

Association of College & Research Libraries  
 50 E. Huron St. Chicago, IL 60611  
 800-545-2433, ext. 2523  
[acrl@ala.org](mailto:acrl@ala.org), <http://www.acrl.org>



### Board of Directors Action Form

To: ACRL Board of Directors  
 Subject: ACRL Information Literacy Framework for Higher Education  
 Submitted by: Susanna Boylston, Chair, ACRL Standards Committee  
 Date submitted: January 16, 2015

#### BACKGROUND:

The *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, adopted by ACRL in 2000, have become an essential document related to the emergence of information literacy as a recognized learning outcome at many institutions of higher education. These, like all ACRL standards, are reviewed cyclically, but, unlike other standards, which are reviewed every five years, the *Information Literacy Competency Standards* are on a ten-year cycle. They came due for review in 2010.

In June 2012, the ACRL Board approved a unanimous recommendation that they be significantly revised, and the Board authorized the creation of a Task Force charged with creating the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. This Task Force, co-chaired by Trudi Jacobson and Craig Gibson, has been working since March 2013. The group reflects some of the best minds in the library profession currently working in the area of information literacy. It also includes experts from other parts of higher education and an accrediting agency.

The Task Force used a transparent process throughout the development stages, explained fully on its Web page [http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/?page\\_id=17](http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/?page_id=17). In brief, Task Force members started communicating their direction in April 2013 when they submitted a [prospectus](#) to the ACRL Board of Director's Executive Committee, outlining a proposed approach. The Board discussed this prospectus and provided [feedback](#) in May 2013 to help direct the focus. The Task Force continued to check in regularly with the Board about its direction, and at every instance the Board had questions but continued to encourage the group to pursue the approach it took in the *Framework*.

The Task Force shared drafts of the *Framework* for public comment as follows: Draft 1, part 1 on February 20, 2014, Draft 1, part 2 on April 4, 2014, Draft 2 on June 17, 2014, and Draft 3 on November 12, 2014. (Please refer to the Transmittal Form for full details about all of the events mentioned here.) Feedback was continually sought and incorporated into the *Framework*: in-person forums were held at the 2014 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, and the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago and a hearing was held at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas. Five online forums were held in October 2013, November 2013, and April 2014. Two online hearings were held in July 2014.

The third draft, released in November 2014, like the earlier drafts, was promoted broadly, including within the higher education community. A visiting program officer specifically help Task Force members identify and reach organizations that work with faculty, accreditors, library and information science educators, and administrators to promote the revised, complete June draft. The Task Force provided discussion questions to prompt input and solicited responses via an online questionnaire.

The Task Force also sought input on near final drafts from the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee and the ACRL Standards Committee. All of this community feedback to the drafts was

*Electronic submission is preferred for all Board actions. If electronic submission of the entire document is not possible, please send the Action Form to ACRL Program Officer Allison Payne electronically at [apayne@ala.org](mailto:apayne@ala.org) and the remainder in hard copy.*

invaluable in helping the group hone and refine the final *Framework* that is being presented to the Board now. Some of the notable changes that were made to the *Framework* in response to feedback received over the course of the vetting and revision process were:

- Creating a new Brief Introduction
- Including practical guides on how to use the *Framework*
- Revising substantially the six Frames, including the knowledge practices and dispositions following each threshold concept description

Responses garnered from the most recent feedback form that accompanied the third draft in November showed that, of the 206 surveys received,

- 91% were satisfied with the opportunities to provide feedback to the Task Force on drafts of the Framework
- 67.4% support the new Framework
- 63% were satisfied with the proposed definition of information literacy
- A majority of respondents were satisfied with the new frames (satisfaction ranged from 71% for Information Creation as a Process to 83% for Scholarship as Conversation).

These numbers reflect a small percentage of ACRL's total membership; the members of the Task Force were very mindful to take into account the thoughtful responses they received in all of the various forms provided, but they were also aware that they may have received the most feedback from those individuals who felt very strongly about a specific aspect of the Task Force's work. Based on the feedback to the third draft, Task Force members did not feel it necessary to make any more substantive changes. Some of the minor changes made included:

- Making small changes to the Frame titles
- Standardizing the descriptions of each frame (the opening sentence structure and the division of content between the first and second paragraphs)
- Developing a streamlined definition of information literacy based upon previous versions of the definition

While the Task Force strove to be responsive to the feedback that it received, there were some critical comments that it simply could not address. These issues fell into a few broad categories, and the Task Force's rationale for not addressing these was as follows:

- Mapping the Framework to the Standards. The Framework and the Standards take different approaches to information literacy, and drawing direct connections between the two is not possible, nor would it be advisable if it were possible. The conceptual approach of the Framework allows for more flexibility based on individual settings, and it would be counterproductive to link to a more prescriptive approach. The Framework also addresses a range of domains (affective, metacognitive) and practices (particularly those of learner as producer of information) that were not highlighted in the Standards.
- Learning Outcomes. Some librarians have asked for explicit learning outcomes. The Framework's major components give librarians examples of practices and dispositions from which learning outcomes can be written at the local, institutional level--ideally, co-developed or co-written with teaching faculty. Learning outcomes, in turn, are the assessable statements on which other elements of instructional design are based.
- Sequencing of the Frames. The Task Force cannot prescribe an ideal order for local institutions, given the highly varied curricula among them. Many institutions may find that a cluster of three Frames work best together as an architectural underpinning for a program, before another cluster of Frames is introduced. The intersections among the Frames should be used in an

advantageous way to show the integrative nature of learning about information literacy as a way of thinking, conducting research, and contributing to communities of learning.

It is worth noting that the full membership of the Task Force agreed to weigh in, one last time, via a gradients of agreement exercise to indicate their level of support for the *Framework*. That exercise showed strong support for the Framework: 8 of the 11 responding members indicated strong satisfaction, with the other 3 indicating support or support with reservations.

The Task Force submitted the final draft to the Information Literacy Standards Committee on January 5, 2015. The committee, which had been working with the Task Force and reviewing drafts throughout the process, reviewed this final draft as well as the Task Force's recommendations, and on January 12, 2015, it approved the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, endorsed the Task Force's recommendations, and submitted the documentation to the Standards Committee. Jeanne Davidson, the chair of the Information Literacy Standards Committee, reported, "We were impressed with the job done by the Task Force and commend them on a tremendous effort and an excellent outcome."

The ACRL Standards Committee reviewed all of the documentation submitted by the Task Force and the Information Literacy Standards Committee, focusing on the process that the Task Force followed in revising the *Information Literacy Competency Standards*. The Standards Committee held a virtual meeting on January 15, 2015 to discuss the *Framework*. Five members of the Task Force, including the co-chairs and the ACRL staff liaison, as well as several guests attended the open meeting. Standards Committee members commended the Task Force on both the transparency of the process it followed and on the documentation it provided, especially the detailed information on the transmittal sheet. The committee voted unanimously to approve the process followed by the Task Force and endorsed the recommendations of the Information Literacy Standards Committee. We hereby recommend the *Framework* to the Board.

ACTION RECOMMENDED: That the ACRL Board of Directors

1. Approve the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* as written.
2. Sunset the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* in July 2016, allowing for one full academic year for institutions to transition to the Framework. The *Framework* better reflects the changed education and information environment than the *Standards*, and the Task Force feels strongly that it is inadvisable to have two documents available from which a choice can be made but recognizes the need for a transition period as identified above.
3. Charge a new Task Force with managing the transition from *Standards* to *Framework*. The Task Force envisages this as a small, nimble group. Potential members might include two members of the current ACRL ILCSHE Task Force, one or more members of ACRL discipline sections, a member of the Information Literacy Standards Committee, and a member of the Instruction Section. Their charge would include working with an ACRL staff member to design continuing education opportunities, providing feedback on the online sandbox, providing guidance to the discipline sections, developing a range of educational materials to smooth the transition, and working with higher education associations such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). The Task Force recommends that the new Task Force and/or the ACRL staff member charged with implementation address two issues: (a) learner progression in all six of the Frames, so that examples are provided for the community of the sequence of levels of understanding of the concepts, knowledge practices, and dispositions for students at various stages of their academic careers; and (b) the emerging research agenda resulting from the Framework and how best to showcase ongoing research in the recommended sandbox.

Electronic submission is preferred for all Board actions. If electronic submission of the entire document is not possible, please send the Action Form to ACRL Program Officer Allison Payne electronically at [apayne@ala.org](mailto:apayne@ala.org) and the remainder in hard copy.

4. Encourage ACRL's discipline sections to use the *Framework* to operationalize their learning goals. The Women and Gender Studies Section is poised to serve as a model in this regard, and their work might assist other sections that undertake this project.

IF PERTINENT: Have other stakeholders been consulted? If so, please identify stakeholders and their comments about this action.

Please see the "Background" section above and the Transmittal Sheet for more details.

The four recommended actions to the ACRL Board, listed above, were included as an appendix with the second (June 2014) draft Framework and thus were available for review and comment. Based on feedback received from the feedback form and other sources, the Task Force added two specific actions in Recommendation 3 and included the revised recommendations for review with the November draft. The recommendations were not changed after the draft was publicly vetted.

STRATEGIC GOAL AREA SUPPORTED: Please add additional sheets as needed to explain. (Select the goal area that will be affected most by this action.)

**Value of Academic Libraries**

Goal: Academic libraries demonstrate alignment with and impact on institutional outcomes.

**Student Learning**

Goal: Librarians transform student learning, pedagogy, and instructional practices through creative and innovative collaborations.

**Research and Scholarly Environment**

Goal: Librarians accelerate the transition to a more open system of scholarship.

**Enabling Programs and Services**

ACRL programs ,services, and publications that target education, advocacy, and member engagement.

FISCAL AND STAFFING IMPACT:

ACRL recognized early on that the effect of any changes to the ILCSHE would be significant, both within the library profession and in higher education more broadly. To that end, ACRL has sought applications for an Information Literacy Strategist for its Chicago office for a two-year, half-time, project assignment to encourage adoption of the new Framework. Major responsibilities, as listed in the call for applicants, include:

- Provide educational programming that increases knowledge and encourages use of the new *Framework* within the academic library profession.
- Create and promote a pilot campus program.
- Develop and maintain an online "sandbox" so that ACRL members and academic librarians can try out approaches to using the *Framework* and share their experiences.

- Support ACRL Officers and official representatives who are promoting the new *Framework* at relevant higher education, library, disciplinary and topical conferences.

MOTION:  Above recommendation moved  No motion made  Motion revised (see motion form)

ACTION TAKEN:  Motion Approved  Motion Defeated  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**This page intentionally left blank to accommodate double sided printing.**

# Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education

## Contents

Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Frames.....	5
Authority Is Constructed and Contextual .....	5
Information Creation as a Process.....	6
Information Has Value.....	8
Research as Inquiry .....	9
Scholarship as Conversation.....	10
Searching as Strategic Exploration.....	12
Appendix 1: Implementing the Framework .....	14
Suggestions on How to Use the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education.....	14
Introduction for Faculty and Administrators.....	16
For Faculty: How to Use the Framework .....	17
For Administrators: How to Support the Framework .....	18
Appendix 2: Background of the Framework Development.....	19
Appendix Three: Sources for Further Reading.....	22

## Introduction

This *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* grows out of a belief that information literacy as an educational reform movement will realize its potential only through a richer, more complex set of core ideas. During the fifteen years since the publication of the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*,<sup>1</sup> academic librarians and their partners in higher education associations have developed learning outcomes, tools, and resources that some institutions have deployed to infuse information literacy concepts and skills into their curricula. However, the rapidly changing higher education environment, along with the dynamic and often uncertain information ecosystem in which all of us work and live require new attention to be focused on foundational ideas about that ecosystem. Students have a greater role and responsibility in creating new knowledge, in understanding the contours and the changing dynamics of the world of information, and in using information, data, and scholarship

ethically. Teaching faculty have a greater responsibility in designing curricula and assignments that foster enhanced engagement with the core ideas about information and scholarship within their disciplines. Librarians have a greater responsibility in identifying core ideas within their own knowledge domain that can extend learning for students, in creating a new cohesive curriculum for information literacy, and in collaborating more extensively with faculty.

The *Framework* offered here is called a framework intentionally, because it is based on a cluster of interconnected core concepts, with flexible options for implementation, rather than on a set of standards or learning outcomes or any prescriptive enumeration of skills. At the heart of this *Framework* are conceptual understandings that organize many other concepts and ideas about information, research, and scholarship into a coherent whole. These conceptual understandings are informed by the work of Wiggins and McTighe,<sup>2</sup> which focuses on essential concepts and questions in developing curricula, and on *threshold concepts*,<sup>3</sup> which are those ideas in any discipline that are passageways or portals to enlarged understanding or ways of thinking and practicing within that discipline. This *Framework* draws upon an ongoing Delphi Study that has identified several threshold concepts in information literacy,<sup>4</sup> but the Framework has been molded using fresh ideas and emphases for the threshold concepts. Two added elements illustrate important learning goals related to those concepts: *knowledge practices*,<sup>5</sup> which are demonstrations of ways in which learners can increase their understanding of these information literacy concepts, and *dispositions*,<sup>6</sup> which describe ways in which to address the affective, attitudinal, or valuing dimension of learning. The *Framework* is organized into six frames, each consisting of a concept central to information literacy, a set of knowledge practices, and a set of dispositions. These are the six concepts that anchor the frames, presented alphabetically:

- Authority Is Constructed and Contextual
- Information Creation as a Process
- Information Has Value
- Research as Inquiry
- Scholarship as Conversation
- Searching as Strategic Exploration

Neither the knowledge practices nor the dispositions that support each concept are intended to prescribe what local institutions should do in using the *Framework*; each library and its partners on campus will need to deploy these frames to best fit their own situation, including designing learning outcomes. For the same reason, these lists should also not be considered exhaustive.

In addition, this *Framework* draws significantly upon the concept of metaliteracy,<sup>7</sup> which offers a renewed vision of information literacy as an overarching set of abilities in which students are both consumers and creators of information who can participate successfully in collaborative spaces.<sup>8</sup> Metaliteracy demands behavioral, affective, cognitive, and metacognitive engagement with the information ecosystem. This *Framework* depends on

these core ideas of metaliteracy, with special focus on metacognition,<sup>9</sup> or critical self-reflection, as crucial to becoming more self-directed in that rapidly changing ecosystem.

Because this *Framework* envisions information literacy as extending the arc of learning throughout students' academic careers and as converging with other academic and social learning goals, an expanded definition of information literacy is offered here to emphasize dynamism, flexibility, individual growth, and community learning:

Information literacy is the set of integrated abilities encompassing the reflective discovery of information, the understanding of how information is produced and valued, and the use of information in creating new knowledge and participating ethically in communities of learning.

The *Framework* opens the way for librarians, faculty, and other institutional partners to redesign instruction sessions, assignments, courses, and even curricula; to connect information literacy with student success initiatives; to collaborate on pedagogical research and involve students themselves in that research; and to create wider conversations about student learning, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and the assessment of learning on local campuses and beyond.

## Notes

1. Association of College & Research Libraries, *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (Chicago, 2000).
2. Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe. *Understanding by Design*. (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2004).
3. Threshold concepts are core or foundational concepts that, once grasped by the learner, create new perspectives and ways of understanding a discipline or challenging knowledge domain. Such concepts produce transformation within the learner; without them, the learner does not acquire expertise in that field of knowledge. Threshold concepts can be thought of as portals through which the learner must pass in order to develop new perspectives and wider understanding. Jan H. F. Meyer, Ray Land, and Caroline Baillie. "Editors' Preface." In *Threshold Concepts and Transformational Learning*, edited by Jan H. F. Meyer, Ray Land, and Caroline Baillie, ix–xlii. (Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2010).
4. For information on this unpublished, in-progress Delphi Study on threshold concepts and information literacy, conducted by Lori Townsend, Amy Hofer, Silvia Lu, and Korey Brunetti, see <http://www.ilthresholdconcepts.com/>. Lori Townsend, Korey Brunetti, and Amy R. Hofer. "Threshold Concepts and Information Literacy." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 11, no. 3 (2011): 853–69.

5. Knowledge practices are the proficiencies or abilities that learners develop as a result of their comprehending a threshold concept.

6. Generally, a disposition is a tendency to act or think in a particular way. More specifically, a disposition is a cluster of preferences, attitudes, and intentions, as well as a set of capabilities that allow the preferences to become realized in a particular way. Gavriel Salomon. "To Be or Not to Be (Mindful)." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meetings, New Orleans, LA, 1994.

7. Metaliteracy expands the scope of traditional information skills (determine, access, locate, understand, produce, and use information) to include the collaborative production and sharing of information in participatory digital environments (collaborate, produce, and share). This approach requires an ongoing adaptation to emerging technologies and an understanding of the critical thinking and reflection required to engage in these spaces as producers, collaborators, and distributors. Thomas P. Mackey and Trudi E. Jacobson. *Metaliteracy: Reinventing Information Literacy to Empower Learners*. (Chicago: Neal-Schuman, 2014).

8. Thomas P. Mackey and Trudi E. Jacobson. "Reframing Information Literacy as a Metaliteracy." *College and Research Libraries* 72, no. 1 (2011): 62–78.

9. Metacognition is an awareness and understanding of one's own thought processes. It focuses on how people learn and process information, taking into consideration individuals' awareness of how they learn. (Jennifer A. Livingston. "Metacognition: An Overview." Online paper, State University of New York at Buffalo, Graduate School of Education, 1997. <http://gse.buffalo.edu/fas/shuell/cep564/metacog.htm>.)

## Frames

These six frames are presented alphabetically and do not suggest a particular sequence in which they must be learned.

### Authority Is Constructed and Contextual

**Information resources reflect their creators' expertise and credibility, and are evaluated based on the information need and the context in which the information will be used. Authority is constructed in that various communities may recognize different types of authority. It is contextual in that the information need may help to determine the level of authority required.**

Experts understand that authority is a type of influence recognized or exerted within a community. Experts view authority with an attitude of informed skepticism and an openness to new perspectives, additional voices, and changes in schools of thought. Experts understand the need to determine the validity of the information created by different authorities and to acknowledge biases that privilege some sources of authority over others, especially in terms of others' worldviews, gender, sexual orientation, and cultural orientations. An understanding of this concept enables novice learners to critically examine all evidence—be it a short blog post or a peer-reviewed conference proceeding—and ask relevant questions about origins, context, and suitability for the current information need. Thus, novice learners come to respect the expertise that authority represents while remaining skeptical of both the systems that have elevated that authority and the information created by it. Experts know how to seek authoritative voices but also recognize that unlikely voices can be authoritative, depending on need. Novice learners may need to rely on basic indicators of authority, such as type of publication or author credentials, where experts recognize schools of thought or discipline-specific paradigms.

### Knowledge Practices

Learners who are developing their information-literate abilities

- define different types of authority, such as subject expertise (e.g., scholarship), societal position (e.g., public office or title), or special experience (e.g., participating in a historic event);
- use research tools and indicators of authority to determine the credibility of sources, understanding the elements that might temper this credibility;
- understand that many disciplines have acknowledged authorities in the sense of well-known scholars and publications that are widely considered "standard" and yet, even in those situations, some scholars would challenge the authority of those sources;

- recognize that authoritative content may be packaged formally or informally and may include sources of all media types;
- acknowledge that they themselves are developing their own authoritative voices in a particular area and recognize the responsibilities this entails, including seeking accuracy and reliability, respecting intellectual property, and participating in communities of practice; and
- understand the increasingly social nature of the information ecosystem where authorities actively connect with one another and sources develop over time.

### *Dispositions*

Learners who are developing their information-literate abilities

- develop and maintain an open mind when encountering varied and sometimes conflicting perspectives;
- motivate themselves to find authoritative sources, recognizing that authority may be conferred or manifested in unexpected ways;
- develop awareness of the importance of assessing content with a skeptical stance and with a self-awareness of their own biases and worldview;
- question traditional notions of granting authority and recognize the value of diverse ideas and worldviews; and
- are conscious that maintaining these attitudes and actions requires frequent self-evaluation.

### **Information Creation as a Process**

**Information in any format is produced intentionally to convey a message and is shared via a selected delivery method. The iterative processes of researching, creating, revising, and disseminating information vary, and the resulting product reflects these differences.**

The information creation process could result in a range of information formats and modes of delivery so experts look beyond format when selecting resources to use. The unique capabilities and constraints of each creation process as well as the specific information need determine how the product is used. Experts recognize that information creations are valued differently in different contexts, such as academia or the workplace. Elements that affect or reflect on the creation, such as a pre- or post-publication editing or reviewing process, may be indicators of quality. The dynamic nature of information creation and dissemination requires ongoing attention to understand evolving creation processes. Recognizing the nature of information creation, experts look to the underlying processes of creation as well as the final product to critically evaluate the usefulness of the information. Novice learners begin to recognize the significance of the creation

process, leading them to increasingly sophisticated choices when matching information products with their information needs.

### *Knowledge Practices*

Learners who are developing their information-literate abilities

- articulate the capabilities and constraints of information developed through various creation processes;
- assess the fit between an information product's creation process and a particular information need;
- articulate the traditional and emerging processes of information creation and dissemination in a particular discipline;
- recognize that information may be perceived differently based on the format in which it is packaged;
- recognize the implications of information formats that contain static or dynamic information;
- monitor the value that is placed upon different types of information products in varying contexts;
- transfer knowledge of capabilities and constraints to new types of information products; and
- develop, in their own creation processes, an understanding that their choices impact the purposes for which the information product will be used and the message it conveys.

### *Dispositions*

Learners who are developing their information-literate abilities

- are inclined to seek out characteristics of information products that indicate the underlying creation process;
- value the process of matching an information need with an appropriate product;
- accept that the creation of information may begin initially through communicating in a range of formats or modes;
- accept the ambiguity surrounding the potential value of information creation expressed in emerging formats or modes;
- resist the tendency to equate format with the underlying creation process; and
- understand that different methods of information dissemination with different purposes are available for their use.

## Information Has Value

**Information possesses several dimensions of value, including as a commodity, as a means of education, as a means to influence, and as a means of negotiating and understanding the world. Legal and socioeconomic interests influence information production and dissemination. .**

The value of information is manifested in a variety of contexts, including varied publishing practices, access to information, the commodification of personal information, and intellectual property laws. The novice learner may struggle to understand the diverse values of information in an environment where “free” information and related services are plentiful and the concept of intellectual property is first encountered through rules of citation or warnings about plagiarism and copyright law. As creators and users of information, experts understand their rights and responsibilities when participating in a community of scholarship. Experts understand that value may be wielded by powerful interests in ways that marginalize certain voices. However, value may also be leveraged by individuals and organizations to effect change and for civic, economic, social, or personal gains. Experts also understand that the individual is responsible for making deliberate and informed choices about when to comply with and when to contest current legal and socioeconomic practices concerning the value of information.

## *Knowledge Practices*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- give credit to the original ideas of others through proper attribution and citation;
- understand that intellectual property is a legal and social construct that varies by culture;
- articulate the purpose and distinguishing characteristics of copyright, fair use, open access, and the public domain;
- understand how and why some individuals or groups of individuals may be underrepresented or systematically marginalized within the systems that produce and disseminate information;
- recognize issues of access or lack of access to information sources;
- decide where and how their information is published;
- understand how the commodification of their personal information and online interactions affects both the information they receive and the information they produce or disseminate online; and
- make informed choices regarding their online actions in full awareness of issues related to privacy and the commodification of personal information.

### *Dispositions*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- respect the original ideas of others;
- value the skills, time, and effort needed to produce knowledge;
- see themselves as contributors to the information marketplace rather than only consumers of it; and
- are inclined to examine their own information privilege.

### *Research as Inquiry*

**Research is iterative and depends upon asking increasingly complex or new questions whose answers in turn develop additional questions or lines of inquiry in any field.**

Experts see inquiry as a process that focuses on problems or questions in a discipline or between disciplines that are open or unresolved. Experts recognize the collaborative effort within a discipline to extend the knowledge in that field. Many times, this process includes points of disagreement where debate and dialogue work to deepen the conversations around knowledge. This process of inquiry extends beyond the academic world to the community at large, and the process of inquiry may also focus upon personal, professional, or societal needs. The spectrum of inquiry ranges from asking simple questions that depend upon basic recapitulation of knowledge, to increasingly sophisticated abilities to refine research questions, use more advanced research methods, and explore more diverse disciplinary perspectives. Novice learners acquire strategic perspectives on inquiry and a greater repertoire of investigative methods.

### *Knowledge Practices*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- formulate questions for research based on information gaps or reexamination of existing, possibly conflicting, information;
- determine an appropriate scope of investigation;
- deal with complex research by breaking complex questions into simple ones, limiting the scope of investigations;
- use a variety of research methods, based on need, circumstance, and type of inquiry;
- monitor gathered information and assess for gaps or weaknesses;

- organize information in meaningful ways;
- synthesize ideas gathered from multiple sources; and
- draw reasonable conclusions based on the analysis and interpretation of information.

### *Dispositions*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- consider research as open-ended exploration and engagement with information;
- appreciate the fact that a question may appear to be very simple, but still disruptive and important to research;
- value intellectual curiosity in developing questions and learning new investigative methods;
- maintain both an open mind and a critical stance;
- value persistence, adaptability, and flexibility, and recognize that ambiguity can be beneficial in the research process;
- seek multiple perspectives during information gathering and assessment;
- seek appropriate help when needed;
- follow ethical and legal guidelines in gathering and using information; and
- demonstrate intellectual humility (i.e., recognize their own intellectual or experiential limitations).

### **Scholarship as Conversation**

**Communities of scholars, researchers, or professionals engage in sustained discourse with new insights and discoveries occurring over time as a result of varied perspectives and interpretations.**

Research in scholarly and professional fields is a discursive practice in which ideas are formulated, debated, and weighed against one another over extended periods of time. Instead of seeking discrete answers to complex problems, experts understand that a given issue may be characterized by several competing perspectives as part of an ongoing conversation in which information users and creators come together and negotiate meaning. Experts understand that, while some topics have established answers through this process, a query may not have a single uncontested answer. Experts are therefore inclined to seek out many perspectives, not merely the ones with which they are already familiar. These perspectives might be either in their own discipline or profession, or may be in other fields. While novice learners and experts at all levels can take part in the conversation, established power and authority structures may influence their ability to participate and can privilege certain voices and information. Developing familiarity with the sources of evidence, methods, and modes of discourse in the field assists novice learners to enter the conversation. New forms of scholarly and research conversations provide more avenues in which a wide variety of individuals may have a voice in the

conversation. Providing attribution to relevant previous research is also an obligation of participation in the conversation. It enables the conversation to move forward and strengthens one's voice in the conversation.

### *Knowledge Practices*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- cite the contributing work of others in their own information production;
- contribute to scholarly conversation at an appropriate level such as local online community, guided discussion, undergraduate research journal, conference presentation/poster session;
- identify barriers to entering scholarly conversation via various venues;
- critically evaluate contributions made by others in participatory information environments;
- identify the contribution that particular articles, books, and other scholarly pieces make to disciplinary knowledge;
- summarize the changes in scholarly perspective over time on a particular topic within a specific discipline; and
- recognize that a given scholarly work may not represent the only—or even the majority—perspective on the issue at hand.

### *Dispositions*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- recognize that they are often entering into an ongoing scholarly conversation, not a finished conversation;
- seek out conversations that are taking place in their area of research;
- see themselves as contributors to scholarship rather than only consumers of it;
- recognize that scholarly conversations take place in a variety of venues;
- suspend judgment on the value of a particular piece of scholarship until the larger context for the scholarly conversation is better understood;
- understand the responsibility that comes with entering the conversation through participatory channels;
- value user-generated content and critically evaluate contributions made by others; and
- recognize that systems privilege authorities and that not having a fluency in the language and process of a discipline disempowers their ability to participate and engage.

## Searching as Strategic Exploration

**Searching for information is often nonlinear and iterative, requiring the evaluation of a broad range of information sources and the mental flexibility to pursue alternate avenues as new understanding is developed.**

The act of searching often begins with a question that directs the act of finding needed information. Encompassing inquiry, discovery, and serendipity, searching identifies both possible relevant sources as well as the means to access those sources. Experts realize that information searching is a contextualized, complex experience that affects, and is affected by, the cognitive, affective, and social dimensions of the searcher. Novice learners may search a limited set of resources, while experts may search more broadly and deeply to determine the most appropriate information sought within the project scope. Likewise, novice learners tend to use few search strategies, while experts select from a variety of search strategies, depending on the sources, scope and context of the information need.

### *Knowledge Practices*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- determine the initial scope of the task required to meet their information needs;
- identify interested parties, such as scholars, organizations, government, and industry, who might produce information about a topic and determine how that information might be accessed;
- utilize divergent (e.g., brainstorming) and convergent (e.g., selecting the best source) thinking appropriately when searching;
- match information needs and search strategies to appropriate search tools;
- design and refine needs and search strategies as necessary, based on search results;
- understand how information systems (i.e., collections of recorded information) are organized in order to access relevant information;
- use different types of searching language (e.g., controlled vocabulary, keywords, natural language) appropriately; and
- effectively manage searching processes and results.

### *Dispositions*

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- exhibit mental flexibility and creativity;
- understand that first attempts at searching do not always produce adequate results;
- realize that sources of information vary greatly in content and format, and have varying relevance and value, depending on the needs and nature of the search;
- seek guidance from experts, such as librarians, researchers, and professionals;

- recognize the value of browsing and other serendipitous methods of information gathering; and
- persist in the face of search challenges, and know when they have enough information to complete their information task.

## Appendix 1: Implementing the Framework

### Suggestions on How to Use the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education

The *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* is a mechanism for guiding the development of information literacy programs within higher education institutions while also promoting discussion about the nature of key concepts in information in general education and disciplinary studies. The *Framework* encourages thinking about how librarians, faculty, and others can address core or portal concepts and associated elements in the information field within the context of higher education. This *Framework* will help librarians contextualize and integrate information literacy for their institutions and will encourage a deeper understanding of what knowledge practices and dispositions an information literate student should develop. The *Framework* redefines the boundaries of what librarians teach and how they conceptualize the study of information within the curricula of higher education institutions.

The *Framework* has been conceived as a set of living documents on which the profession will build. The key product is a set of frames, or lenses, through which to view information literacy, each of which includes a concept central to information literacy, knowledge practices, and dispositions. ACRL encourages the library community to discuss the new *Framework* widely and to develop resources such as curriculum guides, concept maps, and assessment instruments to supplement the core set of materials in the frames.

As a first step, ACRL encourages librarians to read through the entire *Framework* and discuss the implications of this new approach for the information literacy program at their institution. Possibilities include convening a discussion among librarians at an institution or joining an online discussion of librarians. In addition, as one becomes familiar with the frames, consider discussing them with professionals in the institution's center for teaching and learning, office of undergraduate education, or similar departments to see whether some synergies exist between this approach and other institutional curricular initiatives.

The frames can guide the redesign of information literacy programs for general education courses, for upper level courses in students' major departments, and for graduate student education. The frames are intended to demonstrate the contrast in thinking between *novice learner* and *expert* in a specific area; movement may take place over the course of a student's academic career. Mapping out in what way specific concepts will be integrated into specific levels of the curriculum is one of the challenges of implementing the *Framework*. ACRL encourages librarians to work with faculty, departmental or college curriculum committees, instructional designers, staff from centers for teaching and learning, and others to design information literacy programs in a holistic way.

ACRL realizes that many information literacy librarians currently meet with students via one-shot classes, especially in introductory level classes. Over the course of a student's

academic program, one-shot sessions that address a particular need at a particular time, systematically integrated into the curriculum, can play a significant role in an information literacy program. It is important for librarians and teaching faculty to understand that the *Framework* is not designed to be implemented in a single information literacy session in a student's academic career; it is intended to be developmentally and systematically integrated into the student's academic program at a variety of levels. This may take considerable time to implement fully in many institutions.

ACRL encourages information literacy librarians to be imaginative and innovative in implementing the *Framework* in their institution. The *Framework* is not intended to be prescriptive but to be used as a guidance document in shaping an institutional program. ACRL recommends piloting the implementation of the *Framework* in a context that is useful to a specific institution, assessing the results, and sharing experiences with colleagues.

### **How to Use This *Framework***

- **Read and reflect on the entire *Framework* document.**
- **Convene or join a group of librarians to discuss the implications of this new approach to information literacy for your institution.**
- **Reach out to potential partners in your institution, such as departmental curriculum committees, centers for teaching and learning, or offices of undergraduate or graduate studies, to discuss how to implement the *Framework* in your institutional context.**
- **Using the *Framework*, pilot the development of information literacy sessions within a particular academic program in your institution; assess and share the results with your colleagues.**
- **Share a wide range of instructional materials with other information literacy librarians in the online repository developed by ACRL.**

## Introduction for Faculty and Administrators

### *Considering Information Literacy*

**Information literacy is the set of integrated abilities encompassing the reflective discovery of information, the understanding of how information is produced and valued, and the use of information in creating new knowledge and participating ethically in communities of learning.**

This framework sets forth these information literacy concepts and describes how librarians as information professionals can facilitate the development of information literacy by postsecondary students.

### *Creating a Framework*

The Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) has played a leading role in promoting information literacy in higher education for decades. The *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, first published in 2000, enabled colleges and universities to position information literacy as an essential learning outcome in the curriculum and promoted linkages with general education programs, service learning, problem-based learning, and other pedagogies focused on deeper learning. Regional accrediting bodies, the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), and various discipline-specific organizations employed and adapted the *Standards*.

It is time for a fresh look at information literacy, especially in light of changes in higher education, coupled with increasingly complex information ecosystems. To that end, an ACRL Task Force developed a new *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. The *Framework* seeks to address the great potential for information literacy as a deeper, more integrated learning agenda, addressing academic and technical courses, undergraduate research, community-based learning, and cocurricular learning experiences of entering freshman through graduation. The *Framework* focuses attention on the vital role of collaboration and its potential for increasing student understanding of the processes of knowledge creation and scholarship. The *Framework* also emphasizes student participation and creativity, highlighting the importance of these contributions.

The *Framework* is developed around a set of “frames,” which are those critical gateway or portal concepts through which students must pass in order to develop genuine expertise within a discipline, profession, or knowledge domain. Each frame includes a knowledge practices section that is used to demonstrate how the mastery of the concept leads to application in new situations and knowledge generation. Each frame also includes a set of dispositions that address the affective areas of learning.

### For Faculty: How to Use the Framework

A vital benefit in using threshold concepts as one of the underpinnings for the new *Framework* is the potential for collaboration among disciplinary faculty, librarians, teaching and learning center staff, and others. Creating a community of conversations about this enlarged understanding should engender more collaboration, more innovative course designs, and a more inclusive consideration of learning within and beyond the classroom. Threshold concepts originated as faculty pedagogical research within disciplines; because information literacy is both a disciplinary and a transdisciplinary learning agenda, using a conceptual framework for information literacy program planning, librarian-faculty collaboration, and student cocurricular projects, can offer great potential for curricular enrichment and transformation.

- Investigate threshold concepts in your discipline and gain an understanding of the approach used in the *Framework* as it applies to the discipline you know.
  - What are the specialized information skills in your discipline that students should develop, such as using primary sources (history) or accessing and managing large data sets (science)?
- Look for workshops at your campus teaching and learning center on the flipped classroom and consider how such practices could be incorporated in your courses.
  - What information and research assignments can students do outside of class time to arrive prepared to apply concepts and conduct collaborative projects?
- Partner with your IT department and librarians to develop new kinds of multimedia assignments for courses.
  - What kinds of workshops and other services should be available for students involved in multimedia design and production?
- Help students view themselves as information producers, both individually and collaboratively.
  - In your program, how do students interact with, evaluate, produce, and share information effectively in a variety of formats and modes?
- Consider the knowledge practices and dispositions in each information literacy frame for possible integration into your own courses and academic program.
  - How might you and a librarian design learning experiences and assignments that will encourage students to assess their own attitudes, strengths/weaknesses, and knowledge gaps related to information?

### For Administrators: How to Support the Framework

Through reading the *Framework* document and discussing it with your institutions' librarians, you can begin to focus on the best mechanisms to implement the *Framework* in your institution. As an administrator, you can take the following approaches:

- Host or encourage a series of campus conversations about how the institution can incorporate the *Framework* into student learning outcomes and supporting curriculum.
- Provide the resources to enhance faculty expertise and opportunities for understanding and incorporating the *Framework* into the curriculum.
- Encourage committees working on planning documents related to teaching and learning (at the department, program, and institutional levels) to include concepts from the *Framework* in their work.
- Provide resources to support meaningful assessment of information literacy of students at various levels at your institution.
- Promote partnerships between faculty, librarians, instructional designers, and others to develop meaningful ways for students to become content creators, especially in their disciplines.

## Appendix 2: Background of the Framework Development

The *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* were published in 2000 and brought information literacy into higher education conversations and advanced our field tremendously. These, like all ACRL standards, are reviewed cyclically. In July 2011, ACRL appointed a Task Force to decide what, if anything, to do with the current *Standards*. In June 2012, that Task Force recommended that the current *Standards* be significantly revised. This previous review Task Force made recommendations that informed the current revision Task Force, created in 2013.

The charge for this Task Force was to *update the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education so that they reflect the current thinking on such things as the creation and dissemination of knowledge, the changing global higher education and learning environment, the shift from information literacy to information fluency, and the expanding definition of information literacy to include multiple literacies, for example, transliteracy, media literacy, digital literacy, etc.*

Two new elements underlie the model that has been developed: threshold concepts and metaliteracy. The Task Force released the first version of the new *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* in two parts in February and April of 2014 and received comments via two online hearings and a feedback form that was available online for four weeks. The committee then revised the document, released the second draft on June 17, 2014, and sought extensive feedback through a feedback form, two online hearings, an in-person hearing, and analysis of social media and topical blog posts.

On a regular basis, the Task Force used all of ACRL's and ALA's communication channels to reach both individual members and ALA and ACRL units (committees, sections, round tables, ethnic caucuses, chapters, and divisions) with updates. The Task Force's liaison at ACRL maintained a private e-mail distribution list of over 1,300 individuals who attended a fall, spring, or summer online forum; provided comments to the February, April, June, or November drafts; or were otherwise identified as having strong interest and expertise (such as members of the Task Force that drafted ILCSHE, leading LIS researchers and national project directors, members of the Information Literacy Rubric Development Team for the Association of American Colleges & Universities, Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education initiative). Via all these channels, the Task Force regularly shared updates, invited discussion at virtual and in-person forums and hearings, and encouraged comments on public drafts of the proposed *Framework*.

ACRL recognized early on that the effect of any changes to the *Standards* would be significant, both within the library profession and in higher education more broadly. In addition to general announcements, the Task Force contacted nearly 60 researchers who cited the *Standards* in publications outside library and information science literature, more than 70 deans, associate deans, directors or chairs of library and information science schools, and invited specific staff leaders (and press or communications contacts)

at more than 70 other higher education associations, accrediting agencies, and library associations and consortia to encourage their members to read and comment on the draft.

The Task Force systematically reviewed feedback from both the first and second drafts of the *Framework*, including comments, criticism, and praise provided through both formal and informal channels. There were 562 responses to the three official online feedback forms, as well as numerous direct e-mails sent to members of the Task Force. The group was proactive in tracking feedback on social media, namely blog posts and Twitter. While the data harvested from social media is not exhaustive, the Task Force made its best efforts to include all known Twitter conversations, blog posts, and blog commentary. In total, there were several hundred feedback documents, totaling well over a thousand pages, under review. The content of these documents was analyzed by members of the Task Force and coded using HyperResearch, qualitative data analysis software. During the drafting and vetting process, the Task Force provided more detail on the feedback analysis in an online FAQ document.

The Task Force continued to revise the document and then published the third revision in November 2014, again announcing broadly and seeking comments via a feedback form.

The Task Force members as of November 2014 included the following:

- Craig Gibson, Professor, Ohio State University Libraries (Co-chair)
- Trudi E. Jacobson, Distinguished Librarian and Head, Information Literacy Department, University at Albany, SUNY, University Libraries (Co-chair)
- Elizabeth Berman, Science and Engineering Librarian, University of Vermont (Member)
- Carl O. DiNardo, Assistant Professor and Coordinator of Library Instruction/Science Librarian, Eckerd College (Member)
- Lesley S. J. Farmer, Professor, California State University–Long Beach (Member)
- Ellie A. Fogarty, Vice President, Middle States Commission on Higher Education (Member)
- Diane M. Fulkerson, Social Sciences and Education Librarian, University of South Florida in Lakeland (Member)
- Merinda Kaye Hensley, Instructional Services Librarian and Scholarly Commons Co-coordinator, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Member)
- Joan K. Lippincott, Associate Executive Director, Coalition for Networked Information (Member)
- Michelle S. Millet, Library Director, John Carroll University (Member)
- Troy Swanson, Teaching and Learning Librarian, Moraine Valley Community College (Member)
- Lori Townsend, Data Librarian for Social Sciences and Humanities, University of New Mexico (Member)
- 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, from September 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014)
- Kara Malenfant, Senior Strategist for Special Initiatives, Association of College and Research Libraries (Staff Liaison)

In December 2014, the Task Force made final changes. Two other ACRL groups reviewed and provided feedback on the final drafts: the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee and the ACRL Standards Committee. The latter group submitted the final document and recommendations to the ACRL Board for their review at the 2015 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Chicago.

### Appendix Three: Sources for Further Reading

The following sources are suggested readings for those who want to learn more about the ideas underpinning the *Framework*, especially the use of threshold concepts and related pedagogical models. Some readings here also explore other models for information literacy, discuss students' challenges with information literacy, or offer examples of assessment of threshold concepts. Landmark works on threshold concept theory and research on this list are the edited volumes by Meyer, Land, and Baillie (*Threshold Concepts and Transformational Learning*) and by Meyer and Land (*Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge: Linkages to Ways of Thinking and Practicing within the Disciplines*). In addition, numerous research articles, conference papers, reports, and presentations on threshold concepts are cited on the regularly updated website Threshold Concepts: Undergraduate Teaching, Postgraduate Training, and Professional Development; A Short Introduction and Bibliography, available at <http://www.ee.ucl.ac.uk/~mflanaga/thresholds.html>.

- ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards Review Task Force. "Task Force Recommendations." ACRL AC12 Doc 13.1, June 2, 2012. [http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/files/content/standards/ils\\_recomm.pdf](http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/files/content/standards/ils_recomm.pdf).
- American Association for School Librarians. *Standards for the 21st-Century Learner*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2007. [http://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org/aasl/files/content/guidelinesandstandards/learningstandards/AASL\\_LearningStandards.pdf](http://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org/aasl/files/content/guidelinesandstandards/learningstandards/AASL_LearningStandards.pdf).
- Blackmore, Margaret. "Student Engagement with Information: Applying a Threshold Concept Approach to Information Literacy Development." Paper presented at the 3rd Biennial Threshold Concepts Symposium: Exploring Transformative Dimensions of Threshold Concepts, Sydney, Australia, July 1–2, 2010.
- Carmichael, Patrick. "Tribes, Territories, and Threshold Concepts: Educational Materialisms at Work in Higher Education." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 44, no. S1 (2012): 31–42.
- Coonan, Emma. *A New Curriculum for Information Literacy: Teaching Learning; Perceptions of Information Literacy*. Arcadia Project, Cambridge University Library, July 2011. [http://ccfil.pbworks.com/f/emma\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://ccfil.pbworks.com/f/emma_report_final.pdf).
- Cousin, Glynis. "An Introduction to Threshold Concepts." *Planet* 17 (December 2006): 4–5.
- . "Threshold Concepts, Troublesome Knowledge and Emotional Capital: An Exploration into Learning about Others." In *Overcoming Barriers to Student Understanding: Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge*, edited by Jan H. F. Meyer and Ray Land, 134–47. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Gibson, Craig, and Trudi Jacobson. "Informing and Extending the Draft ACRL Information Literacy Framework for Higher Education: An Overview and Avenues for Research." *College and Research Libraries* 75, no. 3 (May 2014): 250–4.
- Head, Alison J. "Project Information Literacy: What Can Be Learned about the Information-Seeking Behavior of Today's College Students?" Paper presented at the ACRL National Conference, Indianapolis, IN, April 10–13, 2013.

- Hofer, Amy R., Lori Townsend, and Korey Brunetti. "Troublesome Concepts and Information Literacy: Investigating Threshold Concepts for IL Instruction." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 12, no. 4 (2012): 387–405.
- Jacobson, Trudi E., and Thomas P. Mackey. "Proposing a Metaliteracy Model to Redefine Information Literacy." *Communications in Information Literacy* 7, no. 2 (2013): 84–91.
- Kuhlthau, Carol C. "Rethinking the 2000 ACRL Standards: Some Things to Consider." *Communications in Information Literacy* 7, no. 3 (2013): 92–97.
- . *Seeking Meaning: A Process Approach to Library and Information Services*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2004.
- Limberg, Louise, Mikael Alexandersson, Annika Lantz-Andersson, and Lena Folkesson. "What Matters? Shaping Meaningful Learning through Teaching Information Literacy." *Libri* 58, no. 2 (2008): 82–91.
- Lloyd, Annemaree. *Information Literacy Landscapes: Information Literacy in Education, Workplace and Everyday Contexts*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2010.
- Lupton, Mandy Jean. *The Learning Connection: Information Literacy and the Student Experience*. Blackwood: South Australia: Auslib Press, 2004.
- Mackey, Thomas P., and Trudi E. Jacobson. *Metaliteracy: Reinventing Information Literacy to Empower Learners*. Chicago: Neal-Schuman, 2014.
- Martin, Justine. "Refreshing Information Literacy." *Communications in Information Literacy* 7, no. 2 (2013): 114–27.
- Meyer, Jan, and Ray Land. *Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge: Linkages to Ways of Thinking and Practicing within the Disciplines*. Edinburgh, UK: University of Edinburgh, 2003.
- Meyer, Jan H. F., Ray Land, and Caroline Baillie. "Editors' Preface." In *Threshold Concepts and Transformational Learning*, edited by Jan H. F. Meyer, Ray Land, and Caroline Baillie, ix–xlii. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2010.
- Middendorf, Joan, and David Pace. "Decoding the Disciplines: A Model for Helping Students Learn Disciplinary Ways of Thinking." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 98 (2004): 1–12.
- Oakleaf, Megan. "A Roadmap for Assessing Student Learning Using the New Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 5 (September 2014): 510–4.
- Secker, Jane. *A New Curriculum for Information Literacy: Expert Consultation Report*. Arcadia Project, Cambridge University Library, July 2011.  
[http://ccfil.pbworks.com/f/Expert\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://ccfil.pbworks.com/f/Expert_report_final.pdf).
- Townsend, Lori, Korey Brunetti, and Amy R. Hofer. "Threshold Concepts and Information Literacy." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 11, no. 3 (2011): 853–69.
- Tucker, Virginia, Christine Bruce, Sylvia Edwards, and Judith Weedman. "Learning Portals: Analyzing Threshold Concept Theory for LIS Education." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 55, no. 2 (2014): 150–65.
- Wiggins, Grant, and Jay McTighe. *Understanding by Design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2004.

**This page intentionally left blank to accommodate double sided printing.**

**Transmittal Sheet for Draft Standards and Guidelines**

(To Accompany All New and Revised ACRL Standards and Guidelines)

**Title of Standard or Guideline:** ACRL Information Literacy Framework for Higher Education

**Section or Committee Submitting:** ACRL Information Literacy Standards for Higher Education Task Force

**Submitting Section or Committee Chairperson:** Trudi Jacobson and Craig Gibson, Co-Chairs

**Date of Previous Version:** January 18, 2000 (Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education)

**Means used to solicit comment on earlier drafts of the new/revised Standard or Guideline:**

  x   **Published in *C&RL News***

ACRL seeks feedback on draft Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education  
News from the Field

Coll. res. libr. news March 2014 75:114-117

<http://crln.acrl.org/content/75/3/114.full?sid=a6b6a740-e01c-4123-81f9-3a4c14157e97>

Hearing on Framework for Information Literacy Competency in Higher Education

ACRL programs at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference: A brief overview

Coll. res. libr. news May 2014 75:258-261

<http://crln.acrl.org/content/75/5/258.full?sid=d3948676-8628-45bd-b60d-7fc2a14c83c5>

ACRL seeks feedback on third draft of proposed Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education  
News from the Field

Coll. res. libr. news December 2014 75:594-597

<http://crln.acrl.org/content/75/11/594.full>

Additionally, ACRL's scholarly journal *College and Research Libraries* published a guest editorial by Craig Gibson and Trudi E. Jacobson "Informing and Extending the Draft ACRL Information Literacy Framework for Higher Education: An Overview and Avenues for Research" May 2014 75:250-254.

<http://crl.acrl.org/content/75/3/250.full.pdf+html?sid=17f4b6fb-ef3f-4f19-8193-2defa8758219>

  x   **Disseminated on email distribution lists (listservs): (give list names and dates):**

ACRLInsider Blog posts

1/10/2014

Expected February Release of Draft Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8145>

2/20/2014

ACRL Seeks Feedback on Draft Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8329>

3/19/2014

Draft Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education Progressing; Signup for Online Forum April 4 or 17

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8498>

4/4/2014

ACRL Releases Second Part of Draft Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8498>

4/14/2014

Comment on IL Framework by April 21; Participate in April 17 Online Forum

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8625>

6/04/ 2013

Rethinking ACRL's Information Literacy Standards: The Process Begins

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/7329>

6/12/2014

Sneak Peek at Forthcoming Revised IL Framework

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8779>

6/17/2014

ACRL seeks feedback on revised Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8911>

7/3/2014

FAQs on IL Framework available; Reminder: online hearings July 7 and 11, comments due July 15

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/8964>

8/15/2014

Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education Progressing; Third Draft for Comment Expected November 1

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/9058>

10/09/2013

Online Open Forums on Revised Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/7818>

10/23/ 2014

Your Comments Matter; 3rd Draft of Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education Forthcoming by mid-November

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/9374>

10/23/2014

Space Added for Upcoming Online Open Forums on Revised Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/7861>

11/12/2014

ACRL seeks feedback on third draft of proposed Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education  
<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/9460>

11/20/2014

FAQs about Proposed Framework for IL Updated; Comment on Draft by December 12  
<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/9486>

12/09/2014

Reminder: Comments Due Dec. 12 on Proposed Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education  
<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/9564>

After each blog post was up, an email message was sent with full text of announcement to these library lists:

- [ili-l@ala.org](mailto:ili-l@ala.org) (ACRL IS)
- [cjc-l@ala.org](mailto:cjc-l@ala.org) (ACRL CJCLS)
- [collib-l@ala.org](mailto:collib-l@ala.org) (ACRL CLS)
- [uls-l@ala.org](mailto:uls-l@ala.org) (ACRL ULS)
- [infolit@ala.org](mailto:infolit@ala.org) (ALA Info Lit)
- [infolit-l@infoserv.inist.fr](mailto:infolit-l@infoserv.inist.fr) (IFLA)
- Private, closed list of 1300+ interested individuals/experts

**\_x\_ Public hearing held [optional]:**

- Online July 7 (134 participants)
- July 11, 2014 (98 participants)

Additionally, the task force held public forums prior to these hearing. In person forums were held at the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago, IL, on June 29 and the 2014 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, PA, on January 25. Another public forum was held at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas, NV on June 28.

Online Forums (with # participants):

- Friday, April 4, 2014: 114
- Thursday, April 17, 2014: est. 158
- Thursday, October 17, 2013: 100
- Tuesday, October 29, 2013: 216
- Monday, November 4, 2013: 290

**\_x\_ Letters to "experts" requesting comments: (list names and dates):**

Tailored messages asking for feedback on the second draft (June 17, 2014) were sent by ACRL to:

- Specific staff leaders (and press/communications contacts) at 70 higher education associations, accrediting agencies and library associations/consortia asking them to distribute in their organizations/networks. Sometimes these messages were sent by ACRL staff who may have relationships with these groups already. Other times ACRL member leaders, such as ACRL liaisons, reached out to their contacts at other disciplinary associations (see full list at [http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/?page\\_id=214](http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/?page_id=214))
- 58 researchers who cited the ILCSHE in publications outside LIS, asking them to distribute in their organizations/networks

- 73 deans, associate deans, directors or chairs of library schools asking them to send to LIS faculty/students, particularly those with an interest in information literacy/instruction

**x   Other professional associations consulted (e.g., Society of American Archivists):**

In addition to the tailored messages sent to dozens of groups in June, as described above, ACRL staff leaders had a productive meeting on April 14, 2014, with Terry Rhodes of AAC&U who oversees the VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) assessment initiative. They discussed the VALUE rubric for information literacy in light of the proposed Framework. Additionally they reached out again to AAC&U leaders in mid-November when the third draft of the Framework was released.

**x   Other (please list):**

Feedback was encouraged via an online form on the April, July, and December drafts of the Framework.

- April: 239 responses
- July: 117 responses
- December: 206 responses

Below please find the demographics for this feedback, in comparison with the ACRL 2012 Membership Survey and the 2010 NCES Academic Library Survey. This shows the distribution of responses received, by type of institution, in comparison to distribution for ACRL members and general NCES distribution.

Type of Organization	2012 ACRL Membership Survey	2010 NCES Academic Library Survey	04/14 Framework Feedback Form (239 responses)		07/14 Framework Feedback Form (117 responses)		12/14 Framework Feedback Form (206 responses)	
			Individuals	Groups (same institution)	Individuals	Groups (same institution)	Individuals	Groups (same institution)
Two-year/technical	12%	16.70%	15.07% 22	16.00% 12	10.11% 9	13.04% 3	19.29% 27	4.26% 2
Four-year/baccalaureate	15%	10.20%	14.38% 21	17.33% 13	19.10% 17	21.74% 5	21.43% 30	34.04% 16
Comprehensive (undergraduate/graduate)	24%	20.80%	23.97% 35	14.67% 11	28.09% 25	21.74% 5	20.71% 29	10.64% 5
University (large research/doctoral granting)	43%	43.30%	21.23% 31	21.33% 16	14.61% 13	8.70% 2	16.43% 23	19.15% 9

Research University (high/very high research activity)	n/a	n/a	21.92%	30.67%	28.09%	30.43%	18.57%	29.79%
			32	23	25	7	26	14
Independent research library	2%	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
			0	0	0	0	0	0
Information-related organization	2%	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.71%	2.13%
			0	0	0	0	1	1
Graduate school of library/information science	2%	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	0.00%
			0	0	0	0	2	0
Special	n/a	n/a	3.42%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%	0.71%	0.00%
			5	0	0	1	1	0
Tribal College	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.71%	0.00%
			0	0	0	0	1	0
K-12 School	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
					0	0	0	0

**Other information:**

Before issuing the third draft for public comment on November 12, 2014, a professional copyeditor revised the document following the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th ed. This final version we are appending now has only minor edits from that third draft.

**Date Approved by Information Literacy Standards Committee** January 12, 2015

**Date Approved by Standards Committee** January 15, 2015

**Date Approved by ACRL Board** \_\_\_\_\_

**Where and on whose responsibility should this (Standard or Guideline) be published or otherwise disseminated?**  
**C&RL News by** \_\_\_\_\_

**Other (please list)**

**This page intentionally left blank to accommodate double sided printing.**