

**ACRL Information Literacy Advisory Committee (ILAC)
2005 ALA Midwinter Meeting**

**Sunday, January 16, 2005
4:30-6:00 pm
Hynes Convention Center, Room 101**

Members Present:

Adis Beesting (Chair, AASL/ACRL Interdivisional Committee on Information Literacy), Mary Ellen Davis (Executive Director, ACRL), Elizabeth Dupuis (Chair, Instruction Section Chair), Keith Gresham (Past-Chair, Instruction Section), Lynne King (ACRL Board Representative), Loanne Snavely (Chair, Institute for Information Literacy Executive Committee)

Members Absent: None

Visitors:

Kristine Anderson (LES), Beth Ashmore (IS Teaching Methods Committee), Paul Beavers (ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee), Doug Cook (EBSS Executive Committee), Tasha Cooper (EBSS Instruction for Educators Committee), Jeanne Davidson (STS Executive Committee), Kathi Carlisle Fountain (LPSS Library Instruction Committee), Mary George (ULS), Betty Glass (WSS), David S. Goble (CJCLS Teaching and Learning Committee), Ramona Islam (DLS Instruction Committee), Kathy Johnson (LES Executive Committee), Ibironke Lawal (STS Information Literacy Task Force), Ling Lin (library school student), Susan Macicak (ANSS Ad-hoc Information Literacy Task Force), Sharon Naylor (EBSS), Jill Newby (STS Executive Committee), Katalin Radics (WESS Executive Committee), Christina Smith (ANSS Ad-hoc Information Literacy Task Force), Glenda Thornton (ULS), Judy Walker (EBSS Executive Committee)

- I. Welcome and introductions
- II. Open Discussion Forum: Subject-Specific Information Literacy Guidelines

Mary Ellen Davis opened the discussion by outlining various issues involved with the desire of ACRL groups to develop subject-specific information literacy standards. Mary Ellen pointed out that the new ACRL Strategic Plan provides direction in these efforts with a specific strategic objective (*ACRL expands the adoption, use and development of information literacy standards*) that stresses building on the primary ACRL information literacy competency standards document and collaborating with professional associations to develop discipline-based standards. What is needed is a clearly articulated process for ACRL groups to follow in the development of discipline-specific information literacy standards. ACRL wants to make sure that faculty, administrators, and other higher education professionals are involved in the development process (i.e., ACRL sections should not operate in silos with these efforts). ACRL has allocated some funding to help sections and other groups in their development work.

Representatives of the following ACRL sections next provided updates on the status of discipline-specific standards development:

EBSS: document in place for education; documents under development for psychology/psychiatry, social work/social welfare, and communications

LES: document in draft form for literatures in English

LPSS: document in draft form; subject faculty involved in development process via the American Political Science Association (APSA)

ANSS: documents under development for anthropology, criminology, and sociology

STS: document entitled *Information Literacy Standards for Science and Technology* in draft form; document has been presented to the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) and preliminary discussions have been held with the American Chemical Society (ACS)

IS: Teaching Methods Committee is working on information literacy in the disciplines portal/gateway project

WESS: no document underway at the moment

Paul Beavers of the ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee reported that the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* document is currently undergoing the required 5-year review, but that the committee is unlikely to recommend changes be made at this time. Regarding the trend of ACRL sections developing discipline-specific standards documents, the Standards and Accreditation Committee is concerned about the granularity question (how far do you refine the base document?) and the lack of an existing process to guide the development of discipline-specific documents (who reviews such a document before it is sent to Standards and Accreditation?).

Mary Ellen Davis mentioned the desirability of making sure that discipline-specific documents are in sync and in harmony with the primary *Competency Standards* document so that the organization sends out a consistent message to external groups.

Attendees then brainstormed a list of common or shared values for developing a process:

1. *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* document is the master or primary document; other subject-specific documents are considered to be applications, interpretations, or commentary.
2. Keep the focus on student competencies and not on what the library should be doing
3. Involve faculty in the process
4. Maintain standard headings of the primary document and adapt the performance indicators; performance indicators is where the customization occurs
5. Involvement/approval/endorsement by professional organizations and societies
6. Involvement/approval/endorsement by accrediting bodies

Attendees then brainstormed ideas related to a document review process:

1. ACRL selects individuals with subject specialties to attend the conferences of other professional organizations
2. ILAC serves as a possible review body
3. ILAC establishes groups of readers to serve as outside peer reviewers
4. Expand ILAC to include individuals with subject specialties and expertise (more formalized roles)
5. ILAC takes on editorial board role
6. IIL Executive Committee serve as possible review body
7. Keep sections responsible but find an information literacy expert to work with the sections (maybe IS or perhaps a new group)
8. Post draft standards for public review; post various versions of what each section is developing on a web site (all in one place; perhaps members-only)
9. Use the attendance list from this meeting to create a listserv that will continue talking about establishing a process

Primary question that still needs answering: What are the steps for a process within ACRL for developing, reviewing, and approving subject-specific guidelines?

It was decided that ILAC would use the group's meeting at ALA Annual (Sunday, June 26, 2005, from 4:30p-6p) to continue this discussion.

III. Announcements, Updates, and Items for Discussion

- A. Update on C&RL News articles on information literacy assessment
Mary Ellen Davis reported that plans are still in place for Betsy Wilson, Karen Williams, and Patty Iannuzzi to work on the articles.
- B. Update on ALA's 21st Century Literacy Project

Mary Ellen Davis reported that she had nothing new to add to the information contained in an e-mail message sent to ILAC members on Nov. 8, 2004.

C. IFLA information literacy document

Discussion on this agenda item was deferred.

D. IIL Student Surveys Project Team

Loanne Snavely reported that test questions were submitted to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) but that they have not yet been accepted. The task force will continue to work on developing and refining questions between now and Annual Conference.

E. ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group

Discussion on this agenda item was deferred.

F. Collaboration within ACRL on IL continuing education projects

Discussion on this agenda item was deferred.

Meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Gresham
ACRL ILAC Facilitator