



ACADEMIC SENATE

07/AS/20/UEPC

Information Literacy at CSU Stanislaus (Sense of the Senate)

Resolved: The Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus support systematic discussion through the UEPC, with an eye to policy implementation in the near future, of the recommendations of the Information Literacy-Faculty Learning Community. These recommendations include:

1. The University explicitly include media and visual literacy as elements of information literacy through the label “Information, Media, and Visual Literacy” (IMVL) and adopt the following critical markers:

- determine information requirements
- access required information
- evaluate information and sources critically, including, for example, approach information skeptically, take into account multiple views, and practice an empathetic understanding of conflicting views
- use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose
- access and use information ethically and legally

2. The University explicitly recognize IMVL as a valued core competency necessary to the development of our students as scholars, professionals, and citizens.

3. That each department on campus specify which course(s) address elements of IMVL.

4. A structure with primary emphasis on media and visual literacy at the lower divisions as appropriate to the given discipline, especially in general education courses, and primary emphasis on the traditional elements of the Information Literacy Standards for academic research essays at the upper-division as appropriate to the discipline.

5. Professional development for faculty including mutually informative work bringing together librarians and disciplinary faculty.

6. Program-level assessment based on a flexible rubric that allows for elaboration and alteration by the program.

Rationale:

Background: Information Literacy (IL) is recognized as a core competency at California State University, Stanislaus and for the university’s accrediting body, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The Senate Executive Committee and the AVP for Academic Affairs agreed on a template providing for appointment of Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs) for the six core competencies at Stanislaus: Civic Engagement, Creative and Critical



Inquiry, Information Literacy, Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, and Written Communication. The charges provided some specific elements such as developing definitions and developing and field testing rubrics with the understanding that the FLCs would also have flexibility and would intersect with governance with recommendations.

The Information Literacy FLC (ILFLC) began meeting in May of 2016, conducting an extensive review of the literature, distributing and analyzing a broad-based campus survey, developing and field testing a rubric, and developing a definition based on markers of IL. After two years of work, the committee submitted a progress report and recommendations to the SEC in September 2018, requesting that the Academic Senate review and support the recommendations with a Sense of the Senate resolution (not a policy recommendation). The report and recommendations were referred to the UEPC and presented to the Senate as an information item in October 2018 and as a discussion item in August 2019

.Key Recommendations 1 & 2:

Approval of a Sense of the Senate resolution will signify Faculty endorsement of a campus definition of IL and recognition of its importance to our students. Recommendation 1 combines elements from the 2000 IL standards published by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and elements developed primarily from the review of literature; analysis of faculty, staff, student and administration responses to a 2017 survey; and the 2016 ACRL Framework for Information Literacy. The conceptual change is to explicitly include both visual literacy and media literacy as critical elements of IL. The definition is composed of recommended markers for IL and viewed as a collection of competencies that allows for selection by faculty and that may be elaborated at the instructor or program level.

Recommendation 2 responds to the opening section of the report from the ILFLC: four of the six “core competencies have explicit and long-term inclusion in the university curriculum through general education and other requirements . . . information literacy (IL), is present but has not been clearly articulated or integrated in the general education, baccalaureate, or graduate curricula in a carefully designed manner to ensure that all students receive adequate instruction in IL.”

Recommendations 3-6

Recommendation 3 is in response to a survey item—Is information literacy a learning outcome in any of the courses you teach? Please list course(s)—where individual faculty responded “yes” listing over 100 courses across many programs and at undergraduate and graduate levels. This is a first step we often recommend to ourselves: to see what we are already doing. A full sense of the distribution of IL instruction, though, requires information from programs rather than reports from individual faculty. Identifying courses is important for recommendation 5, professional development.



Recommendation 4 proposes a structure that promotes an increased emphasis on the media and visual literacies at the lower-division but with the caveat that selection of areas and markers of literacy are best selected as appropriate to the given discipline.

Recommendation 5 calls for ongoing professional development for instructors implementing IL in courses as part of developing a larger culture of professional development at Stanislaus. Members of the ILFLC have conducted two series of workshops for instructors and are currently launching a semester-long facilitation for instructors of English 1007 which has IL as a course outcome. That work will provide two models for assisting instructors in implementation of IL. More particular to IL is the opportunity to collaborate with librarians who have a long history of expertise to draw from, and the 2016 ACRL Framework facilitates exchange of expertise among librarians and instructional faculty. That exchange has been a defining feature of the workshops provided thus far.

Recommendation 6 speaks to the kind of assessment the FLC believes will be most effective and acceptable to faculty. Differing from general education assessment to be conducted at the university level, the community recommends that any assessment of IL be at the program level. Programs already submit annual assessment reports, and some learning outcomes reported map onto IL. This is not a recommendation that more assessment be done but rather the opposite, proposing that assessment done at the program level be accepted without further levels of assessment required. Further, if rubrics are implemented in assessment, they need not be rubrics developed by outside organizations nor common across programs.