

THE COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS'

**Interinstitutional Committee of Academic Officers' (ICAO)
Interinstitutional Accountability/Assessment Team**

**INFORMATION/TECHNOLOGICAL LITERACY
PROGRESS REPORT**

**November 11, 1999
Steve Hunter (TESC)**

I. BACKGROUND

The Fall Colloquy

In late October, 60 faculty and staff attended a 2-1/2 day discussion of Assessing Student Learning in Information/Technological Literacy. Campus teams included librarians, instructional technologists, faculty knowledgeable and interested in this topic representing various disciplines, and assessment experts.

Colloquy activities included presentations describing work on defining and assessing information literacy nationally; opportunities for sustained cross-campus discussions of teaching and learning goals in this area, and to develop/refine measurement strategies, and preliminary planning for campus-based work.

The colloquy was a success. People persisted in difficult discussions of definition and even measurement. They left excited about continuing the work together and producing measures. We have taken the first step toward forming an impressive group of faculty and staff from every campus to work on this project.

We are fortunate in this state to have several national leaders on this topic. Two presented at the Colloquy: (1) Dr. Larry Snyder, from the UW, who chaired the committee that wrote the "Fluency with Information Technology (FIT) Report describing "what everyone needs to know and understand about information technology" in response to a request from the National Science Foundation, and (2) Dr. Lizabeth Wilson, also from the UW, who is president-elect of the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). The ACRL has drafted 5 "Information Literacy Competency Standards" including performance indicators and the beginning of a set of measurable student learning outcomes. Finally, Dr. Nana Lowell, also from the UW, has recently joined the national ACRL effort to work with that group on refining measurable student learning outcomes.

II. Statewide Writing Project as Model

Our state's experience with the Writing Project was briefly described at the colloquy. A more detailed report on the Writing Project precedes this summary. There was widespread support of the Writing Project's model for continuing work on Information/ Technological Literacy across campuses.

III. Colloquy Outcomes

- Participants endorsed, with some revisions, the ACRL Information Literacy Standards and began the harder work of moving toward measurable learning outcomes. The revised standards and performance indicators are attached.

This definition of information literacy is broader than HECB/State charge for a measure of "technological literacy". There was no disagreement about the importance of using technology tools, but faculty tend to see these as means to an end, rather than an end in and of themselves. At the advice of Kathe Taylor and Cindy Flynn, we suggest a working title for this project: "Information/Technological Literacy".

- Institutional teams committed to a statewide project to further work on this topic patterned after the Statewide Writing Project. This will involve:
 - ◆ (1) an inter-institutional planning group – probably three people from each campus including a librarian/instructional technologist, a faculty member and an assessment person;
 - ◆ (2) collection of examples of classroom assignments intended to incorporate "information literacy";
 - ◆ (3) at least ideally, collection of a second piece of writing by the student describing the processes used to collect, evaluate and employ information/technology in the assignment;
 - ◆ (4) An inter-institutional summer workshop patterned after the Writing Workshops of the past two summers where faculty, assessment types and community members evaluate examples of student work and develop a rating rubric for "information/technological literacy".

IV. Next Steps

- Form inter-institutional planning committee (12/99)
- Plan Summer 2000 Information/Technological Literacy Workshop (12/99 – 4/00)
- Secure examples of student work from each campus (1/00 – 4/00)
- Establish campus-based Information/Technological Literacy campus teams and designate workshop participants (1/00 – 4/00)
- Conduct Summer 2000 Information/Technological Literacy Workshop (7/00)
- Write-up workshop results and critique (9/00)
- Revise rating rubrics and project design (10/00 – 12/00)
- Develop campus-specific applications (10/00 – 6/01)
- Design second summer Information/Technological Literacy (12/00 – 4/01)
- Secure examples of student work for second-round workshop from each campus (1/01 – 4/01)
- Conduct Summer 2001 Workshop (7/01)
- Write-up workshop results and critique (9/01)
- Revise rating rubrics (10/01 – 12/01)
- Final Report on Pilot Phase of Information/Technological Literacy Student Learning Outcome Measures (1/02)

**ACRL Standards and Performance Indicators
(Washington State Assessment Modifications 10/25/99)**

Standard One: The information literate student determines the extent of the information needed.

Preamble: The information literate individual frames questions and hypotheses, determines what information is relevant to them, and reevaluates them in the light of new information. Various models of these tasks are appropriate, depending on the questions posed and the academic discipline through which the inquiry is being made.

1. The information literate individual continually defines and redefines the need for information.
2. The information literate individual identifies a variety of sources of information and understands the constraints and possibilities of each.
3. The information literate individual adapts their search strategy depending on the time, money, and skills required.

Standard Two: The information literate individual accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

1. The information literate individual selects the most appropriate investigative methods or information retrieval systems for accessing the needed information.
2. The information literate individual constructs and implements effectively designed search strategies.
3. The information literate individual retrieves information online or in person using a variety of methods.
4. The information literate individual refines the search strategy if necessary.
5. The information literate individual extracts and records the information and its sources.

Standard Three: The information literate individual evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.

1. The information literate individual articulates and applies initial criteria for evaluating both the information and its source.
2. The information literate individual identifies the main ideas from the information gathered.
3. The information literate individual synthesizes main ideas to construct new perspectives.

4. The information literate individual integrates new knowledge with prior knowledge.
5. The information literate individual is able to form new views based on the integration of new knowledge with prior knowledge.
6. The information literate individual validates understanding and interpretation of the information with others.
7. The information literate individual determines whether the initial query should be revised.

Standard Four: The information literate individual uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

1. The information literate individual demonstrates application of new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance.
2. The information literate individual demonstrates the ability to revise the product or performance based on new and/or prior information.
3. The information literate individual demonstrates his or her effective use of information.
4. The information literate individual demonstrates ability to use technology in appropriate and creative ways to generate products or performances (e.g., use of word processor, presentation tool, or spreadsheet).

Standard Five: The information literate individual understands the legal, and social issues surrounding privacy, access and ownership of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

1. The information literate individual understands the ethical, legal and social issues surrounding information and information technology from the perspective of both the consumer and the provider.
2. The information literate individual follows regulations, policies, and etiquette related to the access and use of information resources.
3. The information literate individual acknowledges the use of information sources in communicating the product or performance.