our Task Force members brought up the idea that as a new teaching librarian, she wasn't quite sure what to do with the previous standards. How would she implement it? It looked a little bit overwhelming. Keeping in mind the fact that the teaching faculty, professors, they may not have exactly the same needs as librarians who've been teaching a long time, who would have different needs than new teaching librarians, so we wanted to acknowledge that.

As Craig mentioned, this is not going to be a set of standards in the way that the 2000 version is. There aren't going to be, say, performance indicators linked to a number of standards. So, this is something that I think is freeing in a way, but perhaps also a bit nerve-racking to some people. Assessment, we want this to be accessible, but we need to talk about this further. The Board asked us to consider co-curricular aspects, not just the academic aspects of this. This is something that we need to figure out how we can deal with it, as well as the developmental aspects. The Seven Pillars that Ellysa mentioned specifically say that people can be at different places on

different pillars. That's something that we want to think about. Freshmen are different from seniors. Then again, it may have nothing to do with year, so this developmental aspect is something that we need to go into a little bit further.

And then on our last content slide, sort of the outreach, we have just looked over the applications for what the ACRL is calling a Visiting Program Officer. This is somebody that would spend time with the Task Force now, perhaps, thinking about ways to get information about our work out, but particularly would work with ACRL after we finished our work and after a document has been accepted, working with other educational organizations, working with the librarians and the faculty who will be using it. So, publicizing it, explaining it, thinking about ways to do that to really get the word out.

Also within outreach, Craig mentioned that there will be a Midwinter hearing. A couple of key people at ACRL were very excited to hear about what we are doing with you today and would like to expand the idea of these online forums. I think that ACRL will be hosting some of these.

We're going to be looking at a venue for comments, and the Visiting Program Officer may help us in that regard so that people don't have to wait to comment at a forum, but can do so at any point.

Once it's accepted, we talked about the idea of having a wiki as people transition to this new item and document how they're using it. We could be presenting information or ACRL could be presenting information, but just a way to disseminate what's happening with it. At the forum at Annual, the idea of a sandbox was proposed, and so that's something that we'll be talking about, as

197

well.

We would like to get your feedback. On our last slide, we provided our e-mail addresses here, but we're really interested in hearing what you have to say at this point now that you're sort of hearing about what we're thinking about, the directions we're going. Craig, did you have anything you wanted to add to this latter part?

Craig: No, I think you captured it all very well. I think the real challenge is to think about a document that is modular that will serve different audiences very well because we realized we have a lot of different audiences, and yet we're trying to put this under one kind of unifying set of concepts and umbrellas. We're looking for something that is flexible that will serve a variety of constituencies and yet have a lot of buy in across higher ed, across K through 12, across community organizations. We realize this is a very broad and wide-reaching agenda and there's a huge amount of interests, so we're trying to do this in this fairly accelerated timeline in as thoughtful a way as we can. We really do appreciate the input and the feedback that we would get from all of you, for example, at this point.

Ellysa: Great, then if you do have questions, I ask you to come on up to the microphones. You can see that I had the easy job in this group because all I got to do was work with a great group and we said this is what we think should happen. But now these guys have the really challenging job, and there couldn't be two better people doing it to actually look at how do we implement this.

Donna: This is Donna Witek from the University of Scranton. I have a question about the modular piece that you talked about. When you say that you're looking to create a document that will appeal to and be usable for multiple audiences, are you envisioning a top-tier document that by its language will be applicable across disciplines and environments or are you going to somehow generate categories within the document, based on audience?

Craig: There would be probably one part for the whole set of documents, a unifying set of principles, for example. I can imagine that happening. Building off of that, there could be modules for different kinds with examples of how information literacy might be implemented in, say, a particular field or for a different age group or for different kinds of collaborations. There are many ways that this could happen. That's what we mean by a modular document, part of it that would have a unified set of principles about what information literacy is, and that might well be linked with the threshold concepts idea that Trudi talked about earlier.

Russell: Hi there, Russell Hall, Penn State Erie. My question is more of a comment on nuts and bolts issues. I was sorry I couldn't make your session at ALA because the planners were brilliant enough to put it against the ACRL Instruction Section All Committees Meeting, so a prime constituency couldn't be there for you guys. The other thing was with ACRL going more virtual, I would really urge you to make sure that you get an online forum set up for this because I think you're not going to have that many people in person in Midwinter, for sure.

Trudi: Yes, we have been speaking with Mary Ellen Davis at ACRL about doing that, and so that will be happening.

Speaker: I notice that you are including some other organizations, but I'm wondering if you might expand that a bit. This may be more true on a small campus

198

like ours, but the information technology people feel like they have some ownership of this and a lot of people on our campus are very involved in ISTE and go to the conference every year. I think that might be a good group to consider bringing in, especially as we're moving to a learning commons model, we're all going to be in one building, I think having their ownership would be very beneficial.

Trudi: I think Allan Gyorke came from Penn State.

Craig: He did.

Ellysa: He did. Allan Gyorke was at Penn State up until like two weeks ago. He was our Director of Education Technology Services. He's one of the representatives from Educause, I think, right, Trudi, on this? I think that's where he's coming from.

Craig: He probably is a member of Educause. I don't think we were thinking of an official representative from Educause, but I think that's an important tie-in.

Trudi: One of the challenges we had was trying to keep the Task Force size manageable and yet have broad representation. That was something that we sort of went back and forth. I think given the interest that we had and what we would have liked to have done, it could have been 40 people, but the thought of scheduling even online meetings with that would have been horrifying.

Portia: Portia Diaz from Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I'm going to ask kind of the same question as I did regarding the Common Core, how this impacts the actual curriculum for library science programs. Especially now that one of the charges is looking at the multiliteracy components,

which looks at media and, of course, digital literacies, how is this going to impact that and what kind of collaboration possibly will there be in other disciplines such as comm media, computer science, computer technology, business, those kind of things?

Ellysa: Could you hear that one OK?

Craig: I had a little more trouble hearing that one.

Ellysa: I can paraphrase. That was a question about library science curriculum and how especially the focus on multiliteracies is going to impact library science curriculum, and have you had any affiliation with ALISE, the Library Science Educators Association, or will there be plans to collaborate them to roll this out, as well?

Craig: I think we will certainly be reaching out to them. We realize that their role is very, very important. Even though they don't have an official representative on our group right now, I think that going forward, we'll be very interested in what they have to say.

Trudi: And Lesley Farmer, I believe, is a member of ALISE, so even though she's not sort of an official ALISE representative to the Task Force, there is some overlap.

Craig: I'm going to have to excuse myself to go to another meeting, so I really do appreciate the opportunity to talk with all of you, and I wish all of you the best and we want to hear from you going forward.

Ellysa: Thank you so much. We have two more questions, so Trudi, if it's OK with you, we'll continue on with you for the last two.

199

Trudi: That's fine. Bye, Craig.

Mike: Trudi, it's Mike Nailor from the Pennsylvania School Librarians Association. A very quick question that has to do with a word you used on the slide, co-curricular. Could you talk a little bit about that because I think it means something a little bit different to K-12 educators than it does in the context you were using it. Thanks.

Trudi: Yeah, and this is something that we're still trying to figure out. Our understanding is that they're interested in, say, working with residential life people. Aspects of a student's life on campus that is not necessarily their courses, the academic program. Does that help?

Mike: Yes, thanks.

Ellysa: Thanks for asking that, Mike.

Linda: Trudi, I had a question. This is Linda Neyer. I'm from Bloomsburg University. One thought that occurred to me was that on our campus, we've recently adapted the Value rubrics that were published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). And, of course, as you know, their information literacy rubric is based almost completely on the ACRL standards. I just was wondering and I actually had a comment after this, too, if that was one of your organizations that you were working with.

Trudi: At this point, we're really thinking that because we have such an enormous amount to do and such a short time that we're going to get this Visiting Program Officer up to speed as soon as the person is selected, which we hope will be this coming week, to start thinking about this so we can identify constituencies where we might bring them into the conversation early, rather than just let them know about the outcome of it. That is something that can easily go onto the list, but we're really waiting for this person to start identifying all the different groups. Suggestions are very much welcome.

Linda: OK, great. My other comment just was that I totally agree, it's important to not just focus on the cognitive, but to look at the affective domain, too. I'm wondering how on board the regular teaching faculty are with that. I know on our campus, I think that might be a tough sell. Just if you want to comment on that and thank you so much.

Trudi: Just a very quick response to that part, I've been working with the faculty on my campus this spring on developing learning objectives for information literacy within the majors. I have to agree with you. I've been talking a lot about the metacognitive aspects, sort of thinking about their thinking, and some of that also touches on some of the affective issues. Those are the pieces where they're a little more reluctant. I don't know if they're just not quite understanding or they don't feel it's in their purview, so I do understand your point and thank you for making it.

Ellysa: My pal, Bob Schroeder, and I wrote an article on articulating affective information literacy learning outcomes. There are some strategies in there that aren't as touchy feely like writing reflections, journaling, things that at least help students. I think in a lot of ways affective learning comes back to reflection, and so there are lots of different strategies that you can take in the classroom that might not come across as overtly affective, but that help students think about where they are in the process.

Joe: My name's Joel Burkholder. I'm

200

from York College of Pennsylvania. This is sort of a follow-up to the previous question. I'm working at integrating information literacy across the curriculum. The thing that I'm noticing is that the faculty, not the students necessarily, but the faculty, information literacy, is so situated in what it is that they do in their daily activities that when I speak to them, they're kind of like, "Huh?" They can't separate themselves away from what it is that they do on a daily basis to sort of say, "Well, I know how to do it – my students should know how to do it, as well." Is there any sort of push beyond just changing the jargon to make it more accessible, in terms of how this really contributes to success within a particular area? Does that question make sense?

Trudi: It does. What we're sort of looking at with this document, we're certainly looking at the situated aspect of it. I don't know that we're going to be able to address a variety of different disciplines. Just as it is with the current standards that disciplinary ones came later, it might be something that people start working on, putting on the Wiki. We really are keeping in mind sort of the interrelationship with what students are studying. I'm not sure if I'm expressing myself well and answering your question, but I do want to assure you that we are looking at this issue.

Ellysa: Thanks so much for your question. Thank you for all of these questions. This was wonderful. I know this was great fodder for the committee. Trudi, thank you so much for being here with us today. Let's all give a big round of applause.

Trudi: Thank you.

Ellysa: Thank you, Trudi.

Trudi: Bye-bye.

201