

## MEETING NOTES

### Information Literacy Learning Community (ILLC) 2016

December 1, 2016

10:10 to 11:00 am (35-319b)

#### Membership

Academic Programs: Jack Phelan; Katie Tool; Kennedy Library: Adriana Popescu, Katherine O'Clair, Kaila Bussert; Statistics: Beth Chance

~~~~~

## ACTION ITEMS

| Agenda Item                                                              | Action Items & Context                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Responsible Parties                                                                     | Due Date                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Review November 10 <a href="#">meeting notes and action items</a></b> | Observations from Kaila Bussert. Kaila will follow up with Jack Phelan outside the meeting.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Kaila Bussert, Jack Phelan                                                              |                                                      |
| <b>Action Items &amp; Planning Winter Quarter</b>                        | 1. Members from Kennedy Library will come up with a list of faculty to expand the group by Thursday, December 08, 2016.<br>2. Jack P. will draft a letter inviting faculty from across campus to participate in the ILLC group for rubric and assignment design.<br>3. Jack Phelan will also share this message with his upcoming College Assessment Councils.<br>4. Katherine O'Claire will meet with CAFES department and share the message of campus wide representation effort for the community. | 1. Members from the Library<br>2. Katie Tool<br>3. Jack Phelan<br>4. Katherine O'Claire | 1. 12/8/16<br>2. 12/5/16<br>3. 12/5/16<br>4. 12/5/16 |

## MEETING NOTES

1. Review November 10 [meeting notes and action items](#)
  - i. Kaila Bussert will follow-up with Jack Phelan about details on the prior meeting notes.
2. Discuss & Review the Rubrics below: (20min)
  - [Technology & Information Literacy Developmental Rubric \(Champlain College\)](#)
  - [AACU VALUE Rubric](#)
    - i. (Adriana Popescu) Is criteria no. 7 (Develops a self-learning approach to new and emerging technologies and information structures) necessary?
    - ii. (Katherine O'Claire) My understanding is criteria no. 7 is for self-learning approach. We have not previously discussed about the self-learning approach of information literacy specifically. This is important to include that; the rubric is framed to assess multiple assessments and not for a single assignment. We can gather little bits and pieces from both rubrics. But neither of them are perfect. I prefer the rubric from Champlain College. They have introduced a level that is 'absent'. I like this emerging-developing-proficient-mastery idea as development traits than capstone-milestone-benchmark.
    - iii. (Katherine O.) Champlain college rubric is a 5-point rubric starting at 0 for absent.
    - iv. (Katherine O.) The Champlain College rubric is developed based on the value rubric.
    - v. (Jack P.) I am looking at criteria no 3. 'critically evaluates and appraises information'. It is hard to pinpoint what performance is actually desired. Point 3 and 4 seems to be

very similar. I see more elements contained in level 3 than 4. Understanding the desired performances for different points are tricky.

- vi. (Adriana P.) My understanding on difference between point 3 and 4 is, you get 4 for analysis of assumptions and credibility of information sources. I don't know if you got a chance to look at the executive summary published by Stanford History Education Group on fake news '[Evaluating Information: The Cornerstone of Civic Online Reasoning](#)'. We discovered this while having an interesting conversation with Amy Wiley.

### 3. Action Items & Planning Winter Quarter (10min)

- i. (Katie Tool) Will Thursday 10-11am meeting times good for all?
- ii. (Katherine O.) Are we expanding the group?
- iii. (Katie T.) Do you want to make the announcement for spring?
- iv. (Katherine O.) Expanding the group in winter would be a good idea. We have started looking at C4 and D5 for artifacts. It's not necessary for the extended group to seat here. We, library group can send a suggestion of faculty whom we think should be integrated into the group.
- v. (Katie T.) You can send the suggestion and we will do the communication. In a week.
- vi. (Katherine O.) Some faculty have shown interest. I have received inquiries.
- vii. (Adriana P.) Are you putting out a general call over the campus?
- viii. (Jack P.) That is a good suggestion. Let's put out a call. We are talking about a two pronged approach. 1. Targeted and 2. General call.
  - 1. Targeted – Library will come up with a list by Thursday, December 08, 2016
  - 2. General call for participation will go out on Monday to all faculty.
- ix. (Beth Chance) Can we send out the rubric along with the assignments?
- x. (Katherine O.) That's the target.
- xi. (Jack P.) I remember, during the QR assessment that the MATH & ECON assignments included the rubric. But, STAT and PSY did not have it. Are the C4 and D5 courses partnering only for data collection, or are potential members to help develop the rubric and assignment design?
- xii. (Katherine O.) We will decide that. Initially they will be partnering only for data collection, after that we may ask the faculty that the group has selected you, are you interested in joining us for rubric and assignment design? I don't think they all have to seat in the table for rubric and assignment design.
- xiii. (Jack P.) In the QR the members became the ambassador. But we did cast a wide net. This time it seems we are taking very different approach. More targeted. We already have seven (7) members in this group. We can add maybe 4 or 5 more people. So, what kind of call should we be making since we have many faculty already in mind? Is it targeted call or is it general call?
- xiv. (Katherine O.) The call can be two-phased. We can say, 'Call for inviting people to help develop the rubric and select the courses. My concern is if we cast a wide net, we might lose representation from all the colleges. We need an engineering faculty to be at the table. We should look for a member from each college. There are no C4 or D5 courses in CENG.
- xv. (Katie T.) We required college representation for QR artifact collection. So if we only select courses from C4 and D5, the artifacts will only be collected from CLA. Mary Pedersen and Bruno Giberti met with Department chairs to ask for memberships for the committee. And that's how the group was formed.
- xvi. (Kaila B.) What happened with oral communication committee?
- xvii. (Adriana P.) I am advocating to make a general call across campus because I think it is an opportunity to raise awareness. The faculty that we are targeting are already involved. But others may not be involved. But we have the Megan Oakleaf workshop, which is an opportunity for the faculty who participate in the group. My advocacy is to

- raise awareness. If we only work with the bubbles that we are comfortable with, we can do that for collecting and helping us. I am not imposing my opinion or the member's opinion, those who are from the library. I am flexible. We have done it in so many ways.
- xviii. (Katie T.) We can certainly draft a letter.
  - xix. (Jack P.) Let's recap and set on a plan. We agreed to do a campus-wide call inviting one faculty member from each college to join the learning community.
  - xx. (Katherine O.) Members of the community might reach out to the faculty for data collection. So there might be some outreach involved.
  - xxi. (Adriana P.) It would be good for the faculty to know what are the commitments.
  - xxii. (Katie T.) We should let them know when the meetings are in winter and spring quarter.
  - xxiii. (Katherine O.) I think four (4) meetings are enough in each quarter. There might be more targeted works for individual but for meeting around the table four (4) is enough.
  - xxiv. (Jack P.) I will draft the letter and share it with Mary & Bruno so they are aware of our plan.
  - xxv. (Katherine O.) I will meet with CAFES department and they are good in getting the message disseminated.
  - xxvi. (Jack P.) I will be meeting with all the college assessment councils. So that will be another good place to share our strategy and interests with them. So, what should be the next step regarding rubric design? We seem to agree the Champlain College rubric is a richer model while good pieces can still be drawn from the VALUE rubric. Do we begin with the Champlain rubric as a model to work from?
  - xxvii. (Kaila B.) We don't have to decide this now. The categories are more updated in the Champlain College rubric.
  - xxviii. (Jack P.) I will send a draft of the call for participants letter and email it to all of you for feedback. Ideally this will go out first thing Monday morning. We will probably need to wait to schedule our four Winter meetings until we get confirmation on which faculty will be joining the community.

~~~~~

## Fall 2016 Meeting Schedule

~~Thursday 09/29 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b — Fall Roadmap~~

~~Thursday 10/13 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b — Level of Assessment, Assessment Instruments~~

~~Thursday 11/10 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b — Rubric Planning & Design~~

~~Thursday 12/01 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b — Research Questions and Hypothesis~~