

## MEETING NOTES

### Information Literacy Learning Community (ILLC) 2017 February 22, 2017 1:10 to 2:00 pm (35-319b)

#### Membership

Academic Programs: Jack Phelan, Bruno Giberti, Mary Pedersen, Katie Tool; Kennedy Library: Adriana Popescu, Katherine O'Clair, Kaila Bussert; Statistics: Beth Chance; Journalism: Mary Glick; Honors Program: Greg Fiegel; Communication Studies: Martin Mehl; English: Carol Curiel, Amy Wiley; Kinesiology: Marilyn Tseng; Chem/Biochem: Grant Venerable; Bio Sciences: Sean Lema; Physics: Marwa Abdalmoneam; Business: Hong Hoang, Solina Lindahl; AgBus: Erik Slayter

---

## MEETING NOTES

1. Approve Meeting Notes from [February 8, 2017](#)
  - (Jack P) Meeting notes approved, informed the committee that anyone can add to the meeting notes, in case they find any information missing.
2. Discussion: Defining Information Literacy for Cal Poly (50 min)
  - Polylearn Activity: reviewing the exercise results
  - Formulating/Finalizing a working definition
    - i. (Jack P.) Due to political climate, fake news, etc. this core competency takes on a lot importance. Who is able to publish what? How the information shall be used? In real life and academically as well. All of the competencies, critical thinking, writing, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, these are all centered on information. So, information literacy is extra important. The English department and our campus librarians have is taking on most of the instructional responsibility. The umbrella for lifelong learning is held to represent the lifelong need for literacy; of thinking, writing, oral communicating, and quantitative literacy. Information literacy runs through them all. Katherine O'Clair got the ball rolling with our draft definition. It was a sprawling definition due to all of the component parts. Ultimately, the definition needs to be workable, so faculty can remember and say it. By comparison, the definition stated on AAC value rubric is a concise sentence.
    - ii. (Carol C.) The working definition explicitly states 'effective use' and 'responsibility'. Three different definitions were looked at to see where the overlap was. Martin Mehl's was obviously unsure of 'timely', 'relevance'. Sophisticated ethical social dimension is put onto that. These dimensions should be explicit, instead of being implicit. The definition should be translated for practical assessment. The awareness of bias, finding sources which reflect diversity should be foregrounded. It might be useful, to revisit the categories and perspectives going back to social and economic dimensions.
    - iii. (Jack P.) The rubric is another tool in refining our definition. One of the goals for this committee will be to develop the rubric, and the dimensions of the rubric will often stem from pieces of the definition. The intermediary discussion is, what question do we want to answer.
    - iv. (Carol C.) In order to engage with texts and information in a literate way, students need specific knowledge. One of the concepts students need to understand is ideology. Specifically, students need to understand that everyone has ideology, not just people who are 'biased.' This point is made in the textbook, *Writing Arguments* by Ramage, Bean and Johnson, specifically in distinguishing genuine argument that seeks to solve a

problem with consensus and growth of knowledge, from the pseudo-arguments of committed believers and fanatical skeptics. Fanatical skeptics dismiss everything, disbelieve everything, regardless of evidence. The challenge is to teach students the domains of knowledge in relationship to ideology, understanding how consciousness works in relationship to bias. In addition, the ability to understand one's own perspective, as a function of ideology, involves the metacognition included in the Habits of Mind that support student success. [Listed in the Inventory developed by three organizations of writing teachers and professors.] This is knowledge that we need to teach so students can interact with texts. I don't think we can measure this with the assumption that students already have this ability. While some students come from very select, successful educational backgrounds, they still seem to lack the ability to recognize ideology and bias, in everyone...others and themselves.

- v. (Amy W.) There is also a little bit about familiarity bias. They don't recognize the metacognitive attachment in an unfamiliar subject. When they enter a foreign domain, they don't explicitly manufacture their metacognitive attachment for that.
- vi. (Jack P.) This is why a common language is so valuable across the curriculum. This is tricky stuff to get to but worth achieving. 'Ideology' is now being brought into the conversation. When we juxtapose the two rubrics we are currently looking at (the AACU Value and the Champlagn College rubric, a lot of commonality can be found. Here they are talking about question and about the writer.
- vii. (Katherine O.) Information literacy seems to be a very close cousin of critical thinking. The rubric should be of a kind that internalizes the structure. (Jack P.) It does kind of structurally organize these thoughts. The verb would be to explain. For example, does a student know what a parabola is? Could they identify it? Then do they understand it? Can they explain it to someone? Then at a higher level, can they apply it appropriately? Can the student use a parabola?
- viii. (Amy W.) So, the conversation is spinning around knowledge, stake, sources, application and synthesis.
- ix. (Jack p.) Carol talked about the ability to identify perspectives and there is skeptical versus criticality dimensions; hence the saying, no matter how thin you slice something there will always be two sides, there will be always be at least two sides to every argument.
- x. (Carol C.) The thing I like, from the last two-weeks effort, is moving away from this binary character and emphasizing the variety of information that's being generated. It's not that there are only two facets on each criterion, but there are multiple other sides, and I want to hold to that definition, and I think that might be more acceptable. We are taking the students to a greater level of complexity. Is 'Evidence-based' more acceptable terminology than 'information'? Does 'evidence' suggest a much more active selection than information? In Martin's definition, 'evidence' is more concrete and desirable than 'information.'
- xi. (Katherine O.) Information is gathered. But there are many more purposeful processes, for utilizing evidence than information.
- xii. (Carol C.) The second part is dealing with information as a product. Using the evidence, the new information being generated. When it comes to synthesis, more than evidence is required. Somehow in the last section, evidence does not fit. Evidence is appropriate in the middle part. But not appropriate in the latter part. What needs to be done with 'data' requires a second step, and for coming up to, solving complex problems, that they are running the evidence through. The way the definitions are being articulated suggests presence of evidence.
- xiii. (Jack P.) Was it preferable how Martin broke the definition apart?
- xiv. (Carol C.) It gives the impression that some of the sections were weightier. So, he needed to break it up. But the bulleted breakouts convey more significance merely by the nature of the formatting.

- xv. (Jack P.) We can put together the next draft definition based on this discussion and pick this up with further prompts to the group – perhaps leading us into our discussion of the rubric dimensions.



**Winter 2017 Meeting Schedule**

~~Wednesday 01/25 1:10pm to 2:00pm 35-319b~~

~~Wednesday 02/08 1:10pm to 2:00pm 35-319b~~

Wednesday 02/22 1:10pm to 2:00pm 35-319b

Wednesday 03/08 1:10pm to 2:00pm 35-319b