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From Ted Mulvey, ACRL’s Information Literacy Frameworks and Standards committee (ILFSC) outgoing chair:

- ILFSC’s role – put together documents and resources for other sections/interest groups as they transition their disciplinary standards to align with the Framework
  - ILFSC helps by providing documents and guidance to specific sections – members of the committee act as liaisons to various disciplines, answer questions, share documents, etc.
    - Nancy Fawley (incoming chair) – LibGuide with resources for sections/interest groups revising their standards available at: acrl.libguides.com/ilfsc
  - Helpful documents: Chapter 14, which sets how new standards/documents are created or revised; checklist for developing companion documents; tip sheet for developing companion documents
  - Also, links to the Framework sandbox and table with ILFSC liaisons and the disciplines which the committee is working with

Three groups that worked on revising/creating Framework-companion documents for their disciplines/areas:

WGSS Instruction Section:

- Started process before the Framework came out; in the midst when it was established and implemented – as such, had to switch gears
  - Welcome in a lot of ways – very learner-centered emphasis, greater focus on students being active participants in creating information (not just critical consumers of information) → aligned with feminist pedagogy
    - Building on earlier work that thought about the outcomes they wanted for IL in WGS and also the overarching ACRL Framework
  - Shift worked well for this group
- Uses feminist pedagogical lens to adapt and better frame each of the IL frames to suit WGS instructors and students
  - Threshold concepts in WGS – heavily informed their work → evaluated each frame in the Framework through feminist pedagogical lens
    - Some of the threshold concepts – naming what the social forces or factors are that influence information literacy → for instance, privilege and oppression is a WGS threshold concept
      - What is information privilege? How does systemic oppression impact information?
      - Patriarchy
• Social construction of gender
• Intersectionality
• Feminist praxis

- Looked at in relation to feminist threshold concepts – did the IL frames make sense based on these threshold concepts? Do they need to be addressed?

- Taken the idea of the general Framework and looked at it at a granular level within the specific discipline so that they can connect with the faculty around the research/information in their discipline

- There are variations in WGS that make this discipline-specific application timely and necessary – for instance, the scholarship in WGS often comes from non-traditional routes (information format is different than in other disciplines)
  o Developed actions and attitudes that are specific to WGS
  o Had discussions about who would be working with various IL WGS frames – where do different ideas apply (e.g. faculty research, lower-division class, upper-division class, graduate students)
    ▪ Concepts are covered in a first-year WGS class – novice outcomes and then more advanced outcomes, and about adapting to the learners in the classroom

• The Framework is very adaptable, but because there are threshold concepts in WGS, it’s important to reflect that in their work and in their IL instruction

• Tried to make it explicit how the Framework connects to practices, instructional actions, and threshold concepts in WGS

• Process of revising the disciplinary documents:
  o Started by making smaller groups within larger group; each took a frame and adapted a definition – became their own framework aligned with the Framework
  o Then, took a step back and thought about what this learning looked like in WGS
  o Separately, created an action list – what does an information-literate person doing research in this discipline do, and what do they think like (actions/attitudes)
    ▪ Then, connected the actions/attitudes document with their own framework – in process now
      ▪ Connects to the Framework’s knowledge practices and dispositions
  o Shared their work at WGS faculty groups outside of libraryland – now presenting to WGS section (today) → seeking initial feedback from stakeholder groups
    ▪ Next steps may be more formal feedback – survey to section
    ▪ Still trying to figure out the best ways to gather WGS faculty feedback
  o Have been documenting this process all along so that people can see how their work has happened and how their thinking has developed

• Prior work – focused on developing learning outcomes for WGS learners; have been working to adapt these items into their larger document
This group meets pretty regularly – 4-6 weeks, sub-groups meet in between – but the process seems to be moving so slowly

EBSS Communication Studies Committee:

- Have been working on adapting the Framework for a year – met a lot, very intensive work but slow progress → only now established methods, but will begin data collection in the next year and will have more to report out in the future
- Two-phase process to adapt the Framework – only focusing on Journalism at this time, Media Studies may need its own (practitioner/theoretical focuses):
  - Phase 1: What are the information-seeking behaviors of novice and expert journalists? Anecdotally, they see this, but they needed to get a better sense of these group’s actions.
    - Going to try to collect data on these ideas
    - Series of interviews – will ask the same general questions and then probe in different areas depending on responses
      - Developing interview questions this summer
    - Seven members, hoping for 5-10 interviews each (aiming for a 50-50 split between students and faculty)
      Hoping to present/publish next year
  - Feedback from someone in the room: The study is cart before the horse; set the benchmarks with professional journalists before talking with students → work with social scientist researchers to better develop/improve this study
    - Or, set the benchmarks and then use those to develop their interview questions for both experts and novices
  - Phase 2: Delphi panel – also how the Framework was developed → converge the opinions of experts into a set of recommendations; the committee members are experts on how to get students from novices to experts
    - Delphi panel of committee can take these data and opinions and converge them into recommendations
    - How this will run is sort of up in the air, but that’s down the road – two committee members will facilitate the panel with prompts on how to move students from novice to expert
      - Facilitator will analyze the recommendations and see similarities/differences – opportunities to converge or defend one’s own recommendations in subsequent rounds
      - These rounds go on until a core set of recommendations are developed agreed upon
- Delay in process: had to figure out how to best gather the information they needed; started with survey – took two months to develop, and committee figured out that the questions were library-ese, leading, etc. Figured out that better data would be collected by talking to people, seeing what they do, etc.
• Foresee maybe 18-24 months more of work to do – anticipate having data to share within the next year

Rare Book and Manuscript Section/Society of American Archivists – Primary Source Literacy:
• Started work in 2015, had two-year charge from RMBS/SAA
  o Did not have primary source literacy guidelines, but growing need to define, as a profession, what it is they do when they teach students with primary sources, what someone who is good working with primary sources learns to do (came out of an Assessment/Metrics task force – have to set what you’re doing before you can assess anything!)
    ▪ Diversity of what was happening in their instruction, and so this served to formalize what they were doing so it could be measured/assessed
• Started before the Framework – well underway when it was released/Standards were sunsetted → BUT it was out there, and they looked to see if they can use it as a model for what they were doing → did not think their area aligned as much, and they didn’t have a document already existing as a starting point
  o NOT just thinking about archival literacies but primary sources wherever primary sources exist; also, not just historical primary sources – interdisciplinary work/document
  o Started with a lit review – what do people who teach with primary sources or ask their students to use primary sources want their students to learn
    ▪ Teased out what experts think is important for students to know/do well – tried to fit these learning goals/objectives into the Framework and found that there was repetition across frames → structure did not work for what they were trying to do
  o Document arranged with:
    ▪ Core ideas involved in working with primary sources
    ▪ Learning objectives
    ▪ These two pieces are not nested under each other as the Framework is
• Throughout process, tried to be as transparent as possible – sought feedback on first draft from the community to ensure they were responding to structure, tone, etc.; at that point, it was archives/special collections-focused → from this document, worked to generalize language, make more applicable, etc.
  o Worked through several drafts; held meetings at ALA midwinter and SAA
  o Presented at IFLA satellite conference
  o Present at Organization of American Historians
  o Reached out to faculty through listservs/direct contact, ACRL/SAA sections to get feedback
• Final draft – submitting to RBMS Monday; then will move to Standards committee
  o Has been tremendously informed by feedback and the document reflects many, many voices involved in this kind of information literacy instruction
  o Have heard from many people across primary source librarianship who have cited the ways that this document can help advance primary source literacy
- Proud of document, but doesn’t look like the Framework – some have mentioned crosswalking it, but that may not make the most sense
  - Feedback is to create a table that provides this crosswalk – based on the outcomes in their document, this would be possible
  - Not a disciplinary document – definitely cross-disciplinary

- Document structure:
  - Introduction
  - Four ideas – paragraph talking about analytical, ethical, theoretical concepts important to working with primary sources and practical considerations
  - Learning objectives – grouped into areas with specific actions under each area: conceptualize; find and access; read, understand, and summarize; interpret, understand, and evaluate; and use and incorporate

ILFSC:
- Not seeking to limit companion documents just to discipline or subject area – we need to think about, as a profession, how we can address information literacy that falls outside of disciplinary bounds or extends across disciplinary bounds
- Do not want to force groups to follow specific structures – groups should do what works for them and not feel like they need to mirror the structure of the Framework
  - The Framework is a living document and will be updated, too – we need to consider this as we work on companion documents, because as the Framework evolves, these documents will change and develop, too

Ideas for future resources for other sections/interest groups that came out of this meeting:
- A complied document of what people have done/what has been successful/what has been unsuccessful/suggestions for other sections?
  - Best practices guide – will be something that ILFSC will work on in 2017-2018
- Continuing to have a central place for content (the existing ILFSC LibGuide may serve this purpose)
  - RMBS/SAA – people kept getting lost in where things were located!