FoKAL Summit 2010 Notes

Cumberland Falls State Resort Park

June 8-9, 2009

# Introduction—Jared Porter

Mission Statement, Agenda

# Speaker: Oswald Ratteray

## Information Literacy in Accreditation (PowerPoint Presentation)

### Chronology of Events

Administrators and assessment personnel received training in IL. Later on University of Phoenix was seeking accreditation so the Middle-States standards committee needed to consider virtual libraries. In 2002, they believed IL belonged under the section of Educational Offerings instead of just under the Library. IL should be central to all curricula and not just Gen. Ed.

### Backstage Advocacy

Fighting the battles behind the scenes. Need to find a CEO or an advocate on campus to lead the charge. IL workshops in all conferences. Sponsored regional symposia. Continually be an advocate and defend when IL is challenged.

### My Evolving Thinking

Original workflow: Know, access, evaluate sources, evaluate content (split from evaluate sources), use information, do all ethically/legally.

Process: Starts with faculty, Librarian may lead with Faculty Support, Librarian may lead while Faculty has final word, Faculty leads while librarian may contribute, Faculty leads with Librarian’s insight, Faculty and Librarian jointly.

### Where did it go wrong?

1999 ACRL panel had only 1 faculty member while faculty areas did not have librarians involved so there became “silos.”

### Focus on “Mindful Learning”

Continuous creation of new categories, openness to new information, awareness of more than one perspective.

### The Recursive Nature of Learning

See chart.

### Getting Faculty Attention

Held a conference for Chief Academic Officers to teach about IL. Keep it at a macro-level and call it the ‘learning process.’

### Is the Middle States Experience Transferable?

Analyze the accrediting standards

### Next Steps in SACS

Get your message straight
Organize potential panelists

### Questions

The key players really are faculty. With the shift from accreditation associations to local assessment committees, how do we make sure the students are learning what is intended, is this similar to what you see the future will be? Yes – if you get the faculty’s attention and get them where their heart is you can gain ground.

When you said ‘sideline’ IL what did you mean by that? There were some VPs that had close friends in libraries that were library-centric so extra explanation was needed for this broader approach to IL. Some were very much in favor because they were able to get publicity. You can’t develop new books and panels because of money.

Why is 1-, 2-, 3-hour course not optimal? The fear is that IL can get pigeon-holed if it is just pushed into one course. It is a practical matter, but some can become aware of the need for a change of focus.

If we approach the SACS KY Board of Trustees then they will see us as a librarian, how can we overcome this? Go as a group with faculty that have a shared vision.

If we promote a conference for Chief Academic Officers then we will likely have the same problem. AAC&U annual conference and section that appeals to deans is a good resource. ACE (American Council of Education) may or may not make progress unless there is an inside track.

How effective were the workshops? We have never been able to do a follow-up survey on the workshops to see how well they did.

Besides the Chief Academic Officers and faculty, the institutional effectiveness offices may be good to approach as well. That is correct because they have immediate access to staff. They are key allies for connecting in SACS and other organizations.

Plan A seems to be focused internally to higher education communities while Plan B focuses on outside entities. How significant of a role have the outside positions played in adopting the standards? The rewrites were every 10 years—then they were to do continuous evaluation of our standards. There was a panel to decide what should be rewritten and these are the people that should be sought.

Fascinated by perspective on “for-credit hour model.” This seems to change the way things are done. There will be more deliberate divisions of technical/physical side of librarianship and then there is another side of teaching and learning which may require different staff and types of staff.

If students don’t have the starting point or foundation, then how do you ensure that they get it? There is support of IL, and there are some districts that do not have a strong media literacy program. Anything you can do to get the groups for P-12 and higher ed. (CPE) the better. You might find allies in places you haven’t thought of because they think they they are all alone.

Back to the idea of cultivating relationship between librarians and faculty—gen. ed. faculty wanted to do their own visits to the library and lead the sessions to teach what they thought were “the basics.” How do you cope with that? Be patient for attrition.

On the other hand, the young ones want to do the instructions on their own while the older ones want library engagement. The young ones do fine to tell what they want and how to find it.

At one institution, the freshmen writing program incorporates IL and it does catch most of the students. There is an ‘information fluency’ workshop in CIC? CSC? Some people don’t realize that they are already ‘in’ the program they just don’t use the label.

With newer generations, there is a growing blur between information use and information creation. How does this work into use and ethics? It can be worked in both places.

# Information Literacy and Accreditation Agencies – Marcia Freyman

Looking at 2008 SACS standards IL seems to not be mentioned much. Handout presented other accreditation bodies with italicized areas that blatantly reference information literacy. SACS reduced the overall number of standards and IL was apparently removed.

# SACS Off-Site and On-Site Review Discussion

No one has participated in new compliance visits

Panelists from SACS Visits:

### Pat McFarland

There is a two-step process with an off-site review committee and an on-site committee

1. Off-site Review Committee:
	* Team consists of chair and evaluators with persons from finance, institutional effectiveness, learning support, educational programs, etc.
	* Evaluators are assigned certain requirements (Library specific are 3.8.1, 3.8.2, 3.8.3, 2.9)
	* Sometimes evaluators are assigned as secondary readers for other sections
	* 6-weeks prior to on-site review the information is submitted to the off-site committee
	* The team reviews three institutions
	* The team reviews over two weeks (typically meet as a group in Atlanta), goes standard by standard to explain compliance or non-compliance and writes a response
	* The team deciphers if the library is compliant, but can only go by the narrative provided so DOCUMENT EVERYTHING!
	* It is a subjective process and Information Literacy can’t be found in the standards anywhere
	* We CAN educate reviewers to look for IL
	* We CAN volunteer for the list of reviewers (the President of your institution has to nominate SACS reviewers)
	* Final report goes to SACS and the Institution
	* The Institution can then create focus reports to document all items that were cited as non-compliant
2. On-site Committee
* Assesses the QEP (related to critical thinking or IL)
* Susan, Matt, Elsie have served on on-site committees
* Librarians typically are only pulled into on-site committees if the library is flagged as an issue
* Off-site reviewers don’t see the process to completion
* If something is glaring on-site that off-site missed then it may be brought up

How things can change:

* SACS has distance learning addendum
* IL has entered the backdoor through QEP
* “It’s pathetic that only a few FoKAL members have been on committees.”
* KY reviewers won’t assess other KY schools
* Application 🡪 Signed by President 🡪 Signed by institutional liaison
* Do reviewers come from similar institutions? Yes

### Matthew Onion

* 3.8.2 “access to” is the key phrase—faculty could post to a form for Bibliographic Instruction and that was it (and compliance was granted!)
* “sufficient,” “adeduqte” are terms used so SACS likes the idea of services being *available* but does not go much further than that
* Recommendations vs. Suggestions
* Enable relative assessment (based on institution)

There is some online training for evaluators

# World Café Exercise – Jared Porter

How is FoKAL strategically positioned in establishing IL standards? (Summarized):

1. Looking at other library groups in other SACS states
2. Newer organization is not stuck in “habits.” More flexible.
3. Partnership gives us credibility (peer pressure).
4. Director/Administrator level has more opportunity for buy-in.

Notes from charts:

1. Possibility to get involved at all levels with different
2. FoKAL is a young organization with new ideas and willingness to implement change.
3. FoKAL is positioned to explore different and broader terminology.
4. Unified body
5. Representative of all types of academic libraries
6. Opportunity for relationship with other state groups—and library groups in other states
7. Opportunity for “raising the bar” for IL skills
8. Connections with K-12
9. Leaders and administrators within academic library community
10. Collaboration with faculty
11. Student learning 🡪 how does IL factor into SLO?
12. Advocacy committee
13. Directors of libraries are positioned within institution and with leadership.
14. All academic library types
15. Cover KY—one voice—consensus 🡪 networking
16. Can brand into SACS
17. ACRL guidelines
18. Administrative standing within institutions
19. Involved in local SACS compliance—increase off-site and on-site participation
20. Librarian—share, good ideas, hard working
21. Can collaborate with K-12 (FoKAL, KSMA)
22. FoKAL credibility and clout—no charge ☺
23. Represent big percentage of SACS schools 🡪 contact other states’ organizations
24. We are an organization, not individuals speaking organization to organization 🡪 advocacy arm could reach out
25. We are seeing the need in QEPs that are coming out of the institution
26. As FoKAL we can approach faculty members who would advocate for IL
27. Get more reviewers from libraries would give us an inside track
28. How do we strategically place ourselves in the academic discussion of student learning rather than limiting ourselves to IL? Process not product.

Visions for the Future (Summarized):

1. The terminology isn’t as important as the competencies
2. Every faculty member should be an IL expert. Global. Broad.
3. Need new language
4. Find the “hook” on campus

Notes from charts:

1. Partnership with other campus entities
2. Connect IL concepts to outcomes
3. Personal relationships with faculty
4. Faculty as IL experts
5. Campus-wide outcome/expectation
6. “IL” not necessary – “find the hook”
7. Share today’s discovery with staff about different/new terminology
8. Stepped/staged approach
9. Every faculty member as an IL expert.
10. IL went Global! Keep it Broad!
11. How does the library support the goals of the programs?
12. What do the students need?
13. Asking questions in the institution about learning outcomes and assessment
14. Spreading IL through the curriculum
15. Good faculty and library rapport/library and faculty status
16. Also include other institutional administrative staff
17. More “inclusive” terminology (mindful learning)
18. Find “hook” on campus with other initiatives, etc.
19. Use the library community
20. Establish credibility as library leaders to people with library
21. Flexibility in terminology
22. Focus on student learning
23. Learning knowledge, wisdom
24. KY emphasis on educational programs and FoKAL
25. Partnerships with K-12
26. KYVL training
27. Working with teachers ed.
28. 50 of us—big #
29. Faculty w/ collaboration—pilot programs?
30. FoKAL IL wiki
31. Staff expertise within FoKAL libraries
32. QEPs
33. Institution-wide
34. Share the news when we return
35. Initiate discussion about related terms. Be flexible and focus on core competencies.
36. QEP offers opportunities and Gen. Ed.
37. Modules
38. Part of student success and functioning in today’s world
39. Different delivery method needed. At point of need.
40. IL not focused on the library only, but on learning more broadly
41. Change the terminology
42. Relationships built individually, not by groups
43. Formalize efforts to integrate IL
44. Build relationships broadly

# FoKAL Information Literacy Committee Survey – Marcia Freyman

The survey was approved by the Executive Committee and narrowed down to 10 questions. 26 of 50 schools responded. Review survey results with highlights. KLA presentation at Georgetown coming soon. Comments for question 7 mentions key players or departments on-campus for partnership.

Anyone using assessment tools?
Jefferson CTC: Project SAILS at Jefferson CTC, no funding or support to get students to take test, besides offering pizza; ran it 2 times and then stopped (SAILS was pretty cheap, maybe $3-$5/student).
Pikeville College: 167/200 took it during orientation last year ($3/student and the dean paid), rationale is that many faculty members were convinced that students already knew these things (students scored 30 points less than national average), need at least 200 students to take the test, may consider a post-test. You can ask local questions to see if they are enrolled in ENG098 or ENG099 to see their scores.

iSkills has been replaced by ETS with iCritical Thinking (alignment with ACRL standards)

Anyone else using other instruments that are effective?
Check with Institutional Research to find questions that are important for library staff to see. CPE may have some standards adopted or accepted, but there is no implementation policy.

Texas Lutheran and other schools in SACS have some good IL. Will try to get the sites up on the FoKAL wiki.

# Executive Committee Report—John Stemmer

Acknowledgement: Jared Porter for service on Executive Committee

## Activities of the Last Year

* Disbanded Ad Hoc Committee
* FIG adopted as name for non-affiliated grouping of FoKAL
* Discussed an Ad Hoc Committee on ILL Systems/Technologies
* Approached by TennSHARE about collaborative databases arrangements
* Continuing conversation about KYVL and budgets and databases
* Agreed to Update of ICOLC Economic Crisis Statement – exclusive arrangements
* Lexington Theological Seminary – lost/dropped SACS accreditation so no longer a FoKAL member (impacts ILL & Reciprocal Borrowing privileges).
* Logo

## Summit Planning

* Thanks to Sheree Williams, Jared Porter, Marcia Freyman

## FoKAL related database arrangements

* 40 members currently using FoKAL related database
* Come from all 4 member groups
* Other Database Arrangements
* PsycARTICLES in the works
* Inventory being updated

Lyrasis Offers that didn’t work out

1. Sage
2. Murals
3. eHREF
4. Emerald
5. LibGuides
6. BioOne 1 & 2
7. Annual Reviews
8. Spirnger E-Books
9. Duke University Press
10. Valueline (al members)
11. EBSCO EconLIT & GeoRef
12. Oxford Reference = OED + 3

### Questions/Comments

* What do we have to do if we want to get on the PsycARTICLES list? Check with John Stemmer

## FoKAL Logo—Ilona Burdette

Barbara Flaig came up with original design. SWON is happy to facilitate the creation of T-Shirts. Requests for various electronic sizefavikon.com. Ilona will work on distribution of the logo.

# Committee on Advocacy—Carrie Cooper

Advocacy committee met for Frankfort Advocacy Day. Weather was horrible so turnout wasn’t the greatest. Chair of the committee changed around the start of the year from Stacey Nickell to Carrie Cooper.

We need the deans and directors to feel apart of the advocacy effort of FoKAL

# Information Literacy Report—Marcia Freyman

[See printed report]

Successful pre-conference workshop

# FoKAL Groups Meeting

## Introduce New Executive Committee

Billie Anne Gebb (FIG - 2011)

Sheila Stuckey (SAALCK - 2011)

Ilona Burdette (AIKCU - 2011)

Cynthia Atkins (KCTCS - 2011)

Donna Abell (KCTCS – 2012)

Marge Cummings (FIG – 2012)

Carrie Cooper (SAALCK – 2012)

Morgan Tracy (AIKCU – 2012)

# Membership Meeting

## Database Arrangement Discussion

Lyrasis Agreement—exclusive contract, would we like this to continue or do we want to focus our efforts on another organization. Options: create collections committee, stick with Lyrasis, go with another agent.

Not impressed with pricing from Lyrasis when working with SWON, would like to see other alternatives. Could we contract with SWON again? Can we see two-or-more groups competing with another. How is SWON funded? It’s a membership fee by FTE? Tiered approach? Three tiers: determined by FTE. Low tier is management services for organization.

Essentially they are giving us Lyrasis-negotiated pricing for everyone. What is our added value for FoKAL? Would SWON be willing to get a 3% cut of everything that they negotiate without charging administrative fees? SAALCK does meet monthly with SWON and SAALCK does have a collections committee.

There are some vendors that will not deal with Lyrasis. Why type of savings are we seeing with Lyrasis? What are other options? What will it cost to go with SWON? If we are going to an ‘agent’ do we need to better articulate our expectations.

ACA (Appalachian College Association) is another agent.

We may need to more toward a staff member. We are not an incorporated entity so we will have to come up with an MOA and then we will have to consider what it would mean to hire someone.

What if a member is not a member of FoKAL versus just being a Lyrasis member. We want more numbers like the Lexis Nexis deal ($.02 FoKAL discount below regular Lyrasis member price). Problem if pricing is FTE or per institution.

Can we get non-exclusive with Lyrasis and do a yearly comparison?

The database inventory will need updated yearly and ‘in theory’ Lyrasis will receive and keep those updates.

Since many FoKAL members do pay membership fees to Lyrasis. We are also FoKAL members of the CLP so sometimes get the runaround from services at Lyrasis.

Next Step: Executive Committee need to gather feedback and then give it to the membership (need to notify Lyrasis in September) if we do not renew the contract.

## Administrative Considerations of FoKAL Comment

Since FoKAL has been around for two years, is it time for FoKAL to have some type of administration? Director, secretarial services, etc.?

## Information Literacy Direction/Charge Modification Discussion

Two ways to interpret lack of information literacy language: 1) not important, 2) spread the concepts throughout the standards (without a hang-up on terminology). We should find out which interpretation is correct—find out how to correct or collaborate.

Not sure if the IL Committee should engage SACS or if it should be someone else. Changing SACS seems daunting, but there could be some smaller steps that we could take.

IL Committee has had a very broad focus. Assessment would be significant over the next 12 months to show us the need and the approaches going on across the state. There is an IL wiki and the KY Learning Depot so maybe there should be a conscious effort not to duplicate things. Do we need to encourage a state-wide IL meeting to get them all around the table together?

It might be good for the IL Committee to follow Oswald’s outline, but we are not ready for that yet. The message should come from the leadership.

Advocacy has a developed 4-point message and can take on the message from IL once formed.

We need to be sensitive that IL is not a library-owned, library-centric initiative.

Next steps: Have the Executive Committee reform charge or give tactical plan to IL committee. Do assessment to provide FoKAL with the information needed to know how to proceed. Gather all state-wide IL participants into one meeting to get them talking together.

## Discussion of ILL/ILLiad

It was determined that ILLiad would be too expensive to push out to the entire FoKAL group. There will be an AIKCU Technology Symposium next week with pre-conference on ILLiad/Odyssey. Right now there is not a committee needed, but we need to facilitate a conversation for our staff to be able to discuss Odyssey.

Next Step: Two conversations on ILLiad and Odyssey may be in order. Ad Hoc committee suggestion? Resource sharing committee? Need a survey and then have the Executive Committee figure out next step.

## Reciprocal Borrowing Comments

Nobody’s noticed a number of people borrowing items.

## Discussion of Participation and Number of Participants

The number of participants seem to be an issue. Is this valued? What could be the issue? Can the Executive Committee send a message to those that aren’t here? 75% attendance (37/49)

We should communicate what we gain from this meeting.

Next Step: Have the Executive Committee follow-up on this

## Summit Reflections (Pros/Cons)

Do we want to change our venue? Anne Abate may give 3 comparisons

Shifting days?

Cell phone service?