

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: A HOUSE OF BRICK: USING THE ACRL
FRAMEWORK TO [RE]BUILD A
STRONGER, MORE SUSTAINABLE
DEMOCRACY THROUGH A STAND-
ALONE, INFORMATION LITERACY
COURSE

Courtney Lawrence Douglass, Master of
Science, Library and Information Science, 2017

Thesis Directed By: Dr. Paul Jaeger, Professor and MLIS Program
Director, College of Information Studies

This thesis explores the relationship with and value of information literacy to a successful, democratic society. It analyzes societal needs and presents historical and philosophical relevance for the value of understanding how to acquire, use and create accurate, timely and relevant information pieces and products. Finally, this thesis presents a model for teaching information literacy as an independent social or information science course, and how a college at a major research university has moved to implement such a course for the benefit of the University at large.

A HOUSE OF BRICK: USING THE ACRL FRAMEWORK TO [RE]BUILD A
STRONGER, MORE SUSTAINABLE DEMOCRACY THROUGH A STAND-
ALONE INFORMATION LITERACY COURSE

by

Courtney Lawrence Douglass

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science, Library
and Information Science
2017

Advisory Committee:
Professor Paul Jaeger, Chair
Dr. Ursula Gorham-Oscilowski
Dr. Renee Hill
Dr. Beth St. Jean

© Copyright by
Courtney Lawrence Douglass
2017

Dedication

I can remember the names of all my teachers from Kindergarten through the 12th grade. It was my third-grade teacher, Ms. Auscherman, who took a chance on me. Had it not been for her, college (let alone graduate school... twice) may not have been in my purview. But she did. And so did Mrs. Carol Maid; Ms. Adrian Mucci; Dr. Claudia Floyd; Professor Christine (Chip) Rouse; Professor Stephanie Verni; and Dr. Paul Jaeger. Mrs. Maid helped me see how much I love learning; Ms. Mucci taught me how to write; Dr. Floyd saw how greatly I needed to continue my education, and helped me realize the value of an informed society; Professor Rouse let me have a voice, Professor Verni taught me to use that voice with style; and Dr. Jaeger is the teacher, and the scholar, and the all-around good person I can only hope to be. Each of these educators guided me through a different part of my journey, and I thank them for their patience, knowledge, wisdom, and kindness.

This thesis is because of and for these teachers.

Acknowledgements

During this most recent leg, my wonderful husband, Dr. Kevin Douglass, and my beautiful children have offered endless support as I found this passion in myself to create something that might just make the world a better place. Thank you, Kevin, for listening to my impassioned diatribes about information, information literacy, human rights, advocacy, changing policy, navigating academia ...

I must thank my advisor, Dr. Paul Jaeger, without whom I may not have felt the confidence and support needed to undertake this endeavor; and with whom I have learned much – particularly that I am strongest when I embrace all of who I am – including those weaknesses and vulnerabilities that make me human.

Thanks also to those seasoned librarians who were generous enough to welcome me to their sessions: Joanna Gadsby at The University of Maryland, Baltimore County; Elizabeth DeCoster (formerly) at Goucher College; Shana Ghass at Towson University, and to the friends and classmates who have helped me to grow as a person, and better understand what is needed to make any kind of difference in this life.

Lastly, I thank the other members of my thesis committee – Drs. Ursula Gorham-Oscilowski, Beth St. Jean, and Renee Hill whose work and influence I admire. Thank you for being the type of role models that women in this field and profession need. I look forward to learning more with and from you in the years to come.

Table of Contents

Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Abbreviations	vii
Chapter 1: Once Upon a Time	1
Introduction.....	1
Understanding Information Literacy.....	2
Seeking Fortunes.....	4
Ever After.....	6
Chapter 2: Beware the Wolf	7
Who’s Afraid to Lose Their Rights?.....	7
The Information Illiterate Threat	10
“Four legs good, two legs better...”	13
Chapter 3: From Ancient Architecture to Modern Design.....	16
A Tale as Old as Time	16
Tall Tales – A Current Policy Review.....	17
Chapter 4: Choosing a Cornerstone.....	25
Chapter 5: Building with Straw and Sticks	31
Barn Raising.....	31
If You Take the Blue Pill.....	33
Chapter 6: Brick by Brick.....	41
Chapter 7: Huff and Puff	48
Don’t Blow the House Down.....	48
The Work of Ants	50
Appendices.....	56
Bibliography	75

List of Abbreviations

AHF – American Heritage Foundation

ALA – American Library Association

ALIA – Australian Library and Information Association

ACRL – Association of College and Research Libraries

CGI – Computer Generated Imaging

COMAR – Code of Maryland Regulations

GPA – Grade Point Average

IFLA – International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions

INST – Information studies

MHEC – Maryland Higher Education Commission

MIL – Media and Information Literacy

OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

PCC – Proposals, Courses, and Curriculum

SARA – Standards for Accreditation Requirements for Affiliation

SGD – Sustainable Development Goals

UG - Undergraduate

UGC – Undergraduate Committee

UMD – The University of Maryland

UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

WWII – World War Two

VPAC – Vice Presidents Advisory Committee

Chapter 1: Once Upon a Time

Introduction

My mother always says she should have been a librarian because she loves books. Being a librarian means more than loving books; being a librarian means loving information and the access to and organization of said information. I did not always understand this. In fact, as a child, I thought as my mother did; librarians are ladies who like books and know everything about all of them. The immediately antiquated 1986 mini-series, *Tomes and Talismans* partially reiterated that misconception for me as Ms. Bookhart had clearly memorized the call numbers and content of every book in her archive. A natural-born librarian would have found her fascinating and impressive, so I was clearly not a natural-born librarian. I found Ms. Bookhart condescending and her card catalogs and Dewey Decimal System complicated. I was seven, and much has changed.

I had no concept in 1989 the profound affect the series had on me. In late September 2000, my views on libraries started changing. I began my freshmen year at [then] Villa Julie College where the card catalogs were kept in a cold room for preservation. If I wanted to find a book, I needed to use the computer, and I was sorely disappointed not to get to flip through the dusty index cards in search of my just right source. Then, two years later, as I studied Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* for the first time, Ms. Bookhart's book-loving spirit re-ignited in me, and it was then that I first understood my own heart did not belong only to books but to information. My road to

understanding this was one I had to pave myself, and for that reason the journey has been more fulfilling.

When I first saw an episode of *Tomes and Talismans*, the series was only 3-years-old, yet so much of the story and anticipated technology already felt outdated. My middle-school librarian wowed my sixth-grade self with Encyclopedia Encarta that had no place in my research by the time I started high school. And in less than two decades, the collections I relied on as a college freshman have multiplied quite likely 100-fold. Library Science will continue changing faster than traditional sciences, and I aim to inspire educators to take a more creative and multi-discipline approach in their own classrooms to make sure that Library Science and librarianship receive the recognition they deserve.

Eight years of teaching college freshmen showed me, firsthand the need for information literacy instruction. My awareness first developed through mandatory class sessions in the campus library where I had more fun than my students, and perhaps more fun than most faculty would. Sadly, many schools no longer requires library sessions, only a series of do-it-yourself information literacy modules, and so many students will not even have the opportunity to experience all the school's library has to offer until they enroll in major courses.

Understanding Information Literacy

Information literacy is perhaps the only course of study that truly teaches critical thinking. By its own nature, effective critical thought requires practice; however, learners struggle with this practice while also having to master subject-

specific content. Information literacy is not only an academic discipline; it is a way of lifelong learning.

While the organizational definitions differ slightly, information literacy rests at learning's foundation. Today's students and tomorrow's citizens must have a working knowledge of how to find, manage and use information correctly, ethically, and effectively to both succeed in academic and professional pursuits, and to adjust to changes in society and in information dissemination.

This thesis addresses concepts that may have different context for different readers. As such, exploring popular definitions will allow for a firmer understanding of the thesis. Information literacy, as examined above, has been consistently defined but weakly measured. What do information literate persons look like, and how are they identified? What's more, how do they align with classic democracy? Firstly, they exhibit confidence in their choices and their work because both are grounded in the logical analysis and evaluation of available and sought information. The information literate individual does not accept the world at face value, rather they continually explore, and their ideas continually evolve.

Necessarily, information literacy's implications for academe must also be examined because successful information literacy contributes to a successful academic experience, and institutional prominence, which ultimately translates to success in life.

While this thesis does not aim specifically to promote the academic library or one-shot information literacy instruction, few institutions offer holistic, for credit information literacy courses, and the data available comes from studies of information

literacy programs offered through academic libraries. Also, because of the ACRL Framework's newness, many of the studies examined rely on the now retired Standards for Information Literacy. Later chapters will address the efficacy of this approach in greater depth, where this chapter simply introduces the benefits and limitations of information literacy instruction in its current forms.

Seeking Fortunes

Two and four-year colleges and universities regularly assess student GPA and other measures of success to promote their institutional quality. A successful student body equates to more competitive admissions standards and higher job placement and/ or transfer ratings. Sanabria's 2012 study of information literacy integration throughout a First-Year Seminar at Bronx College of New York shows "solid increases in average GPA's of freshmen students" who participated in the course over those who did not (Sanabria). Further, after taking this seminar, students gained confidence to attempt more credits/ semester than their counterparts. This confidence should be attributed directly to library-led instruction and programs, which may not always be able to address higher order information literacy concepts within their 1-2 hour time constraints, but often represent a welcoming, orientation environment for new students. Studies also indicate that college students who use library services are often more likely to succeed in their coursework and actively participate in campus activities. In this respect, the information literacy skills help students become acculturated to college life (Grallo, Chalmers & Baker, 2012). The information and programs that academic libraries offer encourage students to engage in the

scholarship of their universities, and this engagement in turn promotes student persistence.

Stagg and Kimmins (2014) refer to the information literacy component of library instruction as “generic information literacy,” as it is often taught “as supplementary to course content,” which ultimately “reinforces the idea that these skills are generic in nature (p. 143). While I do not agree with the language choice, I do agree that embedding IL within other disciplines reduces its value to little more than temporary tools to support a singular task. In the same study, Stagg & Kimmins observed that first year graduate students struggle as much, if not more than their undergraduate counterparts, suggesting that the research literacy taught in first-year composition courses does not support lifelong learning (Stagg and Kimmins, 2014). Additionally, a stand-alone information literacy course can reach the “affective domain,” thereby supporting student self-esteem and allowing them to “make accurate judgments about their skill level,” in relation to information literacy as well as other academic demands (p. 144).

This affective design, as well as active, explicit teaching and learning support student success and retention. When students have the opportunity to develop their desired skillset, they are more likely to connect with content, their peers, their instructors, and their institutions (Wilkes et al., 2015). Like academic writing skills, information literacy should be supported across the curriculum not only because they support student success but because they foster lifelong learning.

The Maryland Higher Education Commission reported an overall college graduation rate of 63.7% with significantly lower rates for African American and Pell

Recipient students in 2013 (2016). The same report shows a maximum retention rate of 85.1, but only a 33.9% transfer rate from two-four year institutions within four years (2016). These figures suggest that the most at-risk students – particularly minority and socioeconomically disadvantaged students – are most in need for explicit instruction in content that they see as clearly relevant to their futures.

Ever After

In an age of information overload, Americans must be able to discern bias, manipulation, and fact from fiction; they must do better with discovering and judging information in sources with integrity before retaining and transmitting it. This means understanding what those sources look like and how to find and evaluate them, and to apply the information in a meaningful, ethical fashion. When this doesn't happen, democracy falls to autocracy or totalitarian tyranny.

Chapter 2: Beware the Wolf

Who's Afraid to Lose Their Rights?

In his equally acclaimed and challenged novel, '1984,' George Orwell (1949) prophesied a world of citizen-drones unable to discern reality from fiction because the government under which they lived demanded total compliance with the lies of each day. Enemies were identified and loathed though few knew why. Men and women disappeared seeming to never have existed. Questioning authority was not allowed, and those who were unfortunately privileged with information would eventually be purged. Orwell's vision trounces any semblance of or hope for democracy, and it's very possibility hinges on a society devoid of literacy and willing civic engagement. In fact, Winston Smith, whose job is to alter documents to align with current Party rhetoric, fully acknowledges the power of a single piece of information to "blow the Party to atoms," (69).

To preempt such a deterioration, citizens of a society must have access to information education, and the ultimate confidence and ability to continually self-educate. In doing so, they avoid becoming another mind simply filed away for "lack of creativity, transformation and knowledge," by a system that wants their submission (Friere, 1970). In this sense, education and information literacy are synonymous; moreover, democracy can only thrive with the support of a well-informed and highly involved citizenry. This is particularly true given the 21st Centuries digital news echo-chambers that serve no other purpose than to allow persons to solely "ascribe openly too much to their own wisdom and policy," thus eliminating reflective discourse that promotes the greater good, (Bacon, Of Fortune). The necessary information literacy

skills promote an “emphasis on critical thinking... that could lead to a lifelong ability to participate more effectively in society,” rather than simply using societal rights and privileges to benefit the self (Sturges & Gastinger).

Further, Kay Mathiesen argues that all human rights exist through the right to communicate, (2012). I would contend that all rights extend from information and information literacy because communication cannot be effective if it is not nested in accurate information. Further, communicating and producing information is an extension of information literacy. Mathiesen claims that “without the ability to communicate, we do not have rights at all,” but without first gathering and evaluating accurate, timely information, we cannot communicate with authority and integrity (p. 15). Stanford researcher, Sam Wisenberg uncovered startling evidence that even the most media savvy among us struggle to discern credible information from biased and/or inaccurate reports primarily because “U.S. classrooms haven’t caught up to the way information is influencing,” us in 2016 (Domonoske).

In the 21st Century information age, freedom of expression and opinion are perhaps the most highly abused civil rights for which the only defense is an information literate society. Even in academic circles, with white collar professions, and among the wealthy, information literacy – the “set of competencies that an informed citizen of an information society ought to possess to participate actively and intelligently,” (unknown) – is the least afforded human right, but a human right it is; moreover, there has never been a more desperate time to fight for and promote this foundational right upon which all other rights depend. In fact, “the right to seek and receive information supports a large number of other rights, and in many cases the

right to information is a component of other rights. For instance, without the freedom to seek and receive information about candidates and their positions, the right to vote would be pointless,” (Mathiesen, p. 10).

Four years after Mathiesen defends ‘The Human Right to Internet Access,’ Americans are finding out the full relevance of this freedom to not only seek and receive information but to seek and receive correct information about political candidates. The results of the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election demonstrate the danger in disseminating false information to a population that lacks information literacy. Because the U.S. Constitution already protects communication freedoms, false information is equally protected as accurate information, and it is often indiscernible. A study out of Stanford University demonstrates that even millennials, whom have grown up with Internet technology and access, lack the necessary skills to navigate their screens with literacy, (Domonoske). Further, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights protects information communication in Article 19, which states,

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers,” (19).

The only possible solution to combat the abuses to this right is to better educate information seekers with critical literacy which stands “central to the whole educational,” or learning process (Sturges and Gastinger citing Shor, 1980). Luckily, these skills, albeit more subtly, are also afforded under the same Declaration, but societies cannot rely solely on librarians to right this wrong as most “libraries may

offer access to information for a public that is, in fact, not fully able to make good use of,” overwhelming levels of access that simply confuse and/ or deceive (Sturges & Gastinger, p. 199). An information literate society is the responsibility of all citizens.

The Information Illiterate Threat

Marginalized populations are less likely to make informed decisions even if they actively engage in the political process, but the un-educated citizens of a democratic society will ultimately fight back against their oppression. These citizens will embody all races, ethnicities, genders, and socio-economic levels. They may have earned multiple degrees, achieved professional success, live comfortable lives, and possibly be quite knowledgeable. But if they cannot effectively handle information – that is, if they are not information literate – they are not educated and are, therefore, oppressed. Only by “critically recogniz[ing]” how the current political system oppresses the population can they act to “create a new situation,” (Friere, 29) that allows for a stronger, more inclusive democracy, and one with an active citizenry.

There is a clear connection between the literate society, civic engagement, and humanization. Plato’s ‘Allegory of the Cave’ serves not only as an ideal metaphor for the dangers inherent in media and information illiteracy, but the proposition that those who are so illiterate are slaves deprived of their essential rights to knowledge and civic participation, (Thevenin, 2012). The irony, and perhaps gravest danger is that democracy still allows for freedom of expression without regard to information, and if citizens lack awareness of what they don’t know i.e. the degree to which they are restricted, they will not agitate or challenge government authority, (Berlin, 1996).

When, however, they glimpse the light thus realizing their oppression, they will – in desperation – seek any means and support any figure promising to help them overcome their plight.

Necessarily, all citizens under democratic rule have the right, and are encouraged to participate in shaping and operating the society in which they live, but only those who are information literate can affect, inspire and make positive change that benefits the society as a whole. Unfortunately, studies suggest that political information is often “sparse, potentially biased, and difficult to obtain,” which limits good decision making, and the arduous process of researching candidates’ positions and backgrounds, and fact-checking transcripts, is “a mind-numbing inconvenience,” for voters who lack the cognition or drive, which ultimately limits the number of “well-informed voters among the general public,” (O’Hara, Walter & Christopher, 2009, pp. 1399-1400). Unfortunately, those who lack the foundational literacy to navigate the civic landscape not only fail to participate in a meaningful way, they are at the mercy of those who are either more literate or more powerful. One would hope that education, professional success and experience equate to nobler, wiser intentions, but the modern political landscape in the United States demonstrates otherwise.

As Americans laughed at the British for voting to exit the European Union in what has become dubbed #Brexit, the rest of the world has watched in amusement as Americans selected the two most divisive candidates in their presidential election history. Ironically, American news outlets criticized the Brits for their failure to understand Brexit before voting in favor of it. Instead, some voted along party lines, some voted based on their limited understanding of the issue, and others did not vote

at all because they didn't understand the issue. An analysis of the vote by *'The Parliament'*, however, indicates that voters between the age of 18-24, voters who were employed, and voters with a college degree or higher voted to remain in greater numbers than older voters, the unemployed, and those with a secondary education or lower, (Singh, 2016). It stands to reason that those who fall within the aforementioned demographics have greater access to information, and therefore cast a more educated vote. Likewise, in the United States, voters with greater access to a full range of information types and sources were better able to parse out which 2016 presidential candidate would best benefit the nation as whole. Post-election analysis demonstrates a similar trend in United States voting patterns as exit polls show voters without a college degree supported Donald Trump 52%-44%, even though a separate Pew Research Poll indicated that 47% of voters expected Trump would do poorly in creating jobs for these same struggling populations (Pew). Even more, Mr. Trump's proposed tax plan will negatively impact single parents and the working poor though he campaigned to boost the middle-class economy.

O'Hara et al. study results indicate that voters that are "high in need of cognition" – those that enjoy collecting and discussing information – are more likely to invest time seeking information, and that the information they identify is most likely of a higher quality, and that these voters better fit the profile of "the well-informed voter called for by classic democratic theory," (2009). Suffice it to say, the groups who voted for Mr. Trump are more likely low in need of cognition and quickly discovered post-election that their candidates' success was born of his

supporters vulnerability. Such dire results would have once been the stuff of fiction, but for the “idiot America,” they are now all too real, (GreenDay, 2004).

“Four legs good, two legs better...”

Through the devotion of the “most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallows of slogans,” (Orwell, 9) and those desperate to finally have “an advocate in the Oval Office,” (Waldman) “Ignorance” was, in fact, proven to be strength in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Referencing Orwell is not a mere scare tactic as U.S. literacy rates lag behind many industrialized nations while its leaders are increasingly more from an elite, wealthy pool of dynastic families thereby limiting not only the realistic prospect but the hope and desire of the working class to participate. In the second of three presidential debates in the 2016 election cycle, Donald Trump threatened to incarcerate his opponent, Hillary Clinton, upon his election, and chants of “lock her up,” regularly erupted at his rallies. Much like Oceania’s ‘two-minutes hate,’ Trump supporters ascribe to the views of their leader, and often speak or act without reason, or their mob mentality generates the same type of hostility – whether they are chanting “Lock her up,” or “Swine! Swine! Swine!” (12) – that perpetuates the culture of fear established in Orwell’s dystopia.

Despite losing the popular vote, Mr. Trump won the electorate, challenging the notion of information literacy compelling citizens to act. However, the 2016 election cycle was plagued by misinformation that spoke loudly to working classes and the uneducated. Without the time or foundational, critical literacy skills to discern fact from obscene fiction, these Americans accepted as fact such claims of Hillary Clinton enemies being murdered and the Democratic candidates’ apathy for the lives

lost in Benghazi. In fact, 38% of the information circulated by conservative outlets was blatantly false, (Oliver, 2016).

Stephanie McCrummen's insider report of Melanie Austin – once committed to a mental health facility for threats against President Obama – reveals the dangers inherent in information poverty. Ms. Austin, like so many social media users, finds the information she wants instead of the information that's accurate. An admittedly hard life informs her ideology, and knowing the truth is subordinate to her own validation. Springer et al. discovered that the appearance of certain social cues impact in-depth information seeking behaviors during an election cycle. This suggests that citizens with access to social media are influenced more by the 'Likes', comments and number of shares attached to an information item than the actual validity or presence of information in said item (Springer, 2016). Interestingly, Ms. Austin's passion for Donald Trump's candidacy compelled her to volunteer for his campaign more than many informed citizens. Counter to my position, it is, in fact, being information poor that compels some to action even if that action is nested in delusion.

Raymond Bradbury's *'Fahrenheit 451'* constructs a future built on the logical course his own society – and now ours - was on. With citizens entranced by vapid programming and consumed by meaningless and nonsensical white noise, only those few who dare to seek the truth are positioned to make change. Many Americans, like Stephanie McCrummen prefer flashy news programs to in-depth analysis, and Cliff's Notes or a CGI film adaptation to an actual novel. Bradbury brilliantly and terrifyingly predicts the deterioration of civic engagement when citizens lack or simply forego information literacy. It is not altogether farfetched to envision a

discussion in an American living room surrounding the 2016 Presidential Election that pays tribute to how Mildred Montague and her guests discuss their own candidates from the 'In' party and the 'Out' party. It is clear, in the novel that the winning candidate is pre-selected and any competition is presented as superficial entertainment when the establishment candidate wins "in a landslide" based on his name, appearance and demeanor (Bradbury, 97). Much like this fictional election is fabricated to promote citizen involvement and a sense of input, the 2016 election was won from fabricated news stories and 'click-bait' from outlets betting on a reader base that lacked the basic information literacy skills to properly vet the "quality of information ... [and] leisure to digest it," (84-85). Instead they readily accept the misinformation that affirms their personal beliefs and foolishly act "based on what [they] learn," from false information. In looking at Bradbury's futuristic world where libraries and schools no longer exist and the self-serving populace lacks the mental capacity for discourse, it is not a far stretch to wonder if America's reality plays out on and is pre-established by television and other entertainment outlets.

Sadly, this story does not represent an uneducated society because to be educated is relative to the societies' needs. It instead demonstrates the result of a society of people that ceased to be involved, not only in their governance but in their own lives. They are satisfied to participate so long as it entertains them, but once the show is over, all the lights turn off.

Chapter 3: From Ancient Architecture to Modern Design

A Tale as Old as Time

Active citizenship and civic participation are ancient ideals, which have been relayed for millennia, since Aristotle first outlined the path for a fruitful Athenian Democracy. His call, nested in logic, was born of Plato's "gadfly" in Socrates – the philosopher whose dialogue permeates academic inquiry and – arguably – lays the earliest foundations for information literacy. While Socrates doesn't go so far as to offer a framework, he encourages his students to challenge ideas and challenge authority rather than accept claims as true simply because they come from men in power.

Indeed, Aristotle encourages the lawmaker to design education that embodies the true nature of man's soul – his willingness to fight for justice but longing for peace; his ability to work hard while also enjoying leisure; his awareness of that which holds "moral worth" as distinct from that which is "merely necessary and useful," and warns of the fall that comes when rulers limit the education of the ruled to no more than what best serves the interest of the ruler as "laughable ... [and] with no one to stop him from using those laws, [he has] lost the good life," (1333a30; 1333b5). Here, Aristotle identifies the tyrant who comes to power either through force or manipulation and whose power is difficult to check, but, like in the city-state of Sparta, does not stand for the good of the polis, only his own gain. To avoid such a fall, Aristotle, thousands of years ago, encouraged fair education practices for all citizens. Ironically, the manipulation of which he warns is commonly practiced by politicians in America's great democracy, and with access to seemingly unlimited

information items, United States citizens who are not literate in the ways and means of information are most susceptible to such tyrants.

Centuries before the ACRL offered standards for information literacy, and subsequently a framework, Sir Francis Bacon offered a framework of his own for a societies' becoming literate where information literacy begins with contemplation noting "if a man will begin with certainties, he shall end in doubts; but if he will be content to begin with doubts, he shall end in certainties," (Book One, 28). To assuage the uncertainty, Bacon outlines nine books "Of the Dignity and Advancement of Learning," the fifth of which is arguably a centuries old precursor to information literacy standards and frameworks. He divides logic into "the arts of Discovering, of Judging, of Retaining, and of Transmitting," (Chapter 1, 59) which, he indicates in his *Great Instauration*, is part and parcel to a societies' learned success and ability to create a "better condition than that in which it now is," (66). Thus it is not enough for the individual or small groups to be information literate. The society must set this literacy as its highest priority for its own success.

Tall Tales – A Current Policy Review

Despite its massive military and economic influence, the United States struggles to truly educate its citizens. The most recent annual Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) reports have the U.S. ranked between 16-19 out of 26 countries for mean literacy score based on occupation type, and of 10 'Sustainable Development Goals' (SGD) target benchmarks, the United States has only hit two – those relating to vocational skills and offering diverse and inclusive school environments, (45-47). The OECD defines literacy as "the ability to

understand, evaluate, use and engage with written texts to participate in society, to achieve one's goals, and to develop one's knowledge and potential," (38). For the purposes of this paper, literacy and education must be understood as effectively communicating, processing, applying and/ or creating information. This means that students are not passive listeners and note-takers, diligently preparing for the next test or essay; in fact, the student-teacher relationship is symbiotic and continual, or at least it should be. When this doesn't happen, when young minds are not permitted to explore their worlds, to question pre-existing notions of reality, a gross disservice exists that perpetuates the total acceptance, stagnation and eventual deterioration of a prescribed social order.

Individual nations and worldwide organizations have sought to preserve and protect the very education that maintains democracy. After the atrocities of World War II, the United Nations set forth its Universal Declaration of Human Rights, one fifth of which directly or indirectly addresses information rights. While Article 19 offers clear context for the right to freely share information, subsequent Articles provide insight for how that information should be taught, gathered, used and protected. Article 23 addresses employment rights as nested in choice; however, without access to information and education, citizens are limited to low-paying jobs. Further, Article 25 provides a social justice framework to protect a decent standard of living even in the event of "unemployment, sickness, disability ... or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond [their] control," and "motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance," (Article 25). These articles do not directly address information, access or literacy; however, most social service agencies have

transferred information and services to websites that their users can neither access or navigate without assistance. This was not the case in 1948, but the interpretation of these articles must adapt with societal change. In fact, we must assume that they were meant to be adaptable upon their creation. We can, in fact, see how certain interpretations have been adapted to modern technologies if we examine Articles 26 and 27, which promote education, intellectual freedom and copyright. Media outlets have changed dramatically since 1948, and with each new medium, we have seen new laws protecting ownership and expression of materials while the ability to access, understand and effectively use this information is only loosely suggested by organizations that already have a vested interest in the information in question. It is important to have a basic understanding of current practices and acceptable use to fully appreciate the broad spectrum of disciplines and ideologies that fall within Information Literacy. From international to local, organizations tackle this idea of information literacy and how best to teach it, but despite the noblest intentions, it is, at best, only required as supplemental to other learning.

The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions counts itself as the “global voice of the... information profession,” (IFLA, 2011). It stands to reason that this organization would set and uphold global standards that promote information literate citizens, and that national and local organizations would seek adherence to such international and unifying guidelines. As of 2011, IFLA has issued a set of recommendations for Media and Information Literacy (MIL) but has yet to publish standards, or measurement guidelines to assist policy makers in better understanding and implementing this foundational need. Instead, IFLA encourages

“research... so that experts, educators, and practitioners are able to design effective initiatives;” moreover, the commission acknowledges MIL as essential to general education, even emphasizing its benefits for underserved groups, but only recommends embedding standards throughout a curriculum (2011).

Fortunately, other international and national organizations have taken up IFLA’s call to arms with UNESCO declaring that a system to measure MIL “is a must for any country that wishes to promote and develop the knowledge societies of its citizens,” in its own attempt to establish competency indicators (Moeller, et al, 2010). The commission set a baseline for such indicators to include: access, understanding and evaluation, and use, as MIL’s units of measure. Sturges and Gastinger also note the Scottish Information Literacy Project identifying “information literacy as a civil right;” and identifies the Prague Declaration of 2003, The United Nations Millennium Development Goals, The World Summit on the Information Society’s Declaration of Principles; and the Alexandria Proclamation of 2005 as international initiatives acknowledging the importance of information literacy. Of particular note, Article 100 of the Norwegian Constitution requires “state authorities to create conditions that facilitate open and enlightened public discourse,” as a measure to promote a more information literate society (Sturges & Gastinger, 2009, p.198; interpreting Norwegian Constitution, 2005).

With a somewhat more specific direction, the Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL) re-worked its own competencies to establish a framework for information literacy that is both clear and measurable. The objectives are:

The student will understand that authority is both constructed and contextual.

The student will reflect upon and practice information creation.

The student will understand that all information has value either/ or as commodity, education, influence, negotiation/ understanding.

The student will experience and practice 'research as inquiry'.

The student will participate in 'scholarship as conversation'.

The student will practice 'searching as strategic exploration'. (ACRL)

This framework is new, and most of the United States' regional commissions will need to adjust from the ACRL competency standards, (APPENDIX II) when setting guidelines for accreditation. For example, all accredited and degree-granting higher education institutions in the state of Maryland are bound by policies set forth by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. MHEC, essentially, establishes regulations based on Middle States criteria, with some of the most recent updates being made in late 2013. Middle States updates its standards and recommendations almost annually, though the official 'Standards for Accreditation and Requirements for Affiliation' (SARA) was most recently updated and accepted in May 2015.

Under Standard III of the 2015 SARA, 'Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience,' all accredited institutions must offer "a curriculum designed [to include] at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information

literacy” (SARA, 2015). Further, Middle States recognizes the need for “consistent interpretation and application” of SARA by 2017, as established in its ‘Strategic Goals and Objectives,’ (<http://www.msche.org/?Nav1=ABOUT&Nav2=MISSION>).

Unfortunately, in a 2003 publication, the Commission made clear that information literacy need not be “defined and assessed separately,” nor will schools need a “distinct assessment instrument” to evaluate student information literacy competency (Developing Research and Communication Skills). It defines information literacy too broadly as acquiring and using or creating any information but at least recognizes that information literacy is distinct from information technology.

Middle States has essentially left it to individual institutions to set clear requirements for information literacy and to assess on their own standards. MHEC also identifies information literacy as a general education required skill, but like Middle States, MHEC offers no indication of how schools should approach it. Under COMAR 13b.02.02, MHEC outlines the general education requirements for state schools including earned-credit guidelines; however, information literacy is not recommended as a required credit-bearing course.

As an example of these guidelines in practice, The University of Maryland, College Park prides itself as an institution that fosters “intellectual dexterity... from understanding the many ways knowledge is produced,” (The University of Maryland, UG Catalog). The school sets extensive, global-minded and culturally inclusive general education requirements; however, it does not specifically delineate Media and Information Literacy (MIL) in the General Education Learning Outcomes. The outcomes – spread out over 40 credit hours – do address elements of UNESCO’s

baseline, ACRL's competencies, and MHEC's guidelines. Embedded within, roughly, 12 courses, students must "evaluate, analyze, and synthesize appropriate sources," use source material ethically, and apply critical thinking, but the *Outcomes* do not speak to the first three objectives identified in the ACRL Framework, (Learning Outcomes).

To relegate information literacy instruction and assessment to a goal that can be achieved when scattered is to threaten the credibility of other disciplines or other general education goals. If information literacy can be achieved as embedded throughout other coursework, then composition skills can, arguably, also be learned in other disciplines. Logic establishes that students need a foundation in a skill before they can recognize when they are practicing and/ or becoming adept at said skill. Burying information literacy objectives – objectives that students need to recognize as connected to success – under objectives in other disciplines does not give students the competence needed for effectively navigating academic, career or social goals.

Jill Lewis-Spector offers perspective on the public education in Australia that aptly applies to any democratic republic. The Statement on Information Literacy for all Australians' identifies information literacy as "a basic condition for: learning for life; the creation of new knowledge; acquisition of skills; personal, vocational, corporate and organizational empowerment; social inclusion; participative citizenship; and innovation and enterprise," (Lewis-Spector, 2001) Seemingly, these ALIA standards are given as much priority in Australian education as the ACRL [former] Standards were given in United States education as Lewis-Spector's review of literacy practices hone in on the lack of literacy present in public education. With a focus on rote memorization and regurgitation, schools cannot possibly hope to churn

out a well-informed, active citizen base. Lewis-Spector contends that young people must understand that knowledge is constructed, based on lived experience, and through critical evaluation. Without this framework, voting-aged citizens have no base of knowledge or interest upon which they can build active civic movements.

Chapter 4: Choosing a Cornerstone

Librarian and classroom faculty tend to view “information literacy as a cornerstone for student learning,” but believe that it must “be taught within the disciplinary,” subjects and thus its frames are broken up and spread across the curriculum (Chambers & Smith et al., 2013). Many colleges have adopted standards for writing across the curriculum, and this makes good sense since these schools also require all students to take at least one foundation writing course and one or more upper-level writing courses where the focus is on composition and rhetoric. The students are aware of this, as those words likely appear in the course title, description, and/or syllabus. But information literacy is not often mentioned because its teaching is not explicit. It is grouped with other subjects to form a new substance, but its distinct properties remain. College students need a strong foundation in information literacy as much as they need a foundation in writing and mathematics, and their user behaviors suggest that a conglomerate cornerstone in information literacy is not strong enough to support their lifelong learning needs.

Undergraduates, who have “difficulty resolving, and sometimes even acknowledging discrepancies,” and relevance in a source, often need ‘hand-held’ support through a search task (Britt & Aglinskas, 2010; Perfetti, Britt, & Georgi, 1995; Perfetti, Britt, Rouet, Georgi & Mason, 1994; Wineburg, 1991). Lupien and Oldham (2012) examine the common characteristics assigned to “millennials” as a user group in the library and higher education literature. Importantly, they note that many claims are broad generalizations that extend beyond what empirical research suggests and that fail to capture the nuances of Millennials as a user group. Especially

subject to this is assuming all Millennials are true digital natives, living and breathing technology. Lupien and Oldham challenge this assumption and urge libraries and librarians to avoid using technology for technology's sake. Instead, higher education needs to make a broader effort to understand Millennials as a user group and grasp their actual use and comprehension of information sources and products to develop courses and lesson plans that best match their interests and needs, and that prepare them to contribute to a civil, information driven democracy.

Bloom and Deyrup's 2012 study presents findings that indicate how students "tried to find the shortest path to finishing their research project" without learning how to fully navigate databases (595). In their own study they found students most often had no plan in their searching, but had "an inflated view of their on-line research skills" (599). Similarly, in their study of students in an introduction to communications class, Biddix, Chung, and Park (2011) also found that students "value efficiency over credibility" (180). Students will choose search engines like Google, which allow "natural language," rather than complicated library databases which incorporate Boolean logic and specified search terms (180). College students are barely effective information users in an age where the most successful are information producers, and the one-hour they are required to spend learning these valuable skills is not enough.

One student even stated, "Google is very straight forward. You put in your word and it searches. It also corrects spellings to rectify your search. Bright, eye-catching— simple. Not confusing" (546). This statement along with students' reluctance to use the library website led Griffiths and Brophy to conclude that

students do not know how to search for information outside of popular databases such as Google or have tried other sources but prefer to “Google it.”

Georgas further explores undergraduate students’ interaction with the Google search engine in a 2014 study conducted at Brooklyn University in New York City. She set up a scenario that prompted direct comparison of undergraduate students’ searches in Google and in a library search tool. Although the comparison takes place in a research context, we can glean cues about the students’ relationship with Google as a search tool. Another strength of the study is its diverse sample group, encompassing a wide range of ages and academic disciplines, while also providing a fairly accurate demographic representation of the undergraduate enrollment. In her study, Georgas identifies several key concepts that echo the findings from Biddix, Chung, and Park (2011). First, students’ search strategies are simplistic. This may indicate that they cannot fully express their information need in natural language, much less articulate in sophisticated search strategies. Second, students quickly scan results, usually on the first page, and modify their search rather than delve further into the results list.

These inefficient search skills born of limited experience and reliance on search engines inform Badke’s 2009 article “Stepping Beyond Wikipedia” that insists on information literacy instruction reform. From scholarly research and his own experience working with undergraduates, he notes that students rely heavily on the open web and sites such as Wikipedia during information searches. Bloom and Deyrup (2012) also note that students use inefficient skills learned in high school when approaching their college assignments; they call for steps to be taken within the

information profession to teach better researching practices. As far as helping students find credible and relevant sources, they note, “technology can only do so much” (599).

Regardless of students’ searching proficiency or preference for web-based search engines, it is important to know how students actually seek information when they use library resources. The study by O’Brien and Symons (2005) provides a picture of the information-seeking behavior of the “millennial” generation, which they term the “Next-Gens” in keeping with previous publications, notably Abram and Luther (2004). Specifically, they look at how undergraduates’ information-seeking behavior and preferences may affect information literacy instruction within the academic library, which is examined later in this chapter. In the process of examining data, what emerges is a picture of students’ information behavior that changes based on academic discipline: what types of information sources do students consult, and how frequently? They find, for example, that humanities students more often search for information in physical resources, and students in the sciences are more likely to search electronic resources. They also determine an order of frequency for the general information sources that students consult: search engine (most frequent), peers, library catalog, browsing shelves, professor, and librarian (least frequent). It is these pictures that are of primary interest.

Even if undergraduates do not use official library or university websites for information, they are likely to be on social media (Kim, Sin, and He 2013). From the survey responses received from undergraduates, the study identifies several social media platforms that students use for academic purposes as well as social. These

include Microblogs (Twitter), Wikipedia and similar sites, and Social Q&A platforms such as Yahoo! Answers (2). A later study by Kim, Sin, and Yoo-Lee (2014) examined undergraduates' use of social media as information sources more closely. The study determined that over 98% of students use Wikipedia and 95% use social networking sites such as Facebook for information seeking, but few students relied on blogs and microblogs for information sources. Although Wikipedia served as a starting-place to gain "background information or a quick overview" of both academic subjects and everyday information needs, the study found that most students only use social networking sites to "keep in touch with others, get updates/news, and glean the opinion of others" (447).

However, some studies indicate that undergraduate students do approach Internet sources with some skepticism. Biddix, Chung, and Park (2011) questioned students' evaluation of Internet sources and found most students regarded .edu sites as "generally accurate" (180). Bloom and Deyrup also found in their study that about thirty percent of their respondents viewed .gov, .edu, .org, or federal websites as more reliable.

Although Britt and Aglinskas (2002) research focuses on document level literacy skills, their findings benefit the instruction design for a stand alone information literacy course. The study of high school seniors and college undergraduates demonstrates increased success in search and application when guided by the 'Sourcer's Apprentice' online learning platform, which helps them better understand the efficacy of a particular source. The participants who worked independently struggled in this regard demonstrating the need for additional guidance

in both finding information and assessing its relevance and compatibility, which are basic information literacy skills. The primary goal of a stand-alone IL course is to help students attain higher-level IL skills, and to become successful, independent information seekers, evaluators, users, and producers.

This extensive user profile demonstrates that college students are learning how to use their school's library resources, but many of them will not feel comfortable doing so. This goes back to a lack of awareness. Without knowing what information literacy means, the students have no way of knowing how to learn or practice it. Library databases are meant for academic research, and most young adults do not consider this kind of research as relevant to their post-academe lives. As a result, time will naturally erode the coarse and delicate composition of their information literacy cornerstone.

Chapter 5: Building with Straw and Sticks

Barn Raising

For this thesis, it is critical to distinguish information literacy from what I will refer to as institutional or research literacy. Both are important and involve developing both information and research capabilities, but different settings and limitations address different components and support different user goals. Further, it is important to include the disclaimer that the design of this thesis and the course it details in Chapter 6 in no way undermine the value of academic libraries or the work that academic librarians do. In fact, the instruction that academic librarians provide becomes more specialized to discipline needs when the students are information literate. The students then understand that the librarians are not simply helping them with research for one assignment; the librarians are supporting the students' information literacy.

To be clear, institutional and research literacy are those skills that fall under the ACRL framework most easily and readily addressed by academic librarians in the limited time they have for working with students. These skills guide students through some of their most difficult and relevant coursework. The one-shot sessions academic librarians teach often focus on a specific course assignment, and therefore the students may not easily understand how the skills transfer. Understanding the need for a scholarly source may not always translate to understanding how to independently and accurately evaluate sources for reliability – skills they will need to ethically contribute to an information society and a strong democracy.

Currently, higher education accreditation committees and outcomes assessment groups throughout the academe have determined that all college students should acquire and apply information literacy skills; however, very few colleges/universities offer information literacy as a credit-bearing course; moreover, the faculty charged with determining a student's information literacy proficiency are not librarians, and likely have no formal background with information literacy instruction or assessment. They are subject-specific instructors looking only to align the required information literacy goals with their specific course objectives, and if the student meets the course objectives, they must have also met the information literacy goals. That the students can or cannot transfer these essential skills depends solely on the methods of each faculty member and their particular course aims. Since information literacy is not generally an independent credit-bearing course, most schools encourage or require incorporating those skills into 100-level English composition courses or first year experience seminars. After spending 50 minutes with a college librarian, sometimes in the college library and within the confines and context of one of the aforementioned class structures, students are expected to complete a single, related research assignment, thus fulfilling the accreditation requirement for information literacy.

With burgeoning enrollment at both two and four year schools, academic librarians are often overwhelmed accommodating multiple departments and hundreds of courses during a semester; moreover, some institutions have implemented online modules or tutorials to replace the aforementioned "one-shot" introductory sessions that are common across freshmen composition or first year experience courses. But,

most college students - particularly first year undergraduates - do not know the term “information literacy”. They do not realize it falls under a specific academic discipline, and they have no concept that it is the key to their academic and -quite likely - career success. Just as grade schoolers cannot flourish without fluency in reading, writing, and mathematics, college students cannot navigate their coursework without a solid foundation in research and the ability to aptly find and appropriately apply the most relevant and credible information to an assignment, project or body of work. Moreover, they are not likely to appreciate and therefore not likely to acquire the information literacy skills they so desperately need through this limited exposure. A pressing component of this problem is the lack of respect afforded to librarian faculty and to information literacy as its own discipline.

With over four thousand institutions of higher learning in the United States, Elrod, Wallace and Sirigos set out to analyze the syllabi for at least 406 credit-bearing information literacy courses to expand on the model set by Hyrcaj in 2006 (2011). Not surprisingly, the team was only able to identify the same 100 syllabi from Hyrcaj study, and found that the biggest shift was from teaching finding sources to properly citing them. Moreover, 40% of the courses were offered for only 1 credit hour suggesting that library, and information literacy “skills are not taken seriously by the academe (2011).

If You Take the Blue Pill...

Information literacy instruction must adapt to current technologies. For decades, the Dewey Decimal System and paper card catalogs haunted high school, post-secondary, graduate students and professionals. The format and best practices for

bibliographic, and subsequently information literacy instruction was limited to the institution and its resources; however, those systems and corresponding available technologies are now changing almost more rapidly than librarians can adapt, but they are changing in a way that allows greater connectivity and accessibility among and for users. This is particularly troublesome with millennial college students, who – true to their generation – are often more confident than competent in their abilities to properly conduct research.

Current literature indicates that over the past decade, librarians have researched and experimented with new practices to accommodate the changing student population at colleges and universities. Duncan et al., are currently revising online information literacy instruction at Montgomery College, Maryland in order to most effectively reach all of the schools' students, while the Catholic University of America has manipulated its First Year Experience program to embed librarians in one or more courses in freshmen cohorts. Still, others struggle to make the traditional "one-shot" session work in schools with larger populations and too few librarians to meet with each class that has a need. Most importantly, for information literacy instruction to work, subject-faculty must be willing to create and implement "assignments that require thoughtful use of library sources and services," (Breivik as cited by Anderson and May, 2010, p.496). In a Learning Outcomes Assessment study at Anne Arundel Community College in Maryland, found that while 80% of faculty surveyed expect their students to conduct independent research, only 20% collaborate with a campus librarian/ information expert (Whitlock, 2014). The same LOA found that less than 50% of students surveyed over a three year period displayed proficiency

in basic information literacy skills. While most were able to find appropriate sources, they could not synthesize or cite the material beyond the emergent level (Whitlock). Further, Gray and Montgomery found challenges in their online courses at Idaho State resulting from the librarian's minimal teaching experience and subject faculty's limited information literacy instruction experience. Clearly, collaboration is necessary and must be the result of mutual respect for each instructor's specific discipline and objectives if this instruction practice is to continue.

Colleges and universities stress the need for information literacy in the general education curriculum. Yet, Kim and Schumaker deliberately changed "information literacy" to "library research skills" in a student survey because "the concept of information literacy [is] unfamiliar" to that population (451). Even with a librarian embedded across both of a two-semester First Year Experience (FYE) course, student respondents did not see the long-term value of the librarian-led instruction or information literacy skills (2013). Still, as online courses and web 2.0 technologies become more prevalent in higher education, fewer librarians are embedded in face-to-face courses, and even the 50-minute librarian-led sessions are losing favor and being replaced by online, optional tutorials.

At a mid-sized public university in Maryland, first-year composition classes are no longer required to visit the campus library or host a campus librarian. Instead, during academic year 2014-2015, the school implemented a set of seven tutorials connected to the online learning platform. The tutorials are automatically scored and incorporated into the course grade. However, it is at the discretion of the instructor whether the class will have supplemental information literacy instruction, and the

instructor can weight grades to limit the impact of the tutorials. Interestingly, a study conducted at the University of North Texas concluded that students perform well in information literacy sections regardless of the format, but they may have better retention and future application if the format is consistent with that of the regular course (Anderson and May, 2010).

Additionally, Duncan et al. with Montgomery College, Maryland were only able to conduct 42 face-to-face sessions out of the 150 first-year composition sections offered in the fall 2015 semester. The team implemented online research sessions at designated times through Blackboard Collaborate in hopes of reaching the rest of the first-year composition students; however, only two students participated in any of the four sessions offered. The Blackboard Collaborate sessions offered at Montgomery College were admittedly a failure as they relied primarily on word-of-mouth to spread the information; Duncan et al acknowledge a need for stronger marketing to reach more students (2015). The students at Montgomery College were offered the opportunity to ask questions in a live chat, so they would receive immediate feedback on the instruction as it was taking place. This is, theoretically a more effective and personal approach to having a librarian ‘visit’ an online course where student involvement fluctuates throughout the weeklong session, and research indicates that students are more engaged when the instruction has a personal element.

While online modules are not generally constrained by time, the “absence of personal touch, and the lack of motivation by students to participate when it is not required by the instructors” creates an environment where students may earn a passing grade without necessarily have learned the skills laid out in the course

objectives (Williams, 2010 as cited by Guo et al. 2015). To reconcile the motivation problem, Guo et al. tested the affective aspects that promote student engagement to create a more effective online learning environment by measuring and diagnosing motivational problems described in Keller's ARCS model – attention, relevance, confidence and satisfaction (370).

Even though students responded well in this 'affective' learning environment, their enjoyment did not bridge the learning gap. Avatars that smile and offer positive feedback generate a "positive impact on ... learning motivation, enjoyment, and on intention to use," but these personalities did not offer any benefit for knowledge retention in the study conducted by Guo et al. (376), perhaps because the participants did not fully understand the relevance of the assignments. This is supported by Burgoyne and Chuppa-Cornell who determined a "positive benefit to the for-credit online information literacy class paired with online ENG 102" as they meet a "built-in authentic need [for students] to apply their research" (419). Their library at Chandler Gilbert Community College in Maricopa County, Arizona implemented a "Personal Librarian" embedded program in fall 2009, and over several years revised their model to increase student retention and improve information literacy skills. After four academic years, the program moved to a four-credit learning community, which ultimately returned increases in "persistence and grade distribution" (Burgoyne & Chuppa-Cornell, 2015, p. 418). It is possible that the results are skewed as many of the online students at CGCC are non-traditional, and therefore often more invested and engaged with their learning environments; however, the move from the 'Personal Librarian' model to the learning community model showed improvements suggesting

that the latter could also be effective with a traditional student population or in a face-to-face learning environment. It also affirms that information literacy instruction must be explicit in order to be effective.

Also effective in the online community is the creative use of Web 2.0 for student engagement. Magnuson's study follows a class of 17 graduate students and reveals that Web 2.0 tools effectively enhanced the (retired) ACRL Standards related to collaboration, information organization, creativity, discussion and technology education. The class was structured around four specific Web 2.0 platforms: Glogster, PBWorks, Diigo, and Prezi. Even the use of social sharing site, Flickr was used and "helped [students] understand databases and keywords" (Magnuson, 2013). In this online class, each student was required to post a minimum of 10 resources to Diigo essentially creating a class library of over 200 resources. For the Glogster assignment, students were required to evaluate their classmates' choice of sources, all of which promoted collaboration and fulfilled the ACRL's requirements. This model should be tested in an undergraduate course where there is greater need for student information literacy. Further, the student group in this study were all enrolled in a library science program, which may have affected the study's positive results. However, even though this study predates the ACRL Framework, the assignments and use of Web 2.0 skills support the new model and allow students to be part of the information creation process thereby nesting the skills in relevant context.

And if You Take the Red Pill...

With evidence backing full semester information literacy courses as effective, and online information literacy instruction in a volatile stage of experimentation, the

time has come for major research universities to set a new standard of information literacy instruction. Undergrads already feel they “should be introduced to the library system and research materials” early in their college careers, and want longer and more frequent instruction from the librarians (Kim & Schumaker, 2015), and online modules and one-shot instruction sessions often limit relationship building and personal interaction with a librarian. What’s more, online coursework often results in “higher attrition... because participation can be technically challenging and because sticking with an online course requires strong motivation” (Christensen et al., 2006).

Thomas Atwood references ‘The Cult of Teaching’ as being a limiter to the success of information literacy instruction. As such, librarian faculty have the daunting task of providing the most valuable instruction first year college students can receive in minimal time, through largely ineffective mediums, and (often) without the support of their faculty colleagues (2015). Studies demonstrate that collaboration and learning communities offer the relevance that students need to connect to the less familiar concepts of information literacy proving a need for more explicit instruction in this subject.

No longer can information literacy instruction be taught in a 50-minute bubble. Once higher education surmounts this obstacle, the best practices of information literacy instruction can flourish in the academe to the ultimate benefit of the students it serves.

Chapter 6: Brick by Brick

This chapter presents the course design and implementation for an undergraduate information studies course, INST 152: Foundational Scholarship and Critical Inquiry, that will launch in the Fall Semester, 2017 at the University of Maryland's iSchool. It addresses obstacles and details the steps involved for creating a new course at a major university.

Most of the literature reviewed for and presented in this thesis focuses on information seeking and literacy in the context of academic libraries because the number of credit-courses for information literacy that is taught outside of an academic library is few. In fact, the number taught within the academic library is also minimal; these courses, when offered, are taught as 1 or 2-credit electives without transferable outcomes. Library instruction benefits students, faculty and staff at colleges and universities, but with limited time and resources, the learners may not understand information literacy as anything more than functional research skills. This is not to minimize the work of academic librarians, rather a commentary on how information literacy has not been prioritized as an area of study independent from research and writing. With that in mind, the course addressed in this thesis is built upon the ACRL Framework with coordinating assignments that demonstrate much of the life cycle of information and information products. A key aim is that students will practice the frames throughout the course in a way that transfers to subsequent courses and career. The course design also addresses students' primary struggles with information as identified in the literature review. Chapter 5 looked at outcomes from 100-level, required composition and first-year experience courses revealing a disconnect with full information literacy. The outcomes for INST 152 – Foundational Scholarship and Critical Inquiry in the Information Age, are as follows:

1. Through analysis, evaluation, and creation of myriad information types, the student will create and sustain an information environment where **authority is both constructed and contextual**.
2. In order to connect with the legal concepts surrounding information, the student will reflect upon and practice **ethical, relevant information creation and dissemination**.
3. The student will analyze, discuss, create, and revise information in order to demonstrate that **all information has value either/ or as commodity, education, influence, negotiation/ understanding**.
4. The student will experience and practice **‘research as inquiry’**.
5. In order to participate in **‘scholarship as conversation’**, the student will engage their classmates in focused discussion about controversial social topics.
6. The student will critically evaluate sources for relevance as a means for practicing **‘searching as strategic exploration’**.

The initial course design, in the Spring of 2016, also addressed the ACRL Standards for Information Literacy that have since been retired. It also included multiple essay assignments, fewer discussion opportunities outside the classroom, minimal collaboration, and greater involvement with the campus libraries. Despite its limitations, the Director of the Undergraduate Program for the Information Studies was on board and helped me with a proposal to submit to the Undergraduate Committee for approval.

The committee first reviewed the proposal and syllabus in October, 2016; however, there were concerns that the assignments and topics revolved more around library studies than actual information literacy. At that time, the committee was not prepared to vote, and I worked with one of the school Dean’s to revise the syllabus.

The priority in our revision sessions was on active, purposeful language and learning that would help students understand and therefore ‘buy into’ policies and assignments, and promote their confidence as critical thinkers and information producers. The language and assignment changes were meant to foster intrinsic

motivation throughout the semester. The extensively revised second draft went before the UGC in February, 2017 to meet suggestions for reducing the amount of writing, offering opportunities for the discussion to continue after class, and including explicit lessons on fact-checking in a post-truth environment. With the revisions, the committee approved the course proposal in March, 2017, but it still had two committees to pass in order to be listed for registration.

The iSchool's Program Courses and Curriculum committee is a college-level voting body that includes Dean's and Program Directors from within the college. It was at this meeting that the course number – 152 – was assigned, and the course was approved. The next step took the course proposal before the Vice-Presidents Advisory Council, a university-wide board comprised of high-ranking representatives from each college or school. The purpose of this council guarantees that the various disciplines do not offer overlapping content or content that conflicts with an existing course from another college or school on campus. INST 152 passed the council as well, and I then began work with the iSchool's Director for Undergraduate Studies on the qualifying documents to have it listed as a general education, scholarship in practice, required course.

Using backward design, and with input from full-time undergraduate faculty, each assignment for INST 152 was created to match one or more of the outcomes, but also to offer students the opportunity to utilize their individual skill sets and interests to connect with the content – also intrinsic motivators. Table 7.1 highlights the major course assignments as they correspond with the Framework. The capstone project

includes four deliverables that satisfy all six of the course content outcomes and therefore support the ACRL Framework.

Table 7.1

Assignment	Frame/ Outcome	Measure
Weekly, Online Group Discussions	Scholarship as Conversation	Contribute original ideas and respond to others in an online learning platform.
Op/Ed Essay	Authority is Constructed and Contextual	Incorporate unique ideas with existing knowledge to gain confidence as an authority
Fact-Finding Mission	Information Creation as Process	
Annotated Bibliography	Information has Value; Research as Inquiry	
Information Product Deliverables		
Proposal	Authority is Constructed and Contextual & Research as Inquiry	
Project Update	Information Creation as Process	
Project Revisions and Evaluation	Information has Value Research as Inquiry	Product should appeal to both marginalized and authoritative/ privileged groups. Students re-evaluate their research to make necessary changes.
Recorded Conversation and Reflection	Scholarship as Conversation	Use evidence when engaging with an authority group regarding the value of and need for your information product.

Weekly topics for this course included: Intellectual Freedom; Copyright and Open Access; Information rights; Consumerism, creation and identity; Fact-checking; Information monopolies; Ethics; Self-publishing; Information quality; Critical reading; Search strategies; Citation Assistance; Plagiarism and Adaptation; Critical information literacy; Visual literacy; Online safety and representation.

To reach as many of the 20,000 plus undergraduate students as possible, this class was proposed to the University General Education Review. As a 100-level course that satisfies a general education requirement, the iSchool could offer more sections per semester based on interest. The final syllabus in Appendix 1, reflects the slight changes in language that were necessary to demonstrate the courses alignment with outcomes for a ‘Scholarship in Practice’ general education course, which *“teach students how to assess and apply a body of knowledge to a creative, scholarly, or practical purpose. The resulting application should reflect an understanding of how underlying core disciplines can be brought to bear on the subject,”* (Genedreview).

The course must show evidence of meeting at least 4 of the following 5 outcomes:

- Select and critically evaluate areas of scholarship relevant to the practice of the discipline.
- Apply relevant methods and frameworks to the planning, modeling, and/or preparing necessary to produce a project or participate in the practice in a manner that is authentic to the discipline.
- Critique, revise and refine a project, or the practice of the discipline, according the authentic manner of the discipline.
- Effectively communicate the application of scholarship through ancillary material (written, oral, and/or visual).
- Collaborate in order to bring about a successful outcome.

The proposal required that I address each area and how the course would satisfy the outcomes. Most of the responses focused on the capstone project. Table 7.2 shows the proposal.

The General Education, Scholarship in Practice Committee meets three times each semester to consider courses proposals. To graduate, students at the University of Maryland, College Park must pass two of these courses, one of which should be outside their major course of study.

Table 7.2

<p>Select and critically evaluate areas of scholarship relevant to the practice of the discipline.</p> <p>The first summative assessment prepares students for the types of scholarly discourse they will engage in with their information product (capstone) partners throughout the semester. This early assignment supports the capstone project and requires students to independently evaluate ideas and materials surrounding copyright, open access, and intellectual freedom in the field of information, so they can apply legal and ethical practice during their information product creation. The students will present their critique in the form of a 2-3 page editorial that will be posted on a class blog.</p>
<p>Apply relevant methods and frameworks to the planning, modeling, and/or preparing necessary to produce a project or participate in the practice in a manner that is authentic to the discipline.</p> <p>By the completion of the course, students will create at least two information products - the first will display results of fact-checking a substantial, timely source; the second will be in partnership with an organization looking to promote social change. The latter product will require students to engage with a professional or semi-professional group to understand the groups mission and values and the population it serves in order to create a suitable information product that the group can publish/ mass produce and distribute.</p>
<p>Critique, revise and refine a project, or the practice of the discipline, according the authentic manner of the discipline.</p> <p>The capstone project for this course asks students to design and information product that promotes social change. After the initial design, students will offer peer feedback, but will also solicit feedback from the population that the information product would serve. The students must apply this feedback to revise the initial product design to best reflect the populations needs.</p>
<p>Effectively communicate the application of scholarship through ancillary material (written, oral, and/or visual).</p> <p>Each project and its deliverables requires students to create scholarship materials related to information. Students are asked to reflect on their contributions to inquiry, creation, and the scholarship conversation in myriad mediums. They have options to create audio/ visual information products, and are asked to evaluate how their process of strategic exploration evolved throughout the semester.</p>
<p>Collaborate in order to bring about a successful outcome.</p> <p>Students will not only work with peer groups, but they will reach out to local/ campus groups and organizations to create an effective and useful information product. Additionally, peer feedback, research assistance and conferencing are built into the course calendar. The partners with which the students work will also have a voice in evaluating the work.</p>

Feedback from the Scholarship in Practice Committee – comprised of university wide faculty and administrative staff - suggests a need for more clear i.e. layman language in the proposal. Simply reading through the proposal and syllabus proved confusing for academics who are not information professionals or familiar with the information field. A discussion with the director to clarify the nature and potential impact of the course indicated stronger interest desire to approve the course after a revised proposal.

Given the magnitude of the course, and that multiple instructors – including doctoral students – will teach it, the next step involves creating a common page either on the universities ELMS/ Canvas page or through Box. For continuity, the page should include course readings, sample lesson plans, assignment prompts and criteria, rubrics, slide presentations, and links to any additional resources the instructor could use to modify the course.

This course design will not replace the instruction that occurs in academic libraries, rather it will supplement that instruction by providing a distinct foundation upon which students can continually build their understanding, use and creation of information.

Chapter 7: Huff and Puff

“Information literacy subsumes all of the specific forms of literacy,” including media, computer/ digital/ web, and civic literacy, the latter being essential for those who hope to “initiate change and introduce stronger democracy,” and based on “functional literacy... includ[ing] interpretation of media, and the unpacking of the political propaganda messages,” (Sturges & Gastinger, 2010, p.200).

Don't Blow the House Down

Maria E. Grabe and Jessica G. Myrick (2016) offer a multidisciplinary view of what it means to be an informed/ engaged citizen and the factors that influence said behaviors. Grabe and Myrick encourage readers to transcend Enlightenment ideals of democratic practice to embrace the modern system and its corresponding technological influences. They present scientific theory advocating for affect as strongly influencing decision-making particularly as it connects to the enormity of audio-visual material that permeates airways, roadways, and the Internet. While the two seemingly contend that knowledge-based intellect and rational thought may not carry as much weight in a more visual access society, information literacy is, a) even more necessary given the limited information citizens can process, and b) includes the visual literacy that guides the emotions that compel citizens to action.

College accrediting bodies need to revisit their position on information literacy as a stand-alone subject. There is no doubt that academic libraries and their instruction librarians contribute vastly to retention and graduation rates; however, the struggle to fully teach all the information literacy frames is real. If the academe continues limiting its focus to research and information consumerism with “fixed knowledge stocks,” when students need fluidity that promotes “participation ... that

leads to the creation of new knowledge,” and provides the stable cornerstone upon which they can build success as lifelong learners. Nesting information literacy in research skills for specific subjects or assignments does not prepare graduates for the initiative they will need to demonstrate in their careers or lives.

Fulfilling the right to information requires higher education accrediting bodies to take the necessary steps “to help people avoid misinformation and disinformation and to ensure that relevant and comprehensible information is available,” (Mathiesen, 2014, p. 12). To accomplish this arduous task in an age of information overload, public and information institutions need to collaborate on teaching the critical skills that students and citizens need to be active in their democracy but also to ask questions of the information they have on hand. “If students learn to habitually ask ‘why’ as beginners, that habit will continue,” throughout their adult lives (Burkhardt, 2016, p. 9).

In November 2016, Americans who did not ask questions gave Donald Trump enough electoral votes to secure victory in the Presidential Election. In that same cycle, the Republican Party won majorities in Congress to the delight of voters who were eager to build walls and eliminate ‘Obamacare’. Less than three months into Mr. Trump’s administration, his overall approval rating has reached an historic low of only 35%, with majority disapprovals from Democrats and minority voters at 91% and 77% respectively; however, white voters show 48% disapproval, and male voters disapprove at a rate of 51% (Quinnipiac, 2017). Surveyed voters also disapprove of Congressional leadership and proposed policy related to health care, foreign policy, the environment, and the economy. An astounding 52% are embarrassed to have Mr.

Trump as the American President (Quinnipiac, 2017). With such low approval, some may wonder how Mr. Trump was elected in the first place. Simply put, Trump supporters were easily swayed by propaganda and false rhetoric, and they did not know or care to fact-check the information he dispelled.

Immediately following the election results, infographics on fact-checking and determining source credibility flooded social media, albeit a literal day late, to remind voters that information can be distorted and falsified. Playing on the ‘post-truth’ era, NPR content producer, Steve Inskeep redubs our time as the ‘post-trust’ era because while lies and propaganda are not new, the ease of access and dissemination of lies and propaganda is now unprecedented. Inskeep encourages skepticism, which can be more easily achieved by the type of critical evaluation that comes from information literacy. If we cannot accomplish this, “we cease to be free citizens,” (2016). The change must take place in institutions of higher learning from a “one-way transfer of a canon of knowledge,” to encouraging “participation in diverse knowledge flows that lead to the creation of new knowledge,” as well as lifelong learning, effective decision making, and more of a willingness to participate in civic engagement. (Hagel & Brown et al., 2015, web.)

The Work of Ants

Alongside higher education institutions, information institutions will need to supplement information literacy instruction by teaching citizens how to check facts, and the importance of civic engagement. This was effective in the mid-20th Century as libraries nationwide stood together to show Americans the value of information and of their individual voices.

Even though the ALA had limited resources in these early endeavors, it strived to make all “libraries active community centers for the spread of reliable information on all sides, (Preer, 2008, p.3). The American Heritage Foundation (AHF) Freedom Train allowed libraries across the country to organize corresponding exhibits to promote active citizenship endeavors and hold community discussions and reading groups of the same nature. Observing that “a successful democracy depends upon its people and their ability to make wide decisions that are based on fundamental knowledge of facts. [And that] the library supplies facts,” contributed greatly to the libraries taking a prominent role in promoting citizenship during this post-war era (Preer, 2008, p.12). It was the increased “challenges to intellectual freedom” that prompted information professionals to act; challenges that have since multiplied with minimal response for libraries or the academe (Preer, 2008, p. 15, citing Blakely).

Even so, with its success in 1950, the AHF turned its attention to the 1952 election but vowed to promote civic duty and provide accurate information as opposed to shaming citizens to participate. The collaboration was even more impressive than in 1950. Where millennials are accustomed to news outlets endorsing or shaming candidates and creating click-bait headlines, the media and entertainment industry in 1951 and 1952 simply endorsed voting and participation. Prior to the November 4 election, “major magazines featured articles about voting,” (p.17) and moviegoers were likely to enjoy preview documentaries about voting instead of upcoming attractions. These industries did not benefit financially, nor did they receive special promises from candidates. They simply sought to promote citizenship.

Further, outlets and corporations including *'The New York Times'*, *'Readers' Digest'*, Wonder Bread, Quaker Oats and Sears/ Roebuck to name a few each participated in encouraging citizens to "Vote as you please... but vote" with the only personal incentive to their corporate interests being a democratic society voted for by the people (p.17).

Libraries played a much larger role in this election to reach all facets of the American public and provide everyone with accurate, non-partisan information. The ALA's primary function was the "Register and Vote" campaign with nearly 12,000 public libraries actively encouraging users to register to vote and providing them with the unbiased, accurate information to make a truly informed decision. The ALA even donated radio ad time to the cause reminding citizens that their vote "may be the most important act of citizenship," they will perform in many years, and that exercising this privilege comes with the responsibility of also being well informed on the issues (Preer, p. 18).

With the 1952 election netting over 61 million voters of the 98.4 million eligible (U.S. Census), this election saw one of the highest turnouts in U.S. history at 62%. Comparatively, the 2016 election saw only 55% (CNN) of its 121 million eligible voters at the polls.

While voting is not the only measure of citizenship, the combined efforts of information professionals in the 1950 and 52 elections demonstrate the strength of information literacy. The men and women who cast votes in 1952 did so with confidence and a sense of pride. Counter to Mr. Trump's current approval ratings, Gallup polls from the 1950's would indicate that Americans were satisfied with their

selection of Dwight D. Eisenhower, as his job approval ratings remained high throughout his two terms in office. The difference in the two elections comes down to information literacy.

In the 21st Century, anyone with access to a computer and the Internet can contribute to the information marketplace, and it is too vast a space for educators and librarians to police alone. Hopefully, Mr. Trump's legacy will be to inadvertently promote greater information literacy initiatives in higher education. Indeed, "ordinary citizens" – students and new graduates – must now embrace their right to be information literate and hold the state accountable for teaching "them how to thoughtfully engage in information seeking and evaluating in a cacophonous democracy," (Domonoske quoting Wineberg).

As previously stated, the responsibility to teach information literacy extends beyond academic libraries. Individual schools, even individual faculty at those schools decide how and how much information literacy they teach. Even with a common framework established by a national organization, there is no standard structure for teaching information literacy as a stand-alone course. Badke contends that information literacy cannot be achieved if it is not explicitly taught as its own academic discipline with a distinct and "confirmed role within the curriculum." (2008). And it is evident, perhaps now more than ever, that information literacy is a necessary competency for everyone, particularly Internet users, who should be taught "to read like fact checkers," because "the kinds of duties that used to be the responsibility of editors, of librarians now fall on the shoulders of anyone who uses a screen to become informed about the world," (Wineberg and McGrew).

Appendices

Appendix 1 – INST 152 Course Syllabus:

INST 152 - Foundational Scholarship and Critical Inquiry in the Information Age

Course Information

Meeting days/times: Twice per week/ varies

Contact and office hours: Courtney Douglass - cdoug88@umd.edu; 443-745-2023; Maintain 2 office hours per course

Catalog Description: This course allows for students' engagement with the skills content through independent reading choices, scholarly discourse, and information creation while introducing the importance, appreciation for, ethical use, creation of, and access to information through hands-on praxis with various information institutions and professions, and iSchool faculty, staff and students. Students acquire, hone and apply foundational information literacy and creation skills for research and application.

Extended Description: Reading, writing, arithmetic and information. In order to successfully navigate academic, social and career pursuits, one must have literacy in the aforementioned skills. Greater literacy – or competence – leads to greater success. In this course, we will explore the standards and frameworks that allow individuals to gain scholarship and information literacy and subsequently enhance and adapt those learned skills to all academic coursework and career endeavors. Further, students will utilize appropriate technologies to obtain and evaluate relevant information, and to ethically create and disseminate accurate information for a specified population.

Learning Outcomes

1. Through analysis, evaluation, and creation of myriad information types, the student will create and sustain an information environment where authority is both constructed and contextual.
2. In order to connect with the legal concepts surrounding information, the student will reflect upon and practice ethical, relevant information creation and dissemination.*
3. The student will analyze, discuss, create, and revise information in order to demonstrate that all information has value either/ or as commodity, education, influence, negotiation/ understanding.

4. The student will experience and practice ‘research as inquiry’.
5. In order to participate in ‘scholarship as conversation’, the student will engage their classmates in focused discussion about controversial social topics.
6. The student will critically evaluate sources for relevance as a means for practicing ‘searching as strategic exploration’.

Required Texts and Materials

1. Assigned course readings will be accessible through Canvas.
2. Students will be accountable for identifying appropriate texts and materials as assignments require.
3. Students will need access to a PC or laptop to complete course assignments.

Resources:

<http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/>

‘The Information Literacy User’s Guide’. Bernnard et al.

ISBN: 978-0-9897226-2-9.

<https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/BookDetail.aspx?bookId=190>

‘Learning to Learn: A Guide to Becoming Information Literate in The 21st Century,’
Second ed.

Course Policies

Attendance: The outcomes for this course require scholarly discourse with peers. In order to participate effectively, students should expect to attend each class session. If you will be unable to make a class, please E-mail me beforehand and please be sure to check in with a fellow student following class so that you can catch up on anything you missed. Attendance will be taken at the beginning of each class session.

Absences will only be excused in accordance with University policy (illness, religious observances, participation in University activities at the request of University authorities, and compelling circumstances beyond your control). Any planned absences due to religious observances must be communicated to me in writing during the first two weeks of class. Students may miss one class session with no penalty; thereafter, each unexcused absence will result in your grade being lowered by one step (for example, an A- will become a B+). Repeated tardiness may be considered an unexcused absence.

Class Participation: Demonstrating critical inquiry requires regular participation during class. This will require that you finish all assigned readings prior to each class session and be prepared to offer questions or comments relevant to the discussion. Participation forms an integral part of your own learning experience, as well as that of your classmates. Your participation in classroom discussions will count for 10% of your final grade. Class participation grades will take into account both the quantity and quality of your contributions to class discussions; however, the quality of your contributions (whether questions, viewpoints, responses to others' questions, etc.) to a meaningful, ongoing discussion will be much more heavily weighted. Classroom discussions should remain professional and respectful at all times. Please be sure to silence your cell phones before entering class. Laptop use is permitted during class, but only for class-related activities.

Written Work: In order to demonstrate the basics of effective information creation and dissemination, all written work should be proofread and revised as necessary before submitting. Use Times New Roman 12-point font and one-inch margins. All documents should be double-spaced. We will work with and to understand MLA, APA and Chicago styles. Students will not be expected to have expertise in any particular style, rather demonstrate the ability to use appropriate resources for properly formatting assignments in each. Each assignment will indicate which formatting style is required.

Submitting Assignments: Professionals often work within deadlines, and information is most relevant when it is timely; therefore, each assignment must be submitted before the beginning of class on the indicated due date through our Canvas site. Assignments submitted after the class start time will be considered late.

Grading and Evaluation

Your grade in this course is based on eight core assignments, two of which are comprehensive assignments (1 and 8) that demonstrate your effort and commitment. All course work must be complete and submitted ON TIME to our course Canvas page. Because the groups with which you will work rely on timely delivery of their product, late assignments will receive a 5 point deduction per DAY until the assignment is submitted properly, and in a readable format to the Canvas page. I will not accept any assignments once they are labeled as 'Closed' on Canvas.

Assignment 1	Weekly Group Discussions in ELMS	150 pts	10%
--------------	----------------------------------	---------	-----

Assignment 2	OpEd Essay	100 pts	15%
Assignment 3	Fact-Finding Mission	100 pts	10%
Assignment 4	Midterm	100 pts	5%
Assignment 5	Annotated Bibliography (first and final drafts)	150 pts	15%
Assignment 6	Project Deliverables	100 pts	15%
Assignment 7	Project Portfolio/ Symposium	100 pts	20%
Assignment 8	Class Participation	150 pts	10%

***Each of the above assignments builds on the skills of preceding assignments. Failure to submit an assignment will certainly affect the quality of your work on those that follow and can possibly result in failure of the course.**

*** You will find more detailed information, including corresponding rubrics, for each of these assignments toward the end of this syllabus.**

Course Calendar

Date	Calendar of Readings and Assignments (Due Before Class Session)	In-Class Topic
Week 1		The Value and Process of Information
Class 1		Introduction to course/ syllabus/ expectations/ overview
Class 2	http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/censorshipfirstamendmentissues/ifcensorshipqanda Copyright and Intellectual Property: What you Need to Know	Intellectual Freedom Banned Books; Censorship

	Watch: https://www.ted.com/talks/johanna_blaug_lessons_from_fashions_free_culture	
Week 2		The Value and Process of Information
Class 1	Readings: -Copyright and Fair Use -Copyright Regulations in Age of Advancing Technology -Copyright:Regulation out of Line with our Digital Reality. Abigail J. McDermott	Copyright and Open Access Discussion OpEd Assigned
Class 2	Read: ‘Information Rights and Human Rights’ ‘Citizenship in the Information Society’	Information Rights and Access Federal Legislation i.e. FOIA
Week 3		Exploration and Value
Class 1	Read: Pricing in the Information Marketplace Movie Empire Strikes Back Website Construction and Copyright Laws	Information has worth Assignment #3 - Fact-Finding Mission Assigned Consumerism, creation and your information identity. How to be a great fact-checker
Class 2	Complete Assignment #2 - OpEd, and Submit to Canvas Read: Checking the Fact-Checkers in 2008: Predicting Political Ad	Changes in information sharing/ value

	<p>Scrutiny and Assessing Consistency</p> <p>Is Digital Different? How Information Creation, Capture, Preservation and Discovery are Being Transformed.</p>	<p>Discussion: Information Monopolies/Conglomerates i.e. Time Warner</p> <p>Ethics/ legality</p>
Week 4		Exploration and Value
Class 1	<p>Read: Self-Publishing: Opportunities and Threats in a New Age of Mass Culture</p> <p>http://www.library.illinois.edu/ugl/howdoi/rightsource.html</p>	<p>‘Internet killed the Pulitzer’</p> <p>Self-publishing</p> <p>Information quality and quantity</p>
Class 2	<p>Read: ‘Practicing Critical Evaluation of Online Sources Improves Student Search Behavior’</p> <p>Watch: https://www.ted.com/talks/markham_nolan_how_to_separate_fact_and_fiction_online</p>	<p>Reading Critically for Finding and Evaluating Materials</p>
Week 5		Research and Scholarship, Inquiry and Conversation
Class 1	<p>https://www.carli.illinois.edu/products-services/pub-serv/instruction/ToolkitHomepage</p> <p>Read: ‘Process as Product’</p>	<p>ACRL Accreditation and Framework</p> <p>Information creation, publication and dissemination.</p>
Class 2	<p>Complete Assignment #3 - Fact-Finding Mission and Submit to Canvas</p>	<p>Assignment 5 - Annotated Bibliography Overview and Assignment; - Research as Inquiry</p>

		Assignment 6 - Project and Timeline Assignment 7 -Report/ Portfolio Identify potential project ideas for Project Proposal
Week 6		Research and Scholarship Inquiry and Conversation
Class 1	Chapters 3-4 Read: ‘Internet Research Made Easy’	Search Terms and Strategies - Concepts - Skills
Class 2	Read: Zotero User Guide Watch: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=62lFKT1pWYI	Citations and Assistance Practicum - Purdue Owl - Zotero - EBSCO account - Endnote
Week 7		Research and Scholarship Inquiry and Conversation
Class 1		Review
Class 2	Study for Midterm	Assignment #4 - Midterm
Week 8		Authority
Class 1	Assignment 6a. Submit Project Proposal to Canvas Watch: https://www.ted.com/talks/jp_rangaswami_information_is_food	Discuss Project Topic Selections Information Conglomerates and Control Information consumer vs. producer
Class 2	Read: ‘Intellectual Honesty and Integrity’ ‘Patchwork Plagiarism’	Avoiding plagiarism to be an effective information producer/creator Cultural views of plagiarism/ adaptation

	<p>‘Useful Tips to Avoiding Plagiarism’</p> <p>‘Movie Empire Strikes Back’ (revisit)</p> <p>https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/1/</p>	
Week 9		Authority
Class 1	<p>http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0112697/plotsummary?ref=tt_q1_stry_2</p> <p>http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0116191/plotsummary?ref=tt_q1_stry_2</p>	Evaluating adaptations
Class 2	<p>https://classifiedsection.openthegovernment.org/2015/09/17/openthegovernment-org-challenges-ongoing-classification-of-the-cia-torture-program/</p>	<p>Summary, Paraphrase, Quote</p> <p>Rhetorical Evaluation</p>
Week 10		Authority
Class 1	Assignment 6b Submit to Canvas and/ or hand in.	<p>Discussion: Critical information literacy</p> <p>Information in and for marginalized communities</p>
Class 2	Read:	In-class Research
Week 11		Inquiry and Exploration
Class 1	<p>‘What is Peer Review’</p> <p>‘Why is Peer Review so Important’</p>	In-Class Research w/ guest librarian

Class 2	Complete Assignment #5 - Annotated Bibliography and Submit to Canvas	Discipline-based research in and for scholarly publication. Peer Review and Scholarly Publication Process
Week 12		Exploration, Creation and Conversation
Class 1	Chapter 8	Communication and Information Literacy
Class 2		Visual[ization] and Literacy
Week 13		Exploration, Creation and Conversation
Class 1	Complete Assignment 6c and submit all materials to Canvas/ hand in. Fill-in and submit 'Areas of Concern' survey for conferences	Project Planning/ Work and Individual Conferencing
Class 2	TBD	Project Planning/ Work and Individual Conferencing
Week 14		Exploration, Creation and Conversation
Class 1	Watch: https://www.ted.com/talks/gary_k_ovacs_tracking_the_trackers https://www.ted.com/talks/mikko_hypponen_three_types_of_online_attack	Online safety and representation in a post-truth environment.
Class 2	Complete Assignment 6d - and Submit all materials to Canvas	Review Topic TBD by class

Week 15		Exploration, Creation and Conversation
Class 1		Review Topic TBD by class
Class 2	Complete and submit all materials for project report/ portfolio Assignment #7	Portfolio discussion and reflection Class feedback
Exam Week		Presentation/ Symposium

Major Assignments - Description and Criteria

Assignment 1: Weekly ELMS Discussions - 150 pts

Due: Weekly

Criteria: Each week, we will continue our class discussions on our ELMS page. I will post a question or topic, and students will reflect, question and challenge in small group discussions. For full credit, you should post an initial response, and offer comments and/or pose questions to others in your group. The groups may change throughout the semester. All responses will be submitted on-time to the class Canvas page. Each response should follow the rules of proper grammar, mechanics and sentence structure.

Assignment 2: OpEd Essay - 150 pts

This assignment is a formal essay and will follow appropriate academic writing conventions.

Prompt: After discussing legal and ethical issues surrounding information, each student will compose an original opinion piece that incorporates sources used during class. The essay will total 500-700 words and follow proper APA format.

Criteria: Each essay will be assessed on criteria that evaluates writing quality and demonstrates an ability to critique existing applications of scholarship.

Assignment 3: Fact-finding Mission - 100 pts

This assignment requires students to critically analyze a source, and serve as scholarly ‘fact-checker’. The student will work with a partner to identify appropriate source material that either supports or refutes claims within the source. In a short

written analysis, the student will identify each claim and support that claims accuracy with a relevant, accurate, reliable source. The catch is that you can only use each source type once. For example, if you find a primary source to back up one claim, you cannot use a primary source or related secondary source to back up the next claim.

Feel free to get creative in how you present this. Your submission will include a References page and should be visually interesting. You have the option to submit this assignment electronically or, if it is not an electronic object, you may hand it in.

Assignment 4: Midterm - 100 pts

Students will select a research question from a prompt and perform and document a search to include databases, key words and limiters. The midterm will be timed and include some multiple choice, but mostly short answer responses.

Criteria: The in-class exam will be graded based on correct identification and implementation of search strategies and must demonstrate the student's understanding of information as it is constructed/ contextual. Each of 10 questions will be worth 10 points - 5 for correctness and 5 for explaining the process.

Assignment 5: Annotated Bibliography

Prompt: Each student group will select and critically evaluate information sources that support user needs and product design as it reflects information rights, creation or access. The students will conduct research on the topic and compile no less than 15 sources into a strong, clear annotated bibliography that follows the scholarship conventions around information creation and inquiry.

First Draft - 100 pts

The first draft will include a relevant summary and brief rhetorical evaluation on the authority, benefits and weaknesses of each source. For each entry, the student will include the source title; author/producer and/ or publication; the source title; the relevant summary; the rhetorical evaluation.

Final 6b. - 50 pts

The final annotated bibliography will include ONLY the sources the student chooses as most beneficial for Assignment 6. The student will revise the rhetorical evaluation for each entry to reflect how the source best supports their position.

Assignment 6: Project Deliverables

Each deliverable supports one or more Frames from the ACRL Framework. The deliverables also align with our course **Scholarship in Practice** outcomes:

1. Demonstrate an ability to select, critically evaluate, and apply relevant areas of scholarship.
2. Articulate the processes required to bring about a successful outcome from planning, modeling, and preparing, to critiquing, revising and perfecting.
3. Demonstrate an ability to critique existing applications of scholarship in order to learn from past success and failures.
4. Demonstrate an ability to collaborate in order to bring about a successful outcome.
5. Recognize how an application of scholarship affects or is affected by political, social, cultural, economic or ethical dimensions.
6. Produce an original analysis, project, creative work, performance or other scholarly work that reflects a body of knowledge relevant to the course.

6a. ‘Authority is Constructed and Contextual’ / ‘Research as Inquiry’

-Working with a campus or local group, organization, club or department of your choosing, you will identify a problem: a need or a conflict that needs to be filled or addressed. If you identify a need, you should, theoretically, have the support of your partner. The topic that you select for your project should be based on the community needs of your partner. If you identify a conflict, you must present the conflict to the partner so they are aware of your work. You will create an information product that has the potential to alleviate the conflict.

Deliverables:

Project Proposal

(Assignment 5)Annotated Bibliography - Final

6b. ‘Information Creation as a Process’

-Design or create an information product for your partner community that exposes a problem; educates; allows for the exchange of ideas; or otherwise meets a relevant community need. The product should be realistic and accessible to members of the community. This could mean working with community leaders to establish a tentative/ hypothetical budget. You will not be responsible for funding.

Deliverables:

Project Update 1 w/ mock-up or outline of the information product

6c. ‘Information has Value’

-Adapt/ revise your information product so that it can reach and appeal to both

authoritative and marginalized groups. The product can be print, digital, visual or oral. Additionally, you will create an implement a method to evaluate how various populations respond to your product. For example, you may choose to create a survey and request feedback, or you can observe and record the reactions.

Deliverables:

Project Update 2 w/ applied revisions and rationale.

Product evaluation and feedback from tentative users.

6d. 'Scholarship as Conversation'

- Schedule a 30-45 minute meeting with an authoritative committee with the objective of exacting change or promoting a particular position. Each student in the group must come prepared with valid arguments and source materials. The groups can use various media as evidence during the discussion. The discussion must be recorded.

Deliverables:

Audio or video recording of conversation

Evidence, signs, posters, graphics et al.

Individual Reflection

Assignment 7: Project Report/ Portfolio - 100 pts

Students will compile an official report that includes the project proposal and details the process to show 'Searching as Strategic Exploration' and identifying how the project/ product evolved.

Assignment 8: Class Participation - 150 pts

Students can earn up to 10 pts/ week for class participation as outlined in the class participation rubric.

Appendix 2 – ACRL Information Literacy Standards and Indicators

Standards, Performance Indicators, and Outcomes

Standard One

The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.

Performance Indicators:

1. The information literate student defines and articulates the need for information.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Confers with instructors and participates in class discussions, peer workgroups, and electronic discussions to identify a research topic, or other information need
- b. Develops a thesis statement and formulates questions based on the information need
- c. Explores general information sources to increase familiarity with the topic
- d. Defines or modifies the information need to achieve a manageable focus
- e. Identifies key concepts and terms that describe the information need
- f. Recognizes that existing information can be combined with original thought, experimentation, and/or analysis to produce new information

2. The information literate student identifies a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Knows how information is formally and informally produced, organized, and disseminated
- b. Recognizes that knowledge can be organized into disciplines that influence the way information is accessed
- c. Identifies the value and differences of potential resources in a variety of formats (e.g., multimedia, database, website, data set, audio/visual, book)
- d. Identifies the purpose and audience of potential resources (e.g., popular vs. scholarly, current vs. historical)
- e. Differentiates between primary and secondary sources, recognizing how their use and importance vary with each discipline
- f. Realizes that information may need to be constructed with raw data from primary sources

3. The information literate student considers the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Determines the availability of needed information and makes decisions on broadening the information seeking process beyond local resources (e.g., interlibrary loan; using resources at other locations; obtaining images, videos, text, or sound)
- b. Considers the feasibility of acquiring a new language or skill (e.g., foreign or discipline-based) in order to gather needed information and to understand its context
- c. Defines a realistic overall plan and timeline to acquire the needed information

4. The information literate student reevaluates the nature and extent of the information need.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Reviews the initial information need to clarify, revise, or refine the question
- b. Describes criteria used to make information decisions and choices

Standard Two

The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

Performance Indicators:

1. The information literate student selects the most appropriate investigative methods or information retrieval systems for accessing the needed information.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Identifies appropriate investigative methods (e.g., laboratory experiment, simulation, fieldwork)
 - b. Investigates benefits and applicability of various investigative methods
 - c. Investigates the scope, content, and organization of information retrieval systems
 - d. Selects efficient and effective approaches for accessing the information needed from the investigative method or information retrieval system
2. The information literate student constructs and implements effectively-designed search strategies.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Develops a research plan appropriate to the investigative method
 - b. Identifies keywords, synonyms and related terms for the information needed
 - c. Selects controlled vocabulary specific to the discipline or information retrieval source
 - d. Constructs a search strategy using appropriate commands for the information retrieval system selected (e.g., Boolean operators, truncation, and proximity for search engines; internal organizers such as indexes for books)
 - e. Implements the search strategy in various information retrieval systems using different user interfaces and search engines, with different command languages, protocols, and search parameters
 - f. Implements the search using investigative protocols appropriate to the discipline
3. The information literate student retrieves information online or in person using a variety of methods.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Uses various search systems to retrieve information in a variety of formats
 - b. Uses various classification schemes and other systems (e.g., call number systems or indexes) to locate information resources within the library or to identify specific sites for physical exploration
 - c. Uses specialized online or in person services available at the institution to retrieve information needed (e.g., interlibrary loan/document delivery, professional associations, institutional research offices, community resources, experts and practitioners)
 - d. Uses surveys, letters, interviews, and other forms of inquiry to retrieve primary information
4. The information literate student refines the search strategy if necessary.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Assesses the quantity, quality, and relevance of the search results to determine whether alternative information retrieval systems or investigative methods should be utilized
 - b. Identifies gaps in the information retrieved and determines if the search strategy should be revised
 - c. Repeats the search using the revised strategy as necessary
5. The information literate student extracts, records, and manages the information and its sources.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Selects among various technologies the most appropriate one for the task of extracting the needed information (e.g., copy/paste software functions, photocopier, scanner, audio/visual equipment, or exploratory instruments)
 - b. Creates a system for organizing the information

- c. Differentiates between the types of sources cited and understands the elements and correct syntax of a citation for a wide range of resources
- d. Records all pertinent citation information for future reference
- e. Uses various technologies to manage the information selected and organized

Standard Three

The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.

Performance Indicators:

1. The information literate student summarizes the main ideas to be extracted from the information gathered.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Reads the text and selects main ideas
 - b. Restates textual concepts in his/her own words and selects data accurately
 - c. Identifies verbatim material that can be then appropriately quoted
2. The information literate student articulates and applies initial criteria for evaluating both the information and its sources.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Examines and compares information from various sources in order to evaluate reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, and point of view or bias
 - b. Analyzes the structure and logic of supporting arguments or methods
 - c. Recognizes prejudice, deception, or manipulation
 - d. Recognizes the cultural, physical, or other context within which the information was created and understands the impact of context on interpreting the information
3. The information literate student synthesizes main ideas to construct new concepts.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Recognizes interrelationships among concepts and combines them into potentially useful primary statements with supporting evidence
 - b. Extends initial synthesis, when possible, at a higher level of abstraction to construct new hypotheses that may require additional information
 - c. Utilizes computer and other technologies (e.g. spreadsheets, databases, multimedia, and audio or visual equipment) for studying the interaction of ideas and other phenomena
4. The information literate student compares new knowledge with prior knowledge to determine the value added, contradictions, or other unique characteristics of the information.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Determines whether information satisfies the research or other information need
 - b. Uses consciously selected criteria to determine whether the information contradicts or verifies information used from other sources
 - c. Draws conclusions based upon information gathered
 - d. Tests theories with discipline-appropriate techniques (e.g., simulators, experiments)
 - e. Determines probable accuracy by questioning the source of the data, the limitations of the information gathering tools or strategies, and the reasonableness of the conclusions
 - f. Integrates new information with previous information or knowledge
 - g. Selects information that provides evidence for the topic
5. The information literate student determines whether the new knowledge has an impact on the individual's value system and takes steps to reconcile differences.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Investigates differing viewpoints encountered in the literature
- b. Determines whether to incorporate or reject viewpoints encountered
6. The information literate student validates understanding and interpretation of the information through discourse with other individuals, subject-area experts, and/or practitioners.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Participates in classroom and other discussions
- b. Participates in class-sponsored electronic communication forums designed to encourage discourse on the topic (e.g., email, bulletin boards, chat rooms)
- c. Seeks expert opinion through a variety of mechanisms (e.g., interviews, email, listservs)
7. The information literate student determines whether the initial query should be revised.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Determines if original information need has been satisfied or if additional information is needed
- b. Reviews search strategy and incorporates additional concepts as necessary
- c. Reviews information retrieval sources used and expands to include others as needed

Standard Four

The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

Performance Indicators:

1. The information literate student applies new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Organizes the content in a manner that supports the purposes and format of the product or performance (e.g. outlines, drafts, storyboards)
- b. Articulates knowledge and skills transferred from prior experiences to planning and creating the product or performance
- c. Integrates the new and prior information, including quotations and paraphrasings, in a manner that supports the purposes of the product or performance
- d. Manipulates digital text, images, and data, as needed, transferring them from their original locations and formats to a new context
2. The information literate student revises the development process for the product or performance.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Maintains a journal or log of activities related to the information seeking, evaluating, and communicating process
- b. Reflects on past successes, failures, and alternative strategies
3. The information literate student communicates the product or performance effectively to others.

Outcomes Include:

- a. Chooses a communication medium and format that best supports the purposes of the product or performance and the intended audience
- b. Uses a range of information technology applications in creating the product or performance
- c. Incorporates principles of design and communication

- d. Communicates clearly and with a style that supports the purposes of the intended audience

Standard Five

The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

Performance Indicators:

1. The information literate student understands many of the ethical, legal and socio-economic issues surrounding information and information technology.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Identifies and discusses issues related to privacy and security in both the print and electronic environments
 - b. Identifies and discusses issues related to free vs. fee-based access to information
 - c. Identifies and discusses issues related to censorship and freedom of speech
 - d. Demonstrates an understanding of intellectual property, copyright, and fair use of copyrighted material
2. The information literate student follows laws, regulations, institutional policies, and etiquette related to the access and use of information resources.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Participates in electronic discussions following accepted practices (e.g. "Netiquette")
 - b. Uses approved passwords and other forms of ID for access to information resources
 - c. Complies with institutional policies on access to information resources
 - d. Preserves the integrity of information resources, equipment, systems and facilities
 - e. Legally obtains, stores, and disseminates text, data, images, or sounds
 - f. Demonstrates an understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and does not represent work attributable to others as his/her own
 - g. Demonstrates an understanding of institutional policies related to human subjects research
3. The information literate student acknowledges the use of information sources in communicating the product or performance.
Outcomes Include:
 - a. Selects an appropriate documentation style and uses it consistently to cite sources
 - b. Posts permission granted notices, as needed, for copyrighted material

Bibliography

References:

- Anderson, K., & May, F. A. (2010). Does the Method of Instruction Matter? An Experimental Examination of Information Literacy Instruction in the Online, Blended, and Face-to-Face Classrooms. *Journal Of Academic Librarianship*, 36(6), 495-500.
- Aristotle. (1962). *The Politics*. T.A. Sinclair (translator). London, England: Penguin Books
- Armstrong, B.J., Dirnt, M., & Cool, T., (2004). American Idiot. [Recorded by Green Day]. On *American Idiot* [CD]. Oakland, California: Reprise Records.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. Web. (2016)
- Atwood, Thomas. Keynote Speaker of Your Student Is My Student: Information Literacy and the Transfer Student Experience, Loyola University, Columbia Campus. 11/30/2015.
- Bacon, F. (1999). *Selected Philosophical Works*. Rosemary Sargent (Ed.). Indianapolis/ Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company
- Bacon, F. (1985). *The Essays*. John Pitcher (Ed.). New York, NY: Penguin
- Badke, W. (2009). Stepping Beyond WIKIPEDIA. *Educational Leadership*, 66(6), 54-58.
- Badke, W. (2008). A rationale for information literacy as a credit-bearing discipline. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 2(1), 1-22.
- Berlin, I. (1996). *The Sense of Reality: Studies in Ideas and Their History*. Henry Hardy Ed.). New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux

- Biddix, J. P., Chung, C.J., & Park, H.W. (2011). Convenience or credibility? A study of college student online research behaviors. *Internet and Higher Education*, 14(3), 175-182. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.01.003
- Bloom, B. & Deyrup, R. (2015). The SHU research logs: student online search behaviors trans-scripted. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(5), 593-601. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2015.07.002
- Bradbury, R. (1953). *Fahrenheit 451*. New York: Ballantine Publishing Group
- Britt, M. A., & Aglinskias, C. (2002). Improving Students' Ability to Identify and Use Source Information. *Cognition & Instruction*, 20(4), 485.
- Burgoyne, M. B., & Chuppa-Cornell, K. (2015). Beyond Embedded: Creating an Online- Learning Community Integrating Information Literacy and Composition Courses. *Journal Of Academic Librarianship*, 41(4), 416-421. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2015.05.005
- Burkhardt, J.M. (2016). *Teaching Information Literacy Reframed*. Neal Schuman. Chicago.
- Chambers, W.L., Smith, L.P., Orvis, J.N., Caplinger, C. (2013). Developing a Topic-Centered First-Year Seminar with Emphasis on Information Literacy at a Large Regional University. *College and Undergraduate Libraries*. 20: 52-17. Taylor and Francis.
- Christensen, Baumann, Ruggles, and Stadtler. "Disruptive Innovation for Social Change," *HBR*, December 2006, vol 84, no 12, pp 94-101
- Code of Maryland Regulations. Title 13b. Maryland Higher Education Commission. Web. (2013)

- Domonoske, C. (2016, November 23.). Study Finds Students Have Dismaying Inability to Tell Fake News from Real. *NPR.org. The Two-Way*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/11/23/503129818/study-finds-students-have-dismaying-inability-to-tell-fake-news-from-real>
- Duncan, Maisha, Jenny Hatleberg, and Niyati Pandya. No Shoes Required: Using Blackboard Collaborate for Remote Library Instruction. Proc. of Your Student Is My Student: Information Literacy and the Transfer Student Experience, Loyola University, Columbia Campus. 11/30/2015.
- Elrod, R.E., Wallace, E.D., Sirigos, C.B. (2012). Teaching Information Literacy: A Review of 100 Syllabi. *The Southeastern Librarian*. (60). 3. 8-15.
- Friere, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York, NY: The Continuum Publishing Company
- General Education Learning Outcomes*. (2016). The University of Maryland, College Park. Undergraduate Catalog. Retrieved from:
<http://www.gened.umd.edu/documents/GeneralEducationLearningOutcomes.pdf>
- Grabe, Maria E., Myrick, Jessica G. (2016). Informed Citizenship in a Media-Centric Way of Life. *Journal of Communication* (66). 215-235
- Grallo, J.D., Chalmers, M., Baker, P.G. (2012). How Do I Get a Campus ID? The Other Role of the Academic Library in Student Retention and Success. *The Reference Librarian*. (53) 182-193.

- Gray, C. J., & Montgomery, M. (2014). Teaching an Online Information Literacy Course: Is It Equivalent to Face-to-Face Instruction?. *Journal Of Library & Information Services In Distance Learning*, 8(3/4), 301-309.
doi:10.1080/1533290X.2014.945876
- Guo, Y. R., Goh, D. H., Luyt, B., Sin, S. J., & Ang, R. P. (2015). The effectiveness and acceptance of an affective information literacy tutorial. *Computers & Education*, 87368-384. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2015.07.015
- Hagel III, J., Brown, J.S., Mathew, R., Wooll, M., Tsu, W. (2015). The Lifetime Learner. *The Atlantic*. Deloitte University Press. Retrieved from:
<http://www.theatlantic.com/sponsored/deloitte-shifts/the-lifetime-learner/256/>
- Head, A.J., Van Hoeck, M., Garson, D.S. (2015). Lifelong learning in the digital age: A content analysis of recent research on participation. *First Monday*. 20(2)
- International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. (2011)
- Johnston, N. (2010). IS AN ONLINE LEARNING MODULE AN EFFECTIVE WAY TO DEVELOP INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS?. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 41(3), 207-218.
- Kim, S.U. & Schumaker, D. (2015). Student, Librarian, and Instructor Perceptions of Information Literacy Instruction and Skills in a First-Year Experience Program: A Case Study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 41. (459-456). Elsevier.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.04.005>

- Lewis-Spector, Jill. (2016). Building strong futures: Literacy Practices for Developing Engaged Citizenship in the 21st Century. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, Vol. 39, No. 1
- Lupien, P. & Oldham, R. (2012). Millennials and technology: putting suppositions to the test in an academic library. In M.J. Crump & L.S. Freund, Meeting the needs of student users in academic libraries: reaching across the great divide (pp.89-126). Oxford, UK: Woodhead Publishing Limited.
- Magnuson, M.L. (2013). Web 2.0 and Information Literacy Instruction: Aligning Technology with ACRL Standards. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(3), 244- 251. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2013.01.008
- Malloy, T., Rubenstein, P.S. (2017). Trump Slump Continues As He Drops Below Obama, Quinnipiac University National Poll Finds; Republicans In Congress Drop To More Than 3-1 Negative. Quinnipiac University Poll. Quinnipiac University. Apr. 4. Retrieved from:
https://poll.qu.edu/images/polling/us/us04042017_U423fmbh.pdf/
- Maryland Higher Education Commission. (2016). Data Book: Creating a State of Achievement. Retrieved from:
<http://mhec.maryland.gov/publications/Documents/Research/AnnualPublications/2016Databook.pdf>
- Mathiesen, K. (2014). Human Rights for the Digital Age. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 29:2-18. doi: 10.0180/08900523.2014.863124
- Mathiesen, K. (2012). The Human Right to Internet Access: A Philosophical Defense. *International Review of Information Ethics*. Vol. 18. 9-22

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2015). *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation*. (13th ed.). Web.
- McCrummen, Stephanie. (2016, October 1). Finally. Someone Who Thinks Like Me. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/finally-someone-who-thinks-like-me/2016/10/01/c9b6f334-7f68-11e6-9070-5c4905bf40dc_story.html
- Moeller, Susan et al., (2010). *Background Document of the Expert Meeting Towards Media and Information Literacy Indicators*. UNESCO. Bangkok, Thailand.
- OECD (2016), Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing: Paris. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.187.eag-2016-en>
- O'Hara, R.E., Walter, M.I., & Christopher, A.N. (2009). Need for Cognition and Conscientiousness as Predictors of Political Interest and Voting Strategy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(6), 1397-1416. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00487.x
- Oliver, J. (2016, November 13). President Elect Trump: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver. *HBO*. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rSDUsMwakI>
- Orwell, George. (1949). *1984*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace
- Pierce, D., Redlawsk, D., & Cohen, W. (2016). Social Influences on Online Political Information Search and Evaluation. *Polit Behav*. Springer-Science Business Media. New York. doi: 10.1007/s11109-016-9374-4
- Preer, J. (2006). Promoting Citizenship: How Librarians Helped Get out the Vote in the 1952 Presidential Election. *Libraries and Culture*.

- Sanabria, J.E. (2013). The Library as An Academic Partner in Student Retention and Graduation: The Library's Collaboration with the Freshman Year Seminar Initiative at the Bronx Community College. *Collaborative Librarianship* 5(2): 94-100
- Singh, R. (2016, July 4.). Brexit referendum: Voting Analysis. The Parliament Magazine. Retrieved from <https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/articles/news/brexit-referendum-voting-analysis>
- Stagg, A., Kimminis, L. (2014). First Year in Higher Education (FYHE) and the Coursework Post-Graduate Student. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 40. 142-151. Elsevier.
- Sturges, P., & Gastinger, A. (2010). Information literacy as a human right. *Libri*, 60, 195-202.
- Thevenin, Benjamin. (2012). *The Re-Politicization of Media Literacy Education*. The National Association for Media Literacy Education's Journal of Media Literacy Education 4:1. 61-69
- Tyson, A., Maliam, S. (2016, November 9). Behind Trump's victory: Divisions by race, gender, education. Fact Tank. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/09/behind-trumps-victory-divisions-by-race-gender-education/>
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (1948). New York. United Nations.
- Waldman, P. (2016, November 23). How long before the white working class realizes Trump was just scamming them?. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2016/11/23/how-long-before-the-white-working-class-realizes-trump-was-just-scamming-them/?utm_term=.35b619da520d

Wallace, G. Yoon, R., (2016, November 12). Voter turnout at 20-year low in 2016.

CNN politics. Retrieved from

<http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/11/politics/popular-vote-turnout-2016/>

Wang, A. (2016, November 16). 'Post-Truth' named 2016 word of the year by

Oxford Dictionaries. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/11/16/post-truth-named-2016-word-of-the-year-by-oxford-dictionaries/>

Whitlock, B., Ebrihimi, N., (2016). Beyond the Library: Using Multiple Mixed

Measures Simultaneously in a College-Wide Assessment of Information

Literacy. *College and Research Libraries*. doi:10.5860/crl.77.2.236

Wilkes, J., Godwin, J., Gurney, L.J. (2015). Developing Information Literacy and

Academic Writing Skills Through the Collaborative Design of an Assessment

Task for First Year Engineering Students. *Australian Academic and Research*

Libraries. 46(3). 164-175, Taylor and Francis.

