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During this session, we will:

- give you more information on the process of the Standards revision
- explain both why changes are needed and the direction we are taking
- talk about our next steps in the process
- answer questions
After this session, you will:

- Be able to share the direction of the work with colleagues
- Be interested in learning more about threshold concepts and metaliteracy
- Be aware of the forthcoming draft and your role in providing input
Session Outline

- Changing information environment
- Changing educational environment
- Recommendations of the previous Task Force
- Membership of the current Task Force
- Vision for the new model
  - New elements: threshold concepts & metaliteracy
- Tentative schedule for remainder of the process
The background

- Existing IL Standards approved January 2000
- Seminal document for higher education, not just academic librarians
  - Used by accrediting agencies, numerous academic programs
  - Disciplinary versions have been created
  - Have been translated into a number of languages for use elsewhere
Current Standards showing their age, because they don’t…

- address the globalized information environment
- recognize students as content creators as well as consumers and evaluators
- address ongoing challenges with student learning in a multi-faceted, multi-format, media-rich environment
- sufficiently address the need to position IL as a set of concepts and practices integral to student learning in all disciplines
- allow for open-ended and dynamic thinking about learning in the fluidity of the current information environment
The current Standards don’t…

- adequately address student understanding of the knowledge creation process, as a collaborative endeavor

- emphasize the need for metacognitive and dispositional dimensions of learning throughout ALL steps of conducting research

- position student learning of information concepts and practices as a cumulative, recursive, developmental endeavor (but instead suggest that information literacy is "additive" in increments)

- address scholarly communication, publishing, or knowledge of data sources

- recognize the need for data curation abilities
Recommendations of previous Task Force

...the Information Literacy Competency Standards Review Task Force believes that the ACRL *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* should not be reapproved in their current form. We recommend extensive revision, centered on the following areas of needed improvement:
The Standards must...

- be simplified as a readily understood model for greater adoption by audiences (both disciplinary and collegiate) outside of ALA

- be articulated in readily comprehensible terms that do not include library jargon

- include affective, emotional learning outcomes, in addition to the exclusively cognitive focus of the current standards

- acknowledge complementary literacies
The Standards must...

- move beyond an implicit focus on format
- address the role of the student as content creator
- address the role of the student as content curator
- provide continuity with the American Association of School Librarians’ Standards for the 21st Century Learner
Task Force Membership

- Elizabeth Berman, Science & Engineering Librarian, University of Vermont
- Lesley S. J. Farmer, Professor, California State University-Long Beach
- Ellie A. Fogarty, Vice President, Middle States Commission on Higher Education
- Diane M. Fulkerson, Social Sciences and Education Librarian, University of South Florida in Lakeland
- Allan Gyorke, Chief Academic Technology Officer, University of Miami
- Merinda Kaye Hensley, Instructional Services Librarian and Scholarly Commons Co-coordinator, University of Illinois At Urbana-Champaign
- Jordan E. Horowitz, VP Foundation Relations & Project Development, Institute for Evidence-Based Change
- Joan K. Lippincott, Associate Executive Director, Coalition for Networked Information
Bill Roberson, Director or the Institute for Teaching, Learning & Academic Leadership, University at Albany SUNY

Troy Swanson, Teaching & Learning Librarian, Moraine Valley Community College

Lori Townsend, Data Librarian for Social Sciences and Humanities, University of New Mexico

Lane Alan Wilkinson, Reference & Instruction Librarian, University of Tennessee-Chattanooga

Julie Ann Garrison, Associate Dean of Research and Instructional Services, Grand Valley State University (Board Liaison)

Kate Ganski, Library Instruction Coordinator, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee (Visiting Program Officer)

Kara Malenfant, Senior Strategist for Special Initiatives, Association of College and Research Libraries (Staff Liaison)
The new model will...

- provide a holistic framework to information literacy for the higher education community
- acknowledge that abilities, knowledge, and motivation surrounding information literacy are critical for college students, indeed for everyone, in today’s decentralized information environment
- underscore the critical need for faculty members and librarians to collaborate to effectively address information literacy education
New elements:

- threshold concepts
- metaliteracy
Hofer, Townsend, and Brunetti describe threshold concepts and their criteria, as based on the work of Jan Meyer and Ray Land:

...Threshold concepts are the core ideas and processes in any discipline that define the discipline, but that are so ingrained that they often go unspoken or unrecognized by practitioner. They are the central concepts that we want our students to understand and put into practice, that encourage them to think and act like practitioners themselves. (Hofer, Townsend, and Brunetti, 2012, 387-88)
Threshold Concepts

Meyer and Land propose five definitional criteria for threshold concepts:

- **Transformative**—cause the learner to experience a shift in perspective;

- **Integrative**—bring together separate concepts (often identified as learning objectives) into a unified whole;

- **Irreversible**—once grasped, cannot be un-grasped;

- **Bounded**—may help define the boundaries of a particular discipline, are perhaps unique to the discipline;

- **Troublesome**—usually difficult or counterintuitive ideas that can cause students to hit a roadblock in their learning. (Hofer, Townsend, and Brunetti, 2012, 387-88)
Metaliteracy builds on decades of information literacy theory and practice while recognizing the knowledge required for an expansive and interactive information environment. Today’s lifelong learners communicate, create, and share information using a range of emerging technologies… Metaliteracy expands the scope of traditional information skills…to include the collaborative production and sharing of information in participatory digital environments… (Mackey and Jacobson, forthcoming)
Metaliteracy learning: 4 domains

- **Behavioral** - what students should be able to do upon successful completion of learning activities—skills, competencies

- **Cognitive** - what students should know upon successful completion of learning activities—comprehension, organization, application, evaluation

- **Affective** - changes in learners’ emotions or attitudes through engagement with learning activities

- **Metacognitive** - what learners think about their own thinking—a reflective understanding of how and why they learn, what they do and do not know, their preconceptions, and how to continue to learn (http://metaliteracy.org/learning-objectives/)
SCHOLARSHIP IS A CONVERSATION

Scholarship is not something that a smart person produces as a one-off effort. Rather, information users and creators are part of an ongoing conversation in which new knowledge builds upon or refutes what has gone before, and in turn inspires others. Once a student grasps this concept, instead of searching for discrete research that proves their point (or solves problems or answers questions), they search for conversations that they then become part of.
Dispositions & Knowledge Practices

■ Dispositions:

Suspends judgment on the value of a particular piece of scholarship until the larger context for the scholarly conversation is better understood.

Inclined to see oneself as a contributor to scholarship rather than only a consumer of it.

■ Knowledge Practices:

Identifies the contribution that particular articles, books, and other scholarly pieces make to disciplinary knowledge.

Summarizes the changes in scholarly perspective over time on a particular topic, within a specific discipline.

Contributes to scholarly conversation at an appropriate level (local online community, guided discussion, undergraduate research journal, conference presentation/poster session)
Related Metaliteracy Objective

Identifies social media outlets that present new contributions to scholarship and supplement traditional scholarly communication channels.
Possible Assessments or Assignments:

- Give students a two-part assignment: one having them trace the development of scholarship on a particular topic using the traditional “information cycle” model with the traditional “invisible college” and traditional print publication outlets; then have them expand/refine that model by tracing changes based on social media forums, online communities.

- Have an entire class conduct an investigation of a particular topic from its treatment in the popular media, and then tracing its origin in conversations among scholars and researchers.

- Create an online community for a class where students post their findings from a research project in order for them to understand how research and scholarship work among practicing researchers.
Timeline

- Fall – online open forums with library and higher education community stakeholders
- December 1 – draft document released on this website for public comment (http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/)
- Mid December – online hearing
- Mid January – online hearing
- Saturday, January 25, 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. – in person hearing at the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia
- February 7 – comments on draft due
Timeline continued

- Throughout - continued reports to the ACRL Board throughout process
- Late spring - share near final draft with the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee and the ACRL Standards Committee
- June - final report to ACRL Board (target date)
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