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Creating a Campus-Wide Information Literacy Agenda

Patricia Iannuzzi, Dean, University Libraries
Chris Heavey, Director, General Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Big picture

What is happening – how we can and DO help

SLO articulation – integration – assessment of student learning – faculty development…

Sensitivity to campus culture.. Opportunistic – strategic hooks..
Some of what happened at UNLV

========================================

Information literacy stands beside critical thinking and oral and written communication as fundamental proficiencies required for academic, professional, and personal success. These lifelong learning abilities overlap and intersect in many ways and far beyond library communities. Higher education associations, regional and disciplinary accreditation bodies, and even employers are demanding evidence that students graduate with these skills. Yet colleges and universities struggle with articulating the desired learning outcome in specific ways that align with assessment practices and the collection of evidence of student achievement. Engaging faculty in rethinking curriculum beyond their courses, and even beyond their major, to create a coherent pathway for students to develop and reinforce these skills, is one of the greatest challenges in curriculum conversations. Libraries can help. But we need to be clear on our own role, sensitive to our unique campus cultures, and opportunistic about ways we can identify the unique strategic hooks for our own institutions in order to help advance the conversations and ensure the libraries place at the center of student learning.
Fundamentally boils down to alignment of these three
but we need to plan for the entire student experience..

How are we articulating embedding and gathering evidence through the library experiences, the courses, the program, and then at the institutional level? This was the core of our GWLA project – trying to find out what our campuses were doing – at each level – and what data was being collected..

Many pieces -- gathering evidence in specific places but not in others -- some of you only assess info lit from within the libraries…. Or not at all - - some have a core course in gen ed – others are struggling with linking these skills to the major
So allow me to share one more model of the pieces of this puzzle – and how our assessment plans need to be comprehensive to address the parts of the pieces:

My model for the state of undergraduate education reform is a building -- the roof of my structure is what the student should know when they leave us -- content knowledge, skills and abilities, behaviors and attitudes.. (in this case essential learning outcomes from AAC&U)

Every institution needs to start with a clear articulation of the learning outcomes desired – whether you use the frame offered by AACU or WASC or DQP or Common Core… you clusters of learning outcomes that need to be described in measurable ways for your institution…

the foundation for student learning is engagement-- engaging students in educational experiences that motivate them -- rooted in practices that research has shown lead to higher levels of student motivation and learning.. (such as first year experiences, service learning, undergraduate research, internships, etc)

Motivating students through a curriculum that provides a coherent pathway with milestone markers for the students to assess for themselves how they are doing – with learning outcomes clearly articulated in the first year – in the middle – and at the end -- basically “what we teach”

But what we teach is not enough for students to develop critical thinking and information literacy – related abilities – its also how we teach -- How students are inspired and engaged through learning strategies designed to encourage their passion and curiosity – teaching
methods that are student centered – active, reflective, – rooted in real life. Courses that align those learning outcomes with activities and assessments so that if a faculty member says they want students in their course to have specific information literacy skills – what are they? What is reasonable within a course? What activities and assignments will support their development? What assessments are applied to measure their achievement?

And then the importance of engaging students to take steps for their own development through experiences available external to the curriculum – but intentionally linked to it through campus collaborations.

This image is a reminder of the complex framework for learning that extends far beyond the content of the course. And that no single column or even two – can support the end result ...

Libraries have a role in all areas – in the curricular through course integration of learning outcomes – in the faculty – through helping faculty design assignments that place library collections and information literacy at the heart of student learning – through the co-curricular – the real and virtual places we create for students to learn independently – or with us – outside of the classroom.

But so do other academic partners on campus.
As many of you note, faculty buy in is a challenge – but I say – start where they are… most faculty want their students to develop these abilities – you need to find the framework that works for the culture of your campus…

So find one resonates – and don’t worry about the labels – everyone does – and it’s a red herring.

Here is an activity I like to use to both demonstrate the irrelevance of label
A b or c?

Back in 2006 – derek Bok – President emeritus Harvard…made this statement – I can’t tell if its about information literacy or critical thinking – frankly I don’t care – it describes a set of outcomes that we are talking about.. And perhaps provides a frame that would resonate on your campus…
articulates and applies criteria for evaluating both the information and its sources, including: analyzes the structure and logic of supporting arguments or methods; recognizes prejudice, deception, or manipulation

From Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, Standard 3, performance indicator 2

a. information literacy  b. critical thinking  c. communication
presents evidence in an order that contributes to a persuasive and coherent argument

From Collegiate Learning Assessment - Common Scoring Rubric – Part 2 Written Communication

a. information literacy  b. critical thinking  c. communication
Identifies, categorizes, evaluates and cites multiple information resources necessary to engage in projects, papers or performance in his or her program...

From Lumina Foundation, *Degree Qualifications Profile Intellectual Skills*

a. information literacy  b. critical thinking  c. communication
We are speaking the same language – but using different words.. And the biggest barrier is our own soapbox…

I have been talking to librarians about this for 20 years – we want info lit in the curr – across the curr – etc.. And we are not alone – the critical thinking community – the writing across the curriculum community – the oral communication experts – the multicultural learning professionals -- and then suddenly we have a curriculum stuffed with agendas – bits and pieces of very important content and approaches – but nonetheless often lacking integration .. Or worse – important parts get left out because classroom instructors say “enough” – no more credits added – no more class time on “add ons” -- I need room for my important content from the
major...
And speaking of red herrings – I was asked to address the question about the ACRL standards revision. I don’t want to go on – I have a specific position – I just wrote a perspectives piece in Communications in Information Literacy. These are the recommendations and the direction they are going. I don’t support the current direction…

Time for redefining is over – lots of models out there - 13 years ago if I were to give this presentation I would have one frame --- the standards – since then we have had AACU, DQP, Common Core, and others… I believe that a refocussing on definitions is a red herring – the real challenge is having tools to help institutions like yours embed them.
developmentally – beginning middle and end – with corresponding rubrics and standardized performance based tests
So that’s all I want to say about articulating outcomes – we have lots of models – pay attention to culture – and if your campus already has them, find info lit in them…

Now, remember this? What we teach -- Beginning middle and end…
I am going to turn this over to Chris to talk about what we did at UNLV
Building our University Undergraduate Learning Outcomes

- 2007 Campus-wide retreat
  - Identified broad areas for student learning
- Spring 2008 formed Gen Ed Advisory Committee
  - Refined into five learning outcomes
- Summer 2008 sent two teams to AAC&U
- Fall 2008 vetted UULOs and explored High-Impact Practices
- Spring 2009 vetted in meetings across campus
  - refined….vetted…refined…discussed….
- Spring 2011 adopted by Faculty Senate
University Undergraduate Learning Outcomes – UULOs

- Intellectual Breadth and Lifelong Learning
- Inquiry and Critical Thinking
- Communication
- Global/Multicultural Knowledge and Awareness
- Citizenship and Ethics
University Undergraduate Learning Outcomes

The University Undergraduate Learning Outcomes (UULOs) define what all students should know and be able to do when they graduate. Because students engage with the UULOs in both their general education and academic majors, the UULOs help make the undergraduate experience meaningful and coherent.

**Intellectual Breadth and Lifelong Learning**

Graduates are able to contextualize and integrate basic principles of the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, fine arts, and health sciences, and develop skills and a sense of lifelong learning. Specific outcomes for all students include:

1. Demonstrate a depth of knowledge and skills in at least one major area.
2. Identify the basic principles of natural and health sciences, social sciences, humanities, and fine arts.
3. Apply the methods and theories to solve problems in the natural and health sciences, social sciences, humanities, and fine arts.
4. Recognize the growth of knowledge and how knowledge is transmitted and revised.
5. Demonstrate the learning ability to solve problems by participating in meaningful activities, reflect on one’s own understanding, demonstrate awareness of social trends, collaborate with others, analyze learning plans, and act upon identity on the college和社会 environment.
6. Achieve success in an academic discipline, including applying persistence, motivation, interpersonal communications, writing, presenting, and research.

**Inquiry and Critical Thinking**

Graduates are able to identify problems, express questions, and use relevant forms of research in measurable and meaningful contexts to order, and use information relevant to the problem. Specific outcomes for all students include:

1. Identify problems, articulate questions, or hypotheses, and determine the need for further research.
2. Access and collect the needed information from appropriate primary and secondary sources.
3. Use one or more qualitative methods, including the ability to recognize and interpret assumptions, characterize, evaluate, and interpret information in the context of problems or issues to draw conclusions.
4. Recognize the complexity of problems and identify different perspectives from which the problem or question can be viewed.
5. Demonstrate appropriate conduct, including interpreting and translation of findings and their ability to determine whether a question is relevant.
6. Identify, analyze and evaluate various good and valid alternatives and select reasonable arguments or explanations.
Communication
Students will be able to write and speak effectively both generally and in specialized situations, or communicate thoughtfully in an online environment, and be efficacious as communicators.

- Articulate personal thoughts clearly and coherently.
- Develop a strong argumentative essay that is relevant.

Global/Multicultural Knowledge and Awareness
Students will have a comprehensive understanding of global and multicultural societies and an awareness of their place in the global community. Specific outcomes include:

- Demonstrate knowledge of history, philosophy, and geography of world cultures.
- Apply critical thinking and reasoning to analyze problems in a diverse context.
- Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively in diverse groups.

Citizenship and Ethics
Students will be able to participate in ways and activities in the public life of our communities and states at the local, national, and international levels. Specific outcomes include:

- Acquire knowledge of ethical, social, and political issues.
- Apply ethical and legal principles appropriately.
- Evaluate the impact of technology on society.
Building a Model to Deliver the UULOs

• Vertical Integration
• Beginning, Middle, End
• Communication
• Partnership
• Support
Vertically Integrated Education at UNLV

First-Year Seminar
2-3 credits

Second-Year Seminar
3 credits

Milestone Experience

Culminating Experience

University Undergraduate Learning Outcomes
- Intellectual Breadth and Lifelong Learning
- Inquiry and Critical Thinking
- Communication
- Global/Multicultural Knowledge and Awareness
- Citizenship and Ethics

University Undergraduate Learning Outcomes
- English Composition: 6 credits
- US and Nevada Constitutions: 4-6 credits
- Mathematics: 3 credits
- Distribution (outside major): 18-19 credits
- Fine Arts & Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Life and Physical Sciences and Analytical Thinking
- Multicultural and International

Color code: Gen Ed, Gen Ed Major, Major

http://generaled.unlv.edu/
Thanks Chris

And because we are almost all Carnegie research 1 in this room – I am going to remind you of this bit of ancient history that is remarkably relevant today….

recommendations – made 12 years ago… and I have been using this slide in various iterations that long…

I don’t know about you – but we have worked
on – or are working on all but the last two at UNLV – and some may see it as coincidental – but I know it was intentional on the part of SOME people (but that’s another story about how libraries can lead on their campus)
Back to this model – only did the one column… how many of us are challenged by faculty buy in?

Not just about what we teach – but how we teach…
Video of Faculty
Finks model – embed librarians as partners – create the table – the space - partner on articulating outcomes – assignments that scale and align – assessments..

most comfortable in foundational knowledge area but this model provides a frame for faculty to compare their own course goals to see if they have them in various areas of the taxonomy with an expectation of learning outcomes with corresponding activities and assessments in other areas…such as critical thinking and learning how to learn, and developing feelings or passion for the subject matter.. And most important – being explicit about all three areas and ensuring alignment -- clear articulation of learning outcomes, alignment with activities designed to scaffold learning, and assessments that are clear in how performance is going to be measured.
Bringing the Model to Life

• Partnership, Communication, Support
• Library expertise with faculty development
  – Institute on Inquiry-Based Learning
• Staged Implementation:
  – First-Year Seminar – Fall 2012
  – Second-Year Seminar – Fall 2013
  – Milestone Experience – Fall 2014
  – Culminating Experience – Fall 2015
Faculty Institutes

• First-Year Seminar
  – April 2-4, 2012

• Second-Year Seminar
  – January 14-16, 2013

• Milestone Experience
  – January/February 2014

• Culminating Experience
Finally – the last pillar of my temple for student learning is the co-curricular environment... how do assess the value added from these experiences that happen external to the curriculum..

We also have a breakout on this topic – so I am not going to belabor the point
Bridging The Gap – UNLV Libraries Adds Value To Student Employment Experience

Library student assistants participate in an interactive communication exercise where one person is the communicator and the other person is the listener. The goal is for the listener to understand the instructions from their partner as to how to place a distinct set of shapes in a specific order. Both partners had the opportunity to experience their current verbal communication and listening skills in action and under a time crunch.
Librarians ed role – teaching (students directly) = planning (curriculum mapping) – partnering (course design and assessments)…
Chat a bit about assessment

Setting outcomes more ubiquitous – measuring them less so…

Bulk of work now is on that alignment – at all levels…

What can libraries do… think about these phrases – understand them – apply them locally --

For example

Project at UNLV Erin Rinto did to partner with comp
program – develop a rubric for info lit – collect sample work – assess – and use results to inform assignment and training of GAs who teach…

Performance based – mostly at course level – librarians partner with faculty on assignment design – active and authentic..

Summative – can be standardized – or can be a direct assessment of a body of student work… we used Iskills on a group of exiting hotel students – got results and used to inform conversations with faculty..
What assessments are available? So everyone is looking for the silver bullet… can we just test for information literacy? And if you do, what data does it yield and what do you do with the results?

This is from a wonderful article by Megan on the dangers and opportunities in approaches for both fixed choice and performance based assessments.
And “standardized tests” are varied – some are fixed choice and some are performance, and some are mixed.

Here are a few that I have selected to highlight – and I expect you will learn more about others from my colleagues.

We probably all have opinions based upon our experiences. I will share some of my own.

SAILS – not info lit – lib instruction. Multiple
choice – stripped out all higher order… - otherwise excellent instrument – valid and reliable -- I think this is a good test to use if multiple assessments are being used and there are rubrics or other instruments in place to assess the higher order skills

ISKills

Performance based, not multiple choice; interactive tasks that are real time, scenario based, and use simulated technology [Web search engines, databases, emails, spreadsheet, presentation slides]

provides a variety of reports (including comparison)

evaluates critical thinking in the digital environment with scores in seven sections…Define, access, evaluate, manage, integrate, create, communicate

CAAP Critical thinking test - 40-minute test that measures students' skills in clarifying, analyzing, evaluating, and extending arguments.. Each passage is accompanied by a set of multiple-choice test items. A total score is provided for the Critical Thinking Test; no subscores are provided…
32 multiple choice..based on passages read..

Analysis of elements of an argument -- .53–.66 -17–21 items
Evaluation of an argument --.16–.28  5–9 items
Extension of an argument .. .19  6 items

CLA -- According to the common scoring rubric for CLA, CLA does not cover outcomes defined in ISkills as defining and accessing information – specifically articulate a need for information that defines a hypothesis or problem in operational terms, develop and apply a systematic strategy for ethically and legally finding, retrieving, and sorting information from a variety of relevant resources, representing a wide range of perspectives, acknowledging sources appropriately

CAT  train trainer – faculty teams to score – labor intensive  - difficult to scale
According to the common scoring rubric for CLA, CLA does not cover outcomes defined in ISkills as defining and accessing information – specifically *articulate a need for information that defines a hypothesis or problem in operational terms, develop and apply a systematic strategy for ethically and legally finding, retrieving, and sorting information from a variety of relevant resources, representing a wide range of perspectives, acknowledging sources appropriately*

And info lit does not address the craft of writing.
Let's talk a little bit about rubrics – there are three major sources for info lit and related rubrics.

VALUE rubrics -- institutional, RAILS

Rubric Norming Process – from RAILS
1. Think aloud through scoring several examples.
2. Ask raters to independently score a set of examples that reflects the range of services libraries produce.
3. Bring raters together to review their scores to identify patterns of consistent and inconsistent scores.
4. Discuss and then reconcile inconsistent scores.

5. Repeat the process of independent scoring on a new set of examples.

6. Again, bring all raters together to review their scores to identify patterns of consistent and inconsistent scores.

7. Discuss and then reconcile inconsistent scores. This process is repeated until raters reach consensus about applying the scoring rubric. Ordinarily, two to three of these sessions calibrate raters’ responses.
## Required Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Margin of Error</th>
<th>Confidence = 95%</th>
<th>Confidence = 99%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing Student Learning

• Course Level
• Program Level
  – Objective data: e.g., retention
  – Perceptions of student learning
  – Demonstration of student learning