Fall 2005

Department-Integrated Information Literacy: A Middle Ground

William Joseph Thomas

East Carolina University, thomasw@mail.ecu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/seln

 Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Higher Education Administration Commons, and the Library and Information Science Commons

Department-Integrated Information Literacy: A Middle Ground

William Joseph Thomas

William Joseph Thomas is currently an Instruction and Reference Librarian at the Joyner Library of East Carolina University. He can be reached at thomasw@mail.ecu.edu

Introduction

Much of the current literature on information literacy on college and university campuses encourages instructional services librarians and departments to pursue one of two options: either integrate information literacy into the curriculum as a campus-wide initiative, or establish a for-credit information literacy course taught by librarians. For a variety of reasons, instructional programs may not be able to accomplish either of these goals immediately. Perhaps the library does not have the institutional influence to mount a campus-wide program, or maybe the library lacks the needed resources in terms of personnel or instructional facilities. Tackling the planning required for a program spanning the University curriculum may seem overwhelming. The issues of influence and resources may also be reasons why a library cannot establish a credit-bearing course. Still, we cannot do nothing.

There is a third alternative available to information literacy librarians: working with faculty within a selected department to integrate information literacy goals and instruction into that department as a whole. The whole campus may be too large; one department is not. The resources required for expanding information literacy to the entire campus are beyond the scope of overextended librarians and instructional services departments; the resources required to plan with and reach out to one department are not over-taxing. Integrating information literacy components into a department may provide a stepping-stone approach from which librarians may eventually integrate information literacy into a campus-wide educational enterprise. What is required, and how should we set about integrating information literacy into one department? And, where will this strategy lead us?

What Is Required?

This approach is already on the horizon, most notably in the California State University system. Ilene F. Rockman (2003) provides success stories from Biological Sciences, History, Educational Psychology, and First-Year Experiences in the California State University system. Rockman's article indicates that professors in the departments worked with librarians to integrate information literacy competencies into more than one course, but it does not offer a planning structure or methodology for doing so. Also significant are the efforts underway at San Jose State University. Patricia Senn Breivik and Robert McDermand (2004) briefly describe collaborative efforts in the Art, Biology, Business, and English Departments, and, importantly, the role of the Outreach Librarian in coordinating these efforts. There are also articles describing ventures into integrating information literacy into the Science curriculum and the Psychology curricula (Paglia and Donahue 2003; Brown and Krumholz 2002). The latter two articles are specific to single classes, though: in the first case, a "senior-level geomicrobiology course," and in the second, a Psychology research methods class. This article provides starting points for a general process that librarians at varied types of institutions could follow with any academic department.

The process described in the current article is based on a partnership with a single targeted academic department in addressing how to educate all its students. For purposes of demonstration, this article will focus on partnering with the English Department. The information literacy librarian attempting to establish such a program needs to be aware of the department's goals for its students, the required and elective courses, and the research agenda required by the various courses. The librarian must be able to demonstrate how the library and its instructional goals fit within the department's research agenda. For the English Department, the librarians would discuss with

departmental faculty not only what research skills should be taught to the Composition classes, but also in the lower level elective classes, required classes for majors, upper level undergraduate classes, and capstone courses. This process must span Rhetoric, Linguistics, Literature, Creative Writing, and other classes taught by the English Department. When, for instance, should students learn to navigate general multidisciplinary databases? When should they be proficient in the process of going from identifying citations to getting to print or electronic copies of the articles or the appropriate interlibrary loan request? At what course level should they be proficient in using the *MLA Bibliography,* the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature,* or other indexes?

Librarians recognize that in general, research processes have much overlap among subject areas and resources, but in order to integrate information literacy into a specific department, librarians and the departmental faculty must identify specific research goals and specific research tools. Generalizations in research processes will help librarians continue to meet instruction strategies and reference needs for existing service. What is required to begin a department-integrated information literacy initiative are a department with which to work, an existing library instruction program, willing hands, and the commitment to work together with other librarians and faculty in the department.

How Do We Accomplish Our Goal?

Succinctly put, the following stages can lead to integrating information literacy into a department:

- Select an entry point
- Map information literacy goals onto the department's goals
- Work with departmental faculty to plan
- Draft assessment measures
- Support the students

For starters, the library must identify a department with which to work. The entry point may be any need that spurs a closer working relationship between the department and teaching librarians. In "Writing Information Literacy in the Classroom," Rolf Norgaard discusses the "old ghosts and new specters" of the research paper and current concerns regarding plagiarism (2004, 221). Norgaard goes on to discuss recent curricular design and anti-plagiarism efforts by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (the WPA). These efforts have led to the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition," a document which "offers a very hospitable context for information-literacy initiatives" in its approach to teaching composition (2004, 221). Linking national statements for Composition with those in Information Literacy creates an entry point for an instruction librarian to approach the English Department.

For other departments, accreditation requirements may provide the entry point. As Hannelore Rader indicates, accrediting agencies have begun "including appropriate criteria for outcome measurements regarding information literacy in the accreditation requirements" (2004, 75). The accreditation requirements make the departments eager to cooperate with the library, and lead to the next step.

Next, map Information Literacy goals onto the department's goals. This is not a short conversation. Perhaps the best place to begin is with the required courses for majors. What kinds of research skills should majors have when they graduate? Compile a list, and then compare this list to the research skills named in the ACRL's Information Literacy Competency Standards (2000). Provide breakdowns of competencies and department-identified research skills by level or by course. To use the English Department as an example, professors and librarians may create the following list of research skills, based on individual courses. The first level Composition classes have a general introduction to the library collections and catalog, generate adequate search terms for the library catalog based on the thesis for their paper, then refine those search terms based on interpreting their results from catalog searches. The second level Composition classes learn to search general multidisciplinary databases and learn how to find the articles to which their citations point. The first required course for majors introduces students to the *MLA International Bibliography*, and a required British literature class delves into the *Annual*

Bibliography of English Language and Literature.

We can then chart these department-identified goals alongside the closest Information Literacy Competency Standard equivalent, moving from Standard One's relationship to thesis statements (1.1.b), modifying the information need (1.1.d) and identifying relevant databases and indexes (1.1.c) to Standard Two's practical application of searching the specified databases and indexes (2.2.d, 2.2.e), and going from retrieving citations to retrieving articles (2.3). Sue Samson and Michelle S. Millet provide an example of how this mapping would work at the single-class level for a required English Composition course and for a Public Speaking class at the University of Montana—see specifically their Appendices B and C (2003, 94). Jennifer Laherty has mapped the National Science Education Content Standards with ACRL's Standards, as a means of familiarizing herself with the subject discourse and in order to integrate information literacy into Science education (2000).

Recently, the Literatures in English Section of ACRL began drafting research competency guidelines for literatures in English (2004). Modeled on ACRL's Information Literacy Competency Standards, the LES Research Competency Guidelines are designed to offer "a more specific and source oriented approach within the disciplines of English literatures, with a concrete list of research skills" (2004). Because these guidelines are specific to the discipline, they are helpful to the librarian who wants to integrate information literacy to the English Department. The librarian should still work collaboratively with English faculty in his or her own school to tailor a program best suited to that institution. Librarians working with other subject areas may soon have more examples of this kind of discipline-specific information literacy goals they can use when planning for department-integrated information literacy.

Planning is the most time-intensive step in this process. The teaching librarian must work not only with the department as a whole in terms of planning how to recognize information literacy goals within its research agenda; she must work with each professor in terms of that professor's specific classes. The programming must go from the departmental level to individual classes and even, perhaps, to individual assignments. Planning for the program may not change the department's allocation of time or resources much, but it certainly changes the library's. The need for classroom space and time for the librarian to work with the professors and students will increase. The library administration must support this reallocation of the instruction librarian's time and focus of work. The ACRL's "Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices" offers additional planning considerations, including the need to collaborate with students, faculty, librarians and others, the need to establish both formal and informal communications mechanisms, and the need to conduct assessments (2003).

As part of the planning process, assessment measures help create a feedback loop to refine and plan for the future. Draft assessment measures both for the students within each class and for the information literacy program itself. Paglia and Donahue used four assessment methods, based on D. Barclay's recommendations for evaluating library instruction: anecdotal evidence, survey, testing, and evidence of use (2003, 322). These assessment measures span formal and informal communication, and include both direct and indirect methods. Anecdotal evidence may come from observations undertaken during classes and at the Reference Desk and conversations with faculty and students. Pre-tests, post-tests, and surveys at the end of the course or intermittently during the semester may all be valid formal assessment measures. The librarian or departmental faculty member may test students directly on methodology related to information literacy, as part of testing for course content. Paglia and Donahue used an annotated bibliography assignment as their evidence of use assessment, although there are other options (2003, 322-323). Cecelia Brown and Lee R. Krumholz, for instance, had their students present journal articles, conduct literature searches related to the presented articles, and critique the articles (2002, 113). Brown and Krumholz's students were scored by both microbiology professor and librarian for both course content and information literacy competency, respectively. This assignment certainly provides data allowing the collaborators to assess the students' evidence of

use. Librarians and departmental faculty may be able to assess their information literacy program using some of the same four styles. Assessing the program itself will suggest directions for future growth and development.

Finally, support the students—this support should be embedded in all the processes along the way. Just as the students have their professor for their class, they should have their librarian. Students should recognize their librarian, should feel comfortable sending email or calling to ask questions, and should sign up for individual research consultations when they need them. This isn't to say that students should bypass the Reference Desk or other librarians, but student support is, after all, the ultimate aim in any information literacy program, and the true measure of its success.

Where Will This Strategy Lead Us?

Success in integrating information literacy into one department provides a springboard to the next department. One department isn't enough, any more than relying on a one-shot instruction session is enough. The ultimate goal is to create a campus-wide information literacy program.

Practically, how do we proceed? English Departments in many colleges and universities are associated with Writing Centers, and the partnership between the library and the English Department leads the library to the Writing Center next. Students who need writing help may also need research help. Therefore, teaching assistants (TA's) for the Writing Center will benefit from basic training in instructing students in research skills. The TA's should also be aware of the availability of librarian instruction, whether individual research consultations, or teaching at the Reference Desk, or other possibilities.

If working with the Writing Center isn't feasible, target the next department that provides a reasonable entry point. Examine already-existing working relationships with departments for which the library already teaches instruction sessions. Be familiar with accreditation requirements for various degrees—they may provide the next entry point. Build on the success of that first experience.

San Jose State University has enlisted an Outreach Librarian to coordinate these kinds of departmental efforts (Breivik and McDermand, 2004, 210). The Outreach Librarian has created more opportunities for entry points by establishing a relationship with the Center for Faculty Development, offering a new faculty orientation, promoting the University Scholars Series, and sponsoring a faculty publications reception (2004, 212). Other universities may already have a Coordinator of Information Literacy or Instruction, relationships with centers for teaching and learning, or may already participate in activities which contribute to the librarians' sense of being part of the campus scholarly endeavor. The point is, the groundwork has already been laid. What remains is to take advantage of it.

References

Association of College and Research Libraries. 2000. "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/informationliteracycompetency.htm#stan. (accessed June 17, 2005).

Association of College and Research Libraries Institute for Information Literacy. 2003. "Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline." http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/characteristics.htm. (accessed June 21, 2005).

Association of College and Research Libraries Literatures in English Section. 2004. "Research Competency Guidelines for Literatures in English DRAFT." http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/researchcompentenciesLES.htm. (accessed June 21, 2005).

Breivik, Patricia Senn, and Robert McDermand. 2004. "Campus Partnerships Building on Success: A Look at San Jose State University." *College and Research Libraries News* 65, 4 (April): 210-212, 215.

Brown, Cecelia, and Lee R. Krumholz, 2003. "Integrating Information Literacy into the Science Curriculum." *College and Research Libraries* 63, 2 (March): 111-123.

Laherty, Jennifer. 2000. "Promoting Information Literacy for Science Education Programs: Correlating the National Science Education Content Standards with the Association of College and Research Libraries Information Competency Standards for Higher Education." *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship* 28 (Fall). http://www.library.ucsb.edu/istl/00-fall/article3.html. (accessed June 17, 2005).

Norgaard, Rolf. 2004. "Writing Information Literacy in the Classroom: Pedagogical Enactments and Implications." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 43, 3 (Spring): 220-226.

Paglia, Alison, and Annie Donahue. 2003. "Collaboration Works: Integrating Information Competencies into the Psychology Curricula." *Reference Services Review* 31, 4: 320-28.

Rader, Hannelore B. 2004. "Building Faculty-Librarian Partnerships to Prepare Students for Information Fluency: The Time for Sharing Information Expertise Is Now." *College and Research Libraries News* 65, no. 2 (February): 74-76, 80, 83, 90.

Rockman, Ilene F. 2003. "Integrating Information Literacy into the Learning Outcomes of Academic Disciplines: A Critical 21st Century Issue." *College and Research Libraries News* 64, 9 (October): 612-615.

Samson, Sue, and Michelle S. Millet. 2003. "The Learning Environment: First-Year Students, Teaching Assistants, and Information Literacy," *Research Strategies* 19, 2: 84-98.

ARE YOU LOOKING FOR THE PERFECT VENUE TO PRESENT AND PUBLISH?

If you answered yes, then New Voices wants to hear from you. New Voices is an opportunity for new librarians to present their ideas and perspectives on current library issues. This program is sponsored by the University and College Library Section of the **Southeastern Library Association.**

What: Papers to be presented at the 2006 Southeastern Library
Association presentation and publication in the Southeastern Librarian.

Who: Professionally employed librarians with less than 5 years of
experience. Must be able to attend and present paper at the next SELA Conference April 5-7, 2006 at the East Memphis Hilton, Memphis, TN

Deadline: **December 1, 2005**

Please submit your paper and/or questions to Camille McCutcheon at
cmccutcheon@uscupstate.edu.