

Information Literacy Frameworks and Standards Committee

Meeting - June 26, 2016

Committee members present: Jeanne Davidson, Nancy Fawley, Sharon Mader, Ted Mulvey, Amanda Nichols Hess

Meeting began 3:05pm

1. Introductions:
 - a. The committee introduced themselves.
 - b. Two guests were also present: Brad Seitz, director of LOEX in Ypsilanti, MI; Jan McCartney, librarian at Rasmussen College, Ocala, FL
2. Updates from ACRL Leadership:
 - a. Jeanne shared that the *ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* were rescinded by the board on 6/25/16. This statement prompted considerable discussion; Jeanne noted that the development was somewhat unexpected. The board had planned to discuss perspectives, but ultimately decided to rescind instead of waiting. At the ACRL board meeting on 6/27/16, the board would discuss what comes next.
 - b. In this meeting, the point was raised that there seem to be disconnects between what the ACRL committees are doing and what the ACRL board knows these committees are doing. For instance, as the board grapples with what to do next, they are not recalling the charge and tasks of this committee. To address this issue, Jeanne and Sharon jointly submitted memo in spring addressing how the *Standards, Framework*, and discipline documents fit into the bigger picture of higher education. Sharon and Jeanne will also raise this issue, and their memo, at the ACRL board meeting on 6/27/16.
 - c. Jeanne shared resources discussed by the ACRL board that exist to help librarians integrate the *Framework* -- e.g. LibGuides are available through ACRL, and *C&RL News* will begin publishing a column in the fall that focuses on perspectives on the *Framework*. These may be resources we can share with sections as they develop discipline-specific information literacy documents. Also, there is a new committee at the ACRL leadership level examining where the *Framework* fits into our profession under the "new roles and changing landscapes" umbrella.
3. Updates from ACRL Standards Committee:
 - a. The changes we made to Chapter 14 were approved with little discussion. Ted will clean up this document and send it to David Free, who will vet it and put it in the manual.
4. Review 2015-2016 annual report:
 - a. Jeanne is working on developing a draft and will share this for review.
5. Discuss 2016-2017 work plan:
 - a. This document will include:
 - i. Revising procedures and expectations based on the *ACRL Framework* and the two pilot sections we've worked with this year. Some of this work is already

completed (i.e., Ch. 14), while other components still need to be finished (i.e., the checklist and tip sheet).

- ii. Debrief with the two pilot sections and gain their input to inform the tip sheet. In particular, we need to gain information on what they experienced and what can be generalizable. Some of this information may come from the EBSS / WGSS discussion group held on 6/27/16, where Sharon and Jeanne will present.
 - iii. Continue to work through the pilot project of revising discipline-specific information literacy documents in light of the *Framework*. While this work is underway, the timeline for completing these drafts is TBD. Jeanne noted that she will inquire about this timeline on 6/27/16 at the discussion group, and if no timeline exists, we will need to develop communications mechanisms to continue this work.
 - iv. The ACRL board seemed to be concerned that mechanisms for further oversight / development for the *Framework* needed to be developed; this task is something we have been working on. Jeanne and Sharon will point this out again and re-address it with the ACRL board once there is more clarity re: the *Standards*.
 1. The question was raised about what would happen if people want to make changes to the information literacy frames set forth in the *Framework*, since it is a flexible and living document. The best course of action identified was to address adjustments during the review cycle, which will occur every five years.
6. Finalize tip sheet:
- a. Sharon raised an important concern about how the tip sheet can provide both flexibility and structure. The group determined that, in the introduction, a statement will be included that indicates that the tip sheet allows for flexibility so that the discipline-specific needs can be addressed in the format that is the most appropriate for their needs (i.e., more standards-structured with outcomes and objectives).
 - b. With the *Standards* being rescinded, the group noted that any mention of the term needed to be removed and replaced with the term “companion documents.” Brad Sietz raised the issue that librarians may not know what this term means. To address this issue, the group determined that some examples of these kinds of documents would be included in the tip sheet for context.

- c. There was discussion around whether more information on assessment should be included in the tip sheet, but the group came to no resolution. This issue is one that continues to develop as
 - d. An extensive discussion ensued about what constitutes a “disciplinary companion document.” For instance, do specific learning environments (e.g. distance learners, community colleges) constitute a “discipline”? Does general education represent its own discipline? Jeanne raised the point that maybe we exclude the word “disciplinary” and simply refer to “companion documents.” From this suggestion, further discussion was generated: Would extending the reach of these companion documents duplicate or supplant what other ACRL groups or committees are doing? Would these broader documents for environments be competing documents with the *Framework*? From the discussion of these potential companion documents, Brad raised the issue of how ACRL is supporting librarians as they try to transition from the *Standards* to the *Framework*, especially since companion documents may take considerable time to develop. The *Framework* sandbox was mentioned as a tool that will be soon available for use, but the point was raised that librarians are really searching for support *now*. Jeanne noted that part of the struggle to provide support related to the unclear relationship of the *Standards*, the *Framework*, and 21st century information literacy instruction when both documents were in place. Now that the *Standards* have been rescinded, she hopes this shift will help to generate resources and support tools for librarians integrating the *Framework*.
 - i. The group determined that we would stick with the use of disciplinary for now.
 - e. Nancy also noted that, on page 3, she needed to change the name of the checklist document that is referenced (“Checklist for Developing Subject-Specific Information Literacy Standards”).
 - f. The committee agreed that, after these minor updates are made, the members will read through the tip sheet one more time to ensure all references to the *Standards* have been removed and all other small edits have been made.
7. Begin work on the Checklist document:
- a. The committee will work on the checklist document as part of its 2016-2017 work. Ted will be in touch with Jeanne as needed.
 - b. Most of the information in this document is accurate, except for some wordsmithing (e.g. changing standards to frameworks, removing information literacy consultants).

Action items:

- Jeanne will complete the 2015-2016 annual report and will share it with Ted and Nancy so they can create the 2016-2017 work plan.
- The committee will make the small changes to the tip sheet, and his resource will then go to David Free to be put on the website. There are no other committees that need to review this document, since it is procedural rather than policy-based.

Meeting adjourned 4:47 pm

Respectfully submitted by Amanda Nichols Hess, 7/12/16