

IF=CCC: Information Fluency Is now a Core Proficiency on Campus

Beth Bloom, MA, MLS
Librarian/Associate Professor
Seton Hall University

INTRODUCTION

Seton Hall University (SHU), a mid-sized diocesan Catholic liberal arts doctoral institution, lies 14 miles west of New York City. Boasting a faculty and student body of multiple ethnic, socio-economic, and religious backgrounds, it prides itself on its inclusiveness, its excellent Freshman Studies and Honors programs, its prize-winning School of Business, its School of Diplomacy, and various other graduate programs. However, it lies in an area populated by such universities as Rutgers, Montclair, and William Paterson. SHU's moniker is "the Catholic University of New Jersey," and it attempts to derive its student body from the sizable New Jersey Catholic population. In the past few years, the decreasing number and quality of student applications have indicated that the university must find a way to compete in a marketplace where other higher institutions cost less for an education of similar quality. As the new millennium unfolded, it became quite obvious that SHU needed something in its curriculum to make it stand out, a promise to prospective students of a unique, quality undergraduate experience.

Concurrently, a visit from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Higher Education loomed large. Middle States had recently articulated new requirements for Information Literacy training on college campuses.^① Faced with the impending evaluation visit from the association, the SHU administration mandated a campus-wide information-literacy initiative. Library faculty took advantage of their expertise in the field to establish their position as the main players in this initiative. They partnered with Freshman Studies and with the Freshman English program to have multiple contacts with all incoming students. They worked with the Faculty Senate Library Committee to educate faculty on the true nature of information literacy; i.e., to address the commonly misunderstood distinction between information literacy and information technology.^②

Most importantly, the librarians exploited their faculty status to ensure that they would play a key part in the most important academic initiative at SHU in recent years,

the creation of a new Core Curriculum. This paper will focus on the establishment of the new core and on the library faculty's role in its creation.

DESIGNING THE CORE

Every year, the Center for Catholic Studies at SHU holds a summer seminar on a topic relevant to the mission of the university. The seminar held in the summer of 2001 was titled "The Core of the Core: Reflections on the Core Curriculum." For years preceding this seminar, various constituencies in the university attempted to address problems in the existing core curriculum, which consisted essentially of a two-column restaurant-menu selection process. There was no one common experience for all Seton Hall students. Therefore, this series proved to be the catalyst for a unified, organized commitment to examine, improve, and make truly unique to Seton Hall students a common core experience.

The university administration charged the Faculty Senate with this task. The senate held a special election for a newly formed "Committee to Develop a New Core Curriculum," or CCC. Because SHU librarians were faculty and thus served in the Faculty Senate, the Senate elected two library faculty members to serve on the CCC.

The CCC decided to democratize the core revision process by visiting departments, having "town meetings" and asking faculty to fill out surveys. The goal was to create a clear picture of the ideal SHU graduate in the eyes of the faculty—to determine the result before designing the product. The core designers needed to know what qualities and knowledge would best define the ideal SHU student. In addition, the CCC looked at models from other universities. Some cores consisted of a series of required courses that addressed human issues but that also combined elements of all academic areas—other cores infused existing courses with special emphasis on developing prescribed skills and competencies.

Eventually, the CCC agreed that the core should consist of a combination of three elements (**Table 1** illustrates these components):

- A series of new "**Signature**" courses that would be required of all SHU undergraduates;
- Infusion of five essential **proficiencies** into existing courses
- Infusion of six essential **literacies** into existing courses.

The CCC determined that the **Signature** courses be designed to accentuate the Catholic mission as well as to address transformative issues that face all human beings, particularly freshmen and sophomores. The courses would achieve this goal through requiring community service, attendance at a film series that addressed the human condition, but most important, the study of major philosophical ideas and great literary works from ancient to modern times.

TABLE 1. Essential Components of the New Core Curriculum

<i>Core Proficiencies</i>	<i>Core Literacies</i>	<i>Required Courses</i>
Information Fluency	Ethical literacy	Odyssey of the Mind, Heart and Spirit (Signature I), taken in the Freshman year (developed by committee)
Reading/Writing	Esthetic Sensibility Religious and historical awareness	Odyssey of the Mind, Heart and Spirit (Signature II), taken in the Sophomore year (developed by committee)
Oral Communication	Cultural sensitivity	Odyssey of the Mind, Heart and Spirit (Signature III), taken in the Junior year (developed by department)
Numeracy	Quantitative thinking	A Capstone course, taken in the senior year.
Critical Thinking	Scientific awareness	

In order to address the latter two elements, the core design specified that a certain percentage of courses in any regular departmental curriculum have a particular **proficiency** or **literacy** designation. Before a course could be so designated, its syllabus would have to address and focus on one or several of the **proficiencies** or **literacies**.³ Students in these courses would be assessed specifically on their understanding of and performance in the listed **proficiency/literacy**. An oversight committee would determine if a given course satisfied **proficiency/literacy** guidelines before officially designating it as such.

The faculty as a whole did not accept this design without challenges and some dissension from the ranks, however. Initially, the new core required the three **Signature** courses to be designed by representative faculty from a variety of academic areas, and to be taught in three successive fall semesters. But because, many faculty were concerned that students would not be able to fulfill requirements in their majors, the CCC agreed to reduce the number of university-wide **signature** courses to two. Individual departments would now be responsible for the creation of the third. Many departments around campus also questioned the CCC's authority and/or ability to define the **literacies**, or to oversee coverage of the various **literacies** and **proficiencies**. Faced with the possibility of losing faculty support for the core design completely, the CCC again decided to remand such functions to the academic departments. In order to move the Core forward, departments were charged with making the final decision about both the course and the **proficiency** or **literacy** to be infused.

Despite these challenges, the CCC continued to develop and refine the core. A group of faculty volunteers began to develop the first **signature** course, and subcommittees formed in order to define and address the **proficiencies**.

THE LIBRARIANS AND THE CORE

Establishing their role in defining the **proficiencies** presented a particular challenge for the librarians on the CCC. Their objective was to convince their fellow faculty that information literacy is a skill essential to learning, and hence to an effective educational program. On multiple occasions, librarians introduced information literacy into the conversation, but more often than not, the discussions veered in other directions that appeared to be much more essential to the task at hand. The librarians also shared information literacy documents that the (Association of College and Research Libraries) ACRL prepared especially for teaching faculty, but again, the CCC members would dutifully glance at the handouts and then proceed to stash them away for future perusal.

This was not entirely surprising. Teaching faculty often are unaware that many students lack fundamental information literacy and research skills. College students can generally do a simple search in Google, trade on e-bay, download music, or seem expert at instant messaging. Many faculty assume that these skills translate into students' ability to articulate a research question or locate relevant and essential resources for their assignments. They tell students who might voice difficulties with this to visit the librarians at the reference desk, often assuming that the librarians' primary function is to help the students search the databases. It would appear that relatively few faculty realize that librarians are also adept at helping the students with such essentials as articulating a research question, formulating a research plan, and helping them understand information structures, modes of communication, etc. In sending students at the last minute to the library for a few minutes of librarian assistance, faculty squander an opportunity to get the ultimate benefit from those most qualified to help the students through this process. The students miss out on the major steps essential to good research. Unbeknownst to faculty, they are setting up their students to fail if they use the library simply for triage, and thus, they are often disappointed at the very poor quality of their students' work.

So developed some of the arguments librarians used to convince participating faculty of the need for information literacy training. The librarians began to challenge CCC members to attest to the quality of student research. They asked the faculty if the following scenarios seemed familiar: 1. Students say there is "nothing out there on the topic"; 2. Students try to do a paper on an impossibly broad topic; 3. Students often look for an article or book exactly on their topic; 4. Students confuse information formats; or 5. Students Google their paper topics and use improper Web sites. The reality of these scenarios challenged the faculty on the committee to focus the discussions more toward information literacy.

This availed the librarians on the committee the opportunity to redirect the conversation toward goals,⁴ asking their teaching colleagues: What qualities would faculty like to see exhibited in their students' research? What skills would they like their students to carry into the world beyond academe? The members of the committee agreed that the students should display research or information proficiency, or information fluency. They also agreed that their students generally lacked understanding of this proficiency. If the librarians' expertise addressed these issues, thus it would appear that the library faculty might, in fact, be essential players in achieving the goals of the new core curriculum. Designers of the core, thus, recognized and articulated information literacy. They preferred the term "information fluency" (IF) and determined to refer to it as such in descriptions of the new core curriculum. IF, therefore, took its rightful place as part of the group of five *proficiencies*.

THE CORE PROFICIENCY WORKSHOPS

Thus, the CCC began to establish the scope, definition, and the parameters of the **proficiencies**. As they solved these issues, so the next series of challenges emerged. In particular, how could faculty who were not necessarily well versed in teaching such proficiencies as writing, oral presentation, or IF, for that matter, infuse their courses with these skills? Many believed they were already addressing IF, for example, when they sent their students to the reference desk for last-minute research help. In academe, pedagogical issues and techniques have often taken second place to research and publication. Encyclopedic knowledge of an academic subject area does not necessarily equate with an ability to teach that subject, and most certainly, there was no guarantee that the faculty had the ability to impart principles of the various proficiencies into their coursework. Indeed, many teaching faculty were uncomfortable about participating in this plan of action. Many felt that they were being pressured to include course material for which they had neither time nor expertise.

Therefore, a select subgroup of the CCC worked out a training plan for the faculty slated to participate in the new core. They sent out a call for faculty volunteers who would agree to participate in five subgroups that would represent each of the five **competencies**. Once the groups formed, the CCC monitored and oversaw their functioning. The following missive to the IF subgroup is an example of the initial communication from the CCC:

Your acceptance of a role in this Core Curriculum Faculty Development workshop means that you have agreed to incorporate information literacy into at least one course you teach each semester during the academic year. Rather than an add-on, we would like you to think of ways that information literacy can be used to enhance all aspects of the curriculum and how it can help you accomplish the educational goals you have for your students. We are using a Blackboard course as our project database. We ask that you be a frequent contributor to the database, that you fulfill all assignments in a timely fashion, and that you let us know at once about scheduling conflicts.

- Attend summer retreat and 3 workshops each semester
- Participate in all workshop activities

- Post syllabus for IL-intensive course being taught each semester
- Post all IL assignments, formal and informal
- Use Blackboard in the IL course you are teaching

In the 2005-2006 academic year, the first year of the workshops, four categories of faculty populated each of the five groups: Consultants, Group Leaders, Mentors, and Participants. The group leaders were charged with establishing meeting dates/times, making arrangements for outside consultants, recommending guest speakers, setting up meeting agendas, facilitating meetings, and supervising the progress of all participants. The mentors' purpose was to advise the faculty participants. The faculty participants were to present preliminary syllabi and frequently revise them so that, once the seminar series was over, they would have addressed the core proficiency such that students would be able to develop that proficiency. During that first year, in order to illustrate their commitment to the project, the Office of the Provost funded the workshops. Group leaders received a course reduction and were paid \$3000 for a one-year commitment to the program, mentors received \$1500, and participants \$1000, and consultants \$2000.

The first step in the process was a plenary workshop breakfast meeting, followed by individual subgroup discussions and lunch. The IF subgroup was fortunate to present Dr. Carol Kuhlthau as guest speaker and consultant at the initial meeting. Using a PowerPoint presentation, she summarized essential steps in the information-seeking process as illustrated in her book *Seeking Meaning. A Process Approach to Library and Information Services*.[©] Within the hour, she had successfully illustrated the reasons that students have so much difficulty producing quality research assignments. She demonstrated to faculty how students often skip essential phases in the process of gathering and synthesizing information. She has theorized that, in order to do successful research and writing, some confusion and uncertainty are a necessary step before synthesis and result formulation in the research process. In this computer age, however, students tend to be besotted by the quantity of available information. In confusing quantity with quality, they are lured into thinking that the technology does the thinking for them; i.e., that they need not go through that vital stage of confusion before clarity. They amass readily available sources, become overwhelmed by the enormous amounts of electronic information available, but cannot negotiate a way to use it to their advantage. Serious problems result as the students attempt to skip that very vital part of the research process. This often results in panic, plagiarism, inferior work, or failure.

Dr. Kuhlthau proved to be indispensable to the IF subgroup. Her ability to explain this common problem in a few short moments confirmed and supported in no uncertain terms the very issues upon which the librarians had focused for years. Her solid research was irrefutable. Librarians on the subcommittee benefited from this, as their claims about student behavior were substantiated. They commanded newly found respect as experts in the field of IF.

The IF subgroup's schedule called for two additional summer meetings, to be completed before the beginning of the start of the fall semester (see **Table 2** for discussion topics). In these meetings, we clarified to participating faculty what was expected of them—that they were required to submit initial syllabi and discuss observed

student problems or successes and their own reactions to their students' research projects. The meetings also provided a forum for discussions on the perceived definitions of IF.

As the fall workshops progressed, the group leaders found that the discussions took on a life of their own. Although they tried, they continually had to scrap the meeting agendas. There were as many definitions of IF as there were people in the room. Discussions appeared to go nowhere—to be a waste of precious (and expensive) time. Participating faculty disagreed on how, or even if, IF instruction was necessary for their particular assignments or areas of expertise. The historians, for example, strongly suggested that IF training was a natural outgrowth of the historical method. Other faculty saw no necessity in such training, particularly if their courses focused on literary analysis. Other faculty valued the immediate benefits of IF training in their own or students' research. They had not really thought about its long term benefits in instilling in students skills for life-long learning.

Librarians on the committee knew that many faculty still believed that sending students to the library and asking librarians for research triage would satisfy the basic IF core proficiency requirement. They had to convince faculty that information structures, mode, standards, and language are also essential aspects of IF, not to mention the stages in the research process. Preliminarily exploration of subject; understanding the scope of the research problem; designing the research question; formulating the research plan; resource gathering and application of search strategies and technique all help the student find relevant resources whose content will lead to synthesis and, eventually, to the creation of new knowledge.

Most telling, however, was the gap between librarians' and teaching faculty's approach toward the application of IF concepts. Librarians insisted that IF was a process and should be taught in stages. Teaching faculty wanted their students to use IF concepts in order to produce a specific product. They were not immediately concerned in the long-term usefulness of such instruction. Discussions led to compromise, however. The librarians on the committee needed to relinquish the idea that IF was an extension of their skill, and that they were the sole experts on the subject. They had to accept the fact that, no matter how ideal it would be for students to be allowed time to internalize IF concepts and practices, in fact, they had to produce acceptable research by semester's end. Teaching faculty, on the other hand, had to accept that, although librarians were generalists, they could learn much about the research process from them; that, despite the fact they, as faculty, might be experts in their given field of study, librarians had the facility and means to locate pertinent information in all disciplines.

Indeed, the discussions, which had seemed to lead nowhere, actually were a necessary part in establishing the mutual respect between teaching and library faculty, and in the synthesis of ideas that would eventually lead to a productive outcome. In order for the participants to share with their fellow faculty members IF training techniques, they had to understand the concepts themselves.⁶ In an uncanny way, the IF subgroup's process of discussion, disagreement, and confusion as antecedent to mutual understanding and synthesis of ideas seemed to parallel the stages of the research process

as articulated by Carol Kuhlthau. Once all participants agreed that it was permissible to disagree on their definition of IF-- once they understood that the nature of IF varied according to discipline and educational level--committee members were prepared to learn how to infuse IF into their curricula and syllabi.

As the meetings progressed, participants used the Blackboard course discussion board to share ideas and draft syllabi. Several faculty began to stage their research assignments and insert evaluation into each stage. It was exciting to see how faculty participants began to write process into their research assignments. They planned to ask their students to keep a research and learning journal and to enter librarians into Blackboard as participants, consultants, and co-instructors in many research courses. The workshops that first year produced a series of training documents for faculty who might, in the future, be interested in IF infusion. Using Blackboard as the course management tool, they also included various ACRL Information Literacy documents and examples of IF best practices from other universities. Faculty workshop participants began to rework several of these documents, such as Information Literacy Guidelines, to suit our university's needs. They also began to design grading rubrics, information on developing course-specific and discipline-specific assignments, research paper guidelines, and guidelines for developing IF specific courses at SHU (see **Appendix I** for examples of IF-infused syllabi; see **Appendix II** for IF-infused Course Guidelines).

The workshop series resumed in August, 2006, for the 2006-2007 academic year, funded this time by the Teaching Learning and Technology Center, or the TLTC (see the **Timeline** for the meeting schedules). Eventually the SHU TLTC funded most of the programs, with the proviso that the workshops would develop learning objects, supporting technologies for the new core, and rubrics for assessment. Budgetary constraints in this second year of the workshop series mandated that subgroups would consist of only three classes of participants: team leaders, department liaisons to the Core Curriculum, and faculty members who were working either on individual or on large course redesign. The liaisons either had already participated in the preceding year's workshop or had had experience with IF training. Stipends for participants were reduced ; thus, the workshop schedule was likewise reduced to three 90-minute sessions for each proficiency at the TLTR Summer Institute (an introductory session, a tech session, and a hands-on working session, all back to back) and two regular meetings per semester (one to share plans and the other to share results) that totaled five hours. Whereas the participants in the 2005-2006 academic year produced many course documents, participants in the 2006-2007 workshop understood that large course redesign would require more detailed materials for instructors, guidelines, sample assignments, and assessment tools.

TABLE 2. Summer 2005 Subgroup Meeting Agendas

<i>Meeting Date</i>	<i>Topic or Assignment</i>
June 15	Carol Kuhlthau's discussion Faculty discuss frustrations with students' performance Bring in an assignment topic for discussion
June 17	Discussion of effective research assignments Post topic Introduction to Key databases
June 30	Develop assignment based on discussions: Post in Blackboard Sample effective syllabi Journaling and discussion: challenges in developing new syllabi and course assignments

Timeline			
<u><i>Year 1:</i></u>			
June 2005	July 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006
Consultant's presentation Three ½ day sessions	Initial discussions	three meetings (9 hours)	three meetings (9 hours)
<u><i>Year 2:</i></u>			
August 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	
TLTR Summer Institute Three 90-minute meetings	two meetings (5 hours)	two meetings (5 hours)	

Indeed, in the second year of the workshops, the participants successfully redesigned large courses to include IF, and added assessment rubrics and guidelines as an added benefit. Assessments included assignments, in-class activities, homework assignments, tests/quizzes. Assessments varied by curricular area. Faculty in the humanities generally based their assessment on the final project or paper. The science faculty participant based her IF assessment on basic search strategy in the science databases for a given topic and the appropriateness of the resulting articles. Two faculty members worked on redesigning a business writing course. One availed students of several video clips on controversial issues in the business world. He then asked students to take a side in the controversy and to write a logical response and then to back up their conclusion with appropriate resources (see **Appendix III** for examples of assessments).

RESULTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Librarians' participation in the creation of the new SHU core has established their position on campus as experts in IF training. As a result of their unique experience, they have also achieved the following.

- Deeper communication with faculty on the CCC and in the workshops
- IF training is recognized as essential to General education at SHU
- Librarians have a permanent place in developing segments of the new core
- There is a new faculty awareness that students lack essential IF skills
- The university and students will benefit from a new understanding of IF.

How Did the Librarians Achieve This?

- They were proactive in the push to develop a new core on campus
- As senators, they were assured membership on the new senate CCC
- They exploited previously established, successful partnerships with faculty and programs, such as Freshman Studies, and Freshman English
- They sought support from campus allies
- They persisted in the definition of IF
- They brought Carol Kuhlthau onto campus to support their IF initiative
- They persisted in making sure IF would be recognized as a core proficiency
- They made sure librarians would be part of the CCC assessment team.

LESSONS LEARNED

Be patient. Cultural change takes time. The core curriculum went through several iterations before the final one articulated in this article, several of which ignored the need for IF instruction. The librarians on the CCC spent many months convincing other faculty of the importance of such training.

Be persistent. Don't give up after a few tries. Many faculty confuse IF with computer literacy. Even after much shared evidence to the contrary, in our experience, many faculty still let the term "computer literacy" or "information technology" slip out when discussing IF.

Take advantage of supportive teaching faculty. The librarians took advantage of allegiances made in various departments. They had a history of working with members of the English department. In 1999, they all participated in a grant provided by the TLTC, in which they would use technology to work together to develop tutorials and other instructional objects for underclassmen and women. They had collaborated on a plan to assure that all 75 or so freshman English classes would have a library component. The English faculty and librarians had already developed a mutual respect even before the

core proficiency workshops were planned. In core meetings, English faculty championed librarians, which helped form the respect of other teaching faculty members.^⑦

....AND THE FUTURE...

In the future, will librarians at Seton Hall have more contact with students in classrooms? Certainly, there will be much more collaboration between library and teaching faculty in those sections designated with the IF core proficiency. However, what about those many other classes? Teaching faculty and library faculty will no doubt partner much more, but many faculty see no place for the librarian in their classroom. Consequently, gaps in the connection between librarian and students will still exist. According to Farber^⑧ teaching faculty often have established reasons for not requesting library instruction. They might feel uncomfortable about sharing classes with other faculty or they might feel that, although library instruction is important, they have other priorities set for their classes, or they might feel that there is not enough time to set aside for a library orientation.

Nevertheless, The Middle States Commission on Higher Education, in its focus on outcomes, has specified that, in order to avoid marginalization of important proficiencies, various campus constituents should experiment with and practice new models of instructional collaboration.^⑨ Mackey and Jacobson describe an example of such successful collaboration at the University at Albany.^⑩ In this instance, a campus-wide Information Literacy Committee has developed a “multi-tiered approach” to information literacy instruction. In other words, librarians and teaching faculty share the responsibility to instill information literacy skills. They have developed a system of progressive IL instruction, taught in increasing depth at various stages of the college experience. Jacobson and Germain focus on the Albany campus Information Literacy Subcommittee, consisting of members of Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the School of Information Science and Policy, and the University Libraries. Similarly to SHU they have conducted a series of IF workshops. One of those workshops features faculty who have successfully instilled IF into their courses and who discuss their “best practices”.^⑪ In addition, Weber State University has included its IF team leader as a member of a new general education reform committee.^⑫

Clearly, much literature discusses the inclusion of IF in university curricula.^⑬ Various articles focus on collaboration, such as librarian-faculty partnership in developing IF courses,^⑭ including IF in coursework (curriculum),^⑮ or adding IF components to an existing course.^⑯ However, SHU librarians seem to have benefited from a truly unique experience. The literature does not seem to contain many examples in which librarians: 1. participate in core development, 2. affect the inclusion of IF into a set of core proficiencies, and then 3. train teaching faculty in the inclusion of IF in new courses or in large-course redesign.

The workshops at Seton Hall resulted in teaching faculty coming to the appreciation of just how much is involved in IF instruction. This has resulted in a greater

understanding among teaching faculty of the contribution librarians can make to the intellectual culture at Seton Hall.

The official rollout of the new Core Curriculum has been scheduled for fall, 2008. Courses such as Freshman English 1202 are already in their redesign stage. That redesign includes IF as an essential infused proficiency. Business writing and other pre-requisite courses are experiencing the same. Clearly, this has resulted from the successful partnership between librarians and other CCC members. The librarians hope that their successful part in the new core curriculum will lead to more collaboration with faculty at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The architecture of the new core stipulates that faculty should be proactive in large course redesign. Faculty members who have participated in the core proficiency workshops will be training their colleagues in the application of these proficiencies. This would further necessitate librarians' expertise as partners in IF training. The librarians have established a unique place for themselves on the SHU campus. There, they hope that the best is yet to come.

ENDNOTES

-
- ^① MiddleStates Commission on Higher Education, *Developing Research & Communication Skills. Guidelines for Information Literacy in the Curriculum Executive Summary* (2002).
- ^② Jennifer J. Little and Jane H. Tuten, "Strategic Planning: First Steps in Sharing Information Literacy Goals with Faculty across Disciplines," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 13, No. 3 (2006): 115. The authors describe a similar situation at the University of South Carolina, Aiken.
- ^③ Eventually, the CCC formed subcommittees that composed guidelines for the proficiency courses. See Appendix III for the information fluency proficiency guidelines.
- ^④ Nancy F. Campbell and Threasa L. Wesley, "Collaborative Dialogue: Repositioning the Academic Library," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6, No. 1 (2006): 96.
- ^⑤ Carol Kuhlthau, *Seeking Meaning: A Process Approach to Library and Information Services. Second Edition* (Westport: Libraries Unlimited, 2004): 82.
- ^⑥ Jane Scales, Greg Matthews, and Corey M. Johnson, "Compliance, Cooperation, Collaboration, and Information Literacy," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31, No. 3(2005): 233.
- ^⑦ Robin Lockerby et al., "Collaboration and Information Literacy: Challenges of Meeting Standards when Working with Remote Faculty," *Journal of Library Administration* 41, No. 1/2 (2004): 250.
- ^⑧ Evan Farber, "Working with Faculty: Some Reflections," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 11, No. 2(2004): 131.
- ^⑨ Oswald M. T. Ratteray, "Information Literacy in Self-Study and Accreditation," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 28, No. 6 (2002): 369.
- ^⑩ Thomas P. Mackey and Trudi E. Jacobson, "Integrating Information Literacy in Lower-and Upper-Level Courses: Developing Scalable Models for Higher Education," *JGE: The Journal of General Education* 53 No. 3-4, (2004): 202.
- ^⑪ Trudi E. Jacobson and Carol Anne Germain, "A Campus-Wide Role for an Information Literacy Committee," *Resource Sharing & Information Networks* 17, No. 1/2 (2004): 119.
- ^⑫ Shaun Jackson, Carol Hansen, and Lauren Fowler, "Using Selected Assessment Data to Inform Information Literacy Program Planning with Campus Partners," *Research Strategies* 20 (2005): 54.
- ^⑬ Bill Johnston and Sheila Webber, "As We May Think: Information Literacy as a Discipline for the Information Age," *Research Strategies* 20 (2006): 108-121; Rui Wang, "The Lasting Impact of a Library Credit Course," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6, No. 1 (2006): 79-92.
- ^⑭ Scales, et al., "Compliance, Cooperation, Collaboration and Information Literacy": 229-235; Lockerby et al., "Collaboration and Information Literacy: Challenges of Meeting Standards when Working with Remote Faculty": 250.

® Mackey and Jacobson, "Integrating Information Literacy in Lower-and Upper-Level Courses: Developing Scalable Models for Higher Education": 202.

® Susan Kaplan Jacobs, Peri Rosenfeld, and Judith Haber, "Information Literacy as the Foundation for Evidence-Based Practice in Graduate Nursing Education: A Curriculum-Integrated Approach," *Journal of Professional Nursing* 19, No. 5 (2003): 320-328; Jeanne Galvin, "Alternative Strategies for Promoting Information Literacy," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31, No. 4(2005): 353.

REFERENCES

Campbell, Nancy, and Threasa L. Wesley, T. "Collaborative Dialogue: Repositioning the Academic Library." *portal: Libraries & the Academy* 6, no. 1 (2006): 93-98.

East, John W. "Information Literacy for the Humanities Researcher: A Syllabus Based on Information Habits Research." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31, no. 2 (2005): 134-142.

Farber, Evan I. "Working with Faculty: Some Reflections." *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 11, no. 2 (2004): 129-135.

Galvin, Jeanne. "Alternative Strategies for Promoting Information Literacy." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31, no. 4 (2005): 352-357.

Jackson, Shaun, Carol Hansen, and Lauren Fowler. "Using Selected Assessment Data to Inform Information Literacy Program Planning with Campus Partners." *Research Strategies* 20 (2004): 44-56.

Jacobs, Susan, Peri Rosenfeld, and Judith Haber. "Information Literacy as the Foundation for Evidence-Based Practice in Graduate Nursing Education: A Curriculum-Integrated Approach." *Journal of Professional Nursing* 19, no. 5 (2003): 320-328.

Jacobson, Trudi, and Carol Ann Germain. "A Campus-Wide Role for an Information Literacy Committee." *Resource Sharing & Information Networks* 17, no. 1 (2004): 111-121.

Johnston, B., and S. Webber. "As We May Think: Information Literacy as a Discipline for the Information Age." *Research Strategies* 20 (2005): 108-121.

Kuhlthau, Carol. *Seeking Meaning: A process Approach to Library and Information Services. Second Edition.* Westport: Libraries Unlimited, 2004.

Little, Jennifer, and Jane H. Tuten. "Strategic Planning: First Steps in Sharing Information Literacy Goals with Faculty across Disciplines." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 13, no. 3 (2006): 113-123.

Lockerby, Robin, et al. "Collaboration and Information Literacy: Challenges of Meeting Standards when Working with Remote Faculty." *Journal of Library Administration* 41, no. 1/2 (2004) 243-253.

Mackey, Thomas P., and Trudi E. Jacobson. "Integrating Information Literacy in Lower- and Upper-Level Courses: Developing Scalable Models for Higher Education." *JGE: The Journal of General Education* 53, no. 3-4 (2004): 201-224.

MiddleStates Commission on Higher Education. *Developing Research & Communication Skills. Guidelines for Information Literacy in the Curriculum. Executive Summary*. Philadelphia: MiddleStates Commission on Higher Education (2002): 2-8.

Ratteray, Oswald M. T. "Information Literacy in Self-Study and Accreditation." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 28, no. 6 (2002): 368-375.

Scales, Jane, Greg Matthews, and Corey M. Johnson. "Compliance, Cooperation, Collaboration and Information Literacy." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 31, no. 3 (2005): 229-235.

Wang, Rui. "The Lasting Impact of a Library Credit Course." *Libraries and the Academy*(6), no. 1 (2006): 79-92.

Ward, Dane. "Revisioning Information Literacy for Lifelong Meaning." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32 (2006): 396-402.

APPENDIX I.

RESULTS OF THE IF WORKSHOPS: REPRESENTATIVE SEGMENTS FROM PARTICIPATING FACULTY SYLLABI

Information Fluency Standards as Articulated by English Faculty

Understand the structure of information within the field of literary research:

- Identify and use key literary research tools to locate relevant information:
- Plan effective search strategies and modify search strategies as needed:
- Recognize and make appropriate use of library services in the research process
- Understand that some information sources are more authoritative than others and demonstrate critical thinking in the research process:
- Understand the mechanical and ethical issues involved in writing research essays:
- Locate information about the literary profession itself:

Information Fluency Course Requirement as Articulated for Freshman English 1202 Course Redesign

(Gitangeli Das Bender, Department of English)

One of the explicit goals of this course is for students to become fluent in finding and applying secondary (or researched) sources to their writing. We will learn to seek information through the library database, be critical and analytical about what we find, understand the relevance of the sources to the writing assignment at hand, and incorporate the sources into the writing. In general, this course will introduce students to the resources available at the library and teach them to use the various resources—books, journals, newspaper and magazine articles, and the numerous databases—competently, efficiently, intelligently and with ease. Activities Leading to Successful Incorporation of Outside Sources in the 1202 Research Essay

Re-Search

The research essay I've designed for 1202 asks students to consider the term "research" in its truest sense—to look and look again. Here research is not so much about finding secondary sources as about investigating a poet's mind—her ideas, observations, techniques, style, and most importantly, preoccupations. Research, then, is embodied in the very process of entering into the poet's mind. Noticing patterns and making sense of ideas, common themes, and repetition of images in the primary source—a body of poems—is the main goal of the essay. However, the assignment also requires students to read secondary sources—literary criticism—and this requires specific information fluency skills related to seeking, selecting and applying outside sources. For this, students learn how to utilize library resources, particularly the electronic databases and Setoncat.

Careful Reading

No matter what sources they select, to be "information fluent" students have to be careful and intelligent readers, seeking out ideas of critics that are relevant to and supportive of their own observations. This is a difficult skill, one that experienced writers often struggle with, but it is not impossible for novice writers to learn how to integrate the right source the right way. Here are some of the steps students are required to take as they find outside sources:

Identifying Sources: What Are They?

To do this you should be familiar with the databases (Setoncat and Electronic databases, such as Literature Resource Center, Academic Search Premier, JSTOR, Chadwyck Healey...that will help with your research. You should know how to search for books AND for articles. You should also know the difference between the sort of information a book provides vs. the information an article from a journal, magazine or newspaper provides.

Searching for Sources

Do an online search in the library databases using key terms that relate to your poet and that you think will yield most results for you. Save the citations that you think will serve your writing the best.

Selecting Sources

Select four sources of literary criticism that you think are most useful for the essay you're writing. Create an annotated bibliography for these sources. This means that you should write down the full citation and then a paragraph that summarizes the article. Do this for each of the citations.

Understanding Sources

Now write a brief paragraph (for each of the four sources) explaining what ideas are most relevant for your own writing. Which of the critic's observations make most sense to use as evidence for your own developing argument on the poet? Make direct references to your own ideas/argument as you discuss the critical material and use direct quotes from the source itself as you write.

Incorporating Sources

Select two to three quotations from the four sources that you believe serve your own argument the best. Write a page that continues the argument you've been developing on your poet but now includes ideas from the critics you've been reading. As you integrate the ideas from the critics, you must incorporate direct quotations from the sources. Continue with your conclusion.

Information Fluency as Articulated by History Faculty Member

(Dermot Quinn, Department of History)

Informational Fluency

As is clear from the above, an important requirement of the course is that you should show mastery not only of British history but of the *sources* of British history.How, exactly, do you *know* which is valuable and which is not? What do you do when one source contradicts another? Is contradiction between sources always bad and agreement between them always good? What precisely do you want from sources when you write your papers – facts, interpretations, the “right answer” to the question, a “wrong” answer that you can then triumphantly contradict? ...

Historians make a distinction between primary and secondary sources.

By the beginning of the course you should (1) be able to understand that distinction and (2) be able to provide evidence of your understanding of that distinction by giving examples of both.

By the end of the course you should be able to show why the distinction between primary and secondary sources is important (1) by incorporating both of them into your written work and (2) by demonstrating how that written work *benefited* from this incorporation.

Historians make a distinction between different kinds of secondary sources.

Think, for instance, of the difference between a general survey and a detailed monograph. In what circumstances should we favor one over the other? *Should* we favor one over the other? Is the value of the latter its detail or its focus? Is the danger of the latter its detail or its focus? Is the value of the former its clarity and relative simplicity, its breadth of vision? Is the danger of the former its clarity and relative simplicity, its breadth of vision? What makes the difference between a good general survey and a bad one? A good monograph and a bad one?

Think, also, of the difference between a book and an article that appears in a scholarly journal. What exactly are those differences? Is an article simply, as it were, a smaller monograph – detailed, narrow, exclusive, definitive? What are its advantages and disadvantages? In what circumstances should we rely on scholarly articles and when can we safely ignore them? Think, too, of the location of the article. Is there any useful difference between an article that appears, say, in the English Historical Review and one in Past

and Present or Recusant History? Or between “old” articles (say, those appearing before 1960) and more recent ones?

Think, finally, of the difference between a book review and a review article. Where will you find one? Where will you find the other? What are their distinct purposes? Can you find a way or making use of either or both in your papers?

Historians increasingly make a distinction between different kinds of *on-line sources*.

...Here are a few questions you might want to ask yourself as you surf your way to a term paper. Why do you find one site more useful than another? Is it because it was the first to appear on your Google search? Or because it was a link on another sight you liked? Or because of the pop-up ad for a new Lexus when you visited it? Do “official sites” – say, “The Prime Minister’s Office” or “The Houses of Parliament” have more value than “unofficial” sites? Do official sites have dangers of their own?

How, then, are all of these “informational fluencies” to be demonstrated?

At the end of each of your major papers you must attach to the following:

1. A bibliography (of course!)
2. An indication of the paper’s major primary source or sources and where you found it or them.
3. An explanation of *why* you considered it or them the major primary source/s for your work. Was it because of content, availability, accessibility of style, obvious contemporary significance?
4. An indication of the major book or books you used for the paper.
5. An explanation of *why* you considered these books, and not others, useful.
6. An indication of the major scholarly article or articles you used for the paper.
7. An explanation of why you considered these articles, and not others, useful.

Appendix II:

Guidelines for Information Fluency Subgroup Beth Bloom and Marta Deyrup (University Libraries)

Instructors are expected to familiarize themselves with the ACRL information fluency guidelines: (<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/informationliteracycompetency.htm#ildef>)

These standards were reviewed by the ACRL Standards Committee and approved by the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) on January 18, 2000, at the Midwinter Meeting of the American Library Association in San Antonio, Texas. These standards were also endorsed by the American Association for Higher Education (October 1999) and the Council of Independent Colleges (February 2004). A [PDF of this document](#) is available.

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education defines Information Fluency as “an intellectual framework for identifying, finding, understanding, evaluating and using information. It includes determining the nature and extent of needed information; accessing information effectively and efficiently; evaluating critically information and its sources; incorporating selected information in the learner’s knowledge base and value system; using information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose; understanding the economic, legal and social issues surrounding the use of information and information

technology; and observing laws, regulations, and institutional policies related to the access and use of information” (in: *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation Developing Research & Communication Skills Guidelines for Information Literacy in the Curriculum*, 2002, p. 32).

1. Class assignments will be designed to address developmental stages in the research process as articulated by Dr. Carol Kuhlthau in her book, *Seeking Meaning: A Process Approach to Library and Information Services Second Edition*, such that students are aware of their own research experience.

Best practices include research logs or on-line portfolios; directed class discussion

1. Some time should be spent in class to discuss the research process, as opposed to just focusing on the final research assignment. Best practices include discussion of how information is structured and what resources are most appropriate for the different stages of the research process
2. There should be a series of small assignments, independent of the final project, that are designed to familiarize students with a wide variety of research tools. In general library instruction results in best practices, which also include but are not limited to such assignments as:
 - a. Select a topic in which a review article was written a number of years ago and update that review
 - b. Examine coverage of a controversial issue in several sources (newspaper editorial, scholarly journal, etc.
 - c. Brainstorm on key terms to use in order to find information on a given topic
 - d. Compare Internet and Database searches: provide a precise statement of a search topic, using both venues for your research. Compare the findings
3. At least one-quarter of course grade will be based on a research project.
Best practices have shown that a research intensive paper should represent a culmination of the following components. At various stages, students submit:
 - a. Topic clearly defined
 - b. Bibliography of clearly relevant resources
 - c. Outline of paper
 - d. Thesis statement
 - e. Opening paragraph and summary(The purpose of this preliminary work is for the students to focus on the stages of research and the parts of a paper, rather than on the writing of it.)
4. Students should be graded on the quality of their research process, independently of the final project grade

Appendix III: Assessment examples

Example 1: Business Writing Course Redesign (Department of English). (Tim Wenzell, English faculty)

Steps in the Assessment

- Students do research on careers, take Myers Briggs test to see what careers would most suit them
- Write acceptance/rejection business letter
- Self-assessment of their research
- Faculty asks students to watch the specific news reports on-line,
- Do research in order to be able to write an opinion.

Example 2: 1202 Library Quiz (Selections)

(adapted from a quiz written by Beth Bloom)

PART A: USING DATABASES

1. Which is the best database for research on literary topics?
 - a. CINAHL
 - b. Lexis Nexis
 - c. JSTOR
 - d. Yahoo!
2. An **abstract** is:
 - a. An idea whose time has come
 - b. A summary of a scholarly work
 - c. A bibliography
 - d. A science article
3. Which of the following is a scholarly journal?
 - a. The New York Times Index
 - b. Cosmopolitan
 - c. Shakespeare Quarterly
 - d. USA Today
4. Which library database provides articles full text online?
 - a. MLA Index
 - b. Historical Abstracts
 - c. Academic Search Premier (EBSCOHost)
 - d. Medline
5. Find a library book edited by Marguerite R. Waller about women in the military.
Which of the SetonCat search options listed below is the best choice to find this book?
 - a. Author Browse
 - b. Name Title Browse
 - c. First few words of title
 - d. Call Number Browse
6. What is the book's title?
 - a. *Frontline Feminisms: Women War and Resistance*
 - b. *Military Women*
 - c. *Women in the Military*
 - d. *The International Dictionary of Military Women*
7. What is its call number?
 - a. HQ1236
 - b. HQ 1236 F78 2000
 - c. HQ12.36
 - d. HQ 12.36 F78 2000
8. Where in the library is the book located?
 - a. Main floor
 - b. Third floor

-
- c. Fourth floor
 - d. Civil War Collection
9. What is one of the book's subject headings?
- a. Women and War
 - b. Women in the military
 - c. Military women
 - d. Marguerite R. Waller
10. How many other books with this subject heading does the library own?
- a. 19
 - b. 4
 - c. 5
 - d. None
12. Journals differ from popular magazines in that:
- a. Journals are out of date
 - b. Magazines have pictures
 - c. Magazines are completely unreliable
 - d. Journals are important sources for academic research
13. Which of the following is NOT an example of **plagiarism**:
- a. Paraphrasing without a citation
 - b. Copying a paragraph from a book
 - c. Copying a paragraph from the Internet
 - d. Copying a paragraph from a public domain source
 - e. Including a citation in the text when you have used someone else's ideas
 - f. Copying a paragraph from a paper you wrote last year
14. What is an example of a **paraphrase**?
- a. Taking a block of text from someone's paper and citing it
 - b. Briefly summarizing a passage from someone else's paper and citing it
 - c. Taking a block of text from someone's paper and not citing it
 - d. Taking a string of words from someone's paper and citing them

PART B: FINDING BOOKS IN THE LIBRARY

Use the online catalog, SetonCat to answer the following questions. Go to the library home page by clicking on <http://library.shu.edu>. Then click on Library Catalog, at the upper left portion of the home page. If you need a refresher on how to use SetonCat, click on our online tutorial (<http://library.shu.edu/tutorweb/shucatstart.htm>).

You need to find the 1965 edition of *The Scarlet Letter*. Of the search options, which is the best choice for this search?

- a. Keyword
- b. Title and keyword
- c. Subject
- d. Author (last name, first name)
- e. Title, exact (omit initial article)
- f. Builder (author's last name, first word of title)

-
- Where is this book located?
- 2nd floor, Reference
 - 4th floor
 - Seminary
 - 3rd floor

- What is this book's call number?
- PS 1868.A1 1965
 - Main
 - PS 1868
 - PS 1868 1965

- Who is the book's publisher?
- Bantam Books
 - Seton Hall Press
 - Nathaniel Hawthorne
 - Scarlet Letter Classics

PART C: LIBRARY RESOURCES AND DATABASES

Match the information needed with the best resource listed:

Information Needed

- journal articles
- address for a company
- definition of term
- book on topic
- concise summary of topic

Resources

- _____ directory
- _____ encyclopedia
- _____ library catalog
- _____ library database
- _____ dictionary

In preparing a presentation about the social and physiological effects of domestic abuse, rate the following monthly periodicals in order of credibility:

- TV Guide
- New York Times.
- Time Magazine
- New England Journal of Medicine

- 1,2,4,3
- 4,2,3,1
- 2,1,3,4
- 3,4,1,2

Example 3: Generic IF Questions

(Beth Bloom, Library faculty)

- What are modes of communication in a field?
- What genres/forms do members of a given intellectual community use?
- How do they come up with their terminology?
- How do you go about finding research topics--how do you narrow down, using the accepted terminologies

-
- What is the history of communication in a given field of study
 - What are the best venues for finding information?
 - When do you look for a book on a topic?
 - When is it time to start looking at the journal literature?
 - Which databases are most appropriate/
 - What strategies do you use to use them?
 - Should you browse or search?
 - Should you keyword or use controlled language?
 - How do you find statistical data, if applicable?