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Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education

Six threshold concepts or frames

1. Authority is Constructed and Contextual
2. Information Creation as a Process
3. Information Has Value
4. Research as Inquiry
5. Scholarship as Conversation
6. Searching as Strategic Exploration

(Association of College & Research Libraries, 2016)
Survey/Questionnaire

- **Purpose**
  - Examine progress in the adoption since the release of the *Framework* in 2016
  - Determine the extent of the use of the old *Standards* (Association of College & Research Libraries, 2000)
  - Obstacles to use the *Framework*
  - Best practice

- **Scope**: Sent to national and international library listservs (e.g. infolit, ili-l, acrlframe, Special Library Association, NJLA College and University session, Chinese American Library Association, Ifla, etc.)


- **Survey instrument**: Qualtrics survey online.
Survey/Questionnaire - continue

- Received 700+ responses, 519 are completed and valid.

- 96% (500) teach information literacy (IL) instruction.

- Report on respondents from the U.S. academic institutions only. Few from non-academic and foreign countries.

- The results only apply to those who responded. This is not a random sample.
Institution Types (N=519)

Respondents were asked to pick the category closest to their institution type.

- Doctoral Research Universities: 31%
- Master’s Colleges and Universities: 29%
- Two Year/Community Colleges: 26%
- Baccalaureate Colleges: 14%
Participants’ locations (N= 519)

Northeast: 32% (167)
Southwest: 22% (112)
West: 19% (98)
Southeast: 15% (78)
Midwest: 12% (62)
More than a quarter of librarians have taught less than 5 years; many of them may have only used the Framework in teaching.
Most librarians teach one-shot plus up to three types of settings. A quarter of them teach credit courses.
Modality of Teaching (N=497)

- Face to face: 448, 90%
- Online: 24, 5%
- Hybrid: 25, 5%
Multiple selection question. Most of the respondents (93%) teach assignment-based library instruction. More than half (59%) teach general purpose instruction without assignment attached.
A large percentage of the respondents connected instruction to the *Framework*.
For those who connected instruction to the Framework, most (66%) changed their Learning objectives. More than a third (34%) did not.
How have your learning objectives changed after ACRL Framework replaced the Standards? (N=186 comments)

- Aligned learning objectives with the Framework: 41%
- Changed from skill based to conceptual approach: 37%
- Used certain frames: 12%
- Used only the Framework. No change: 7%
- Engaged more active learning: 4%
- More student centered: 2%
- Scaffold IL in instruction: 2%

Comments-Most of those who changed their learning objectives aligned with the Framework and changed from skills-based to concept-based instruction.
Multiple selection question. Searching as Strategic Exploration and Research as Inquiry were taught the most. However, all the other frames are frequently used.
The most cited challenge is the limited class time. Many also felt it difficult to communicate the Framework concepts with faculty and students (N=336)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited class time</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with faculty</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain to students</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework not measurable</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align Framework to assignments</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link learning outcomes to Framework</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehend Framework concepts</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple selection question. “Include interactive activities” was cited by the most. In comments, many said they used the Framework concepts but in simple language that students can understand.
Multiple selection question. Course assignments and the Framework are the most influential documents that guided librarians' instruction. Close to 1/3 still used the Standards.
About 60% did assess learning outcomes. Almost 1/5 have not but plan to do it. 20% are not sure or will not do it.
Assessment instruments used. Participants can select multiple variables. (N=301)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instruments used</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post Tests</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic assessment (e.g. written papers/presentations)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-minute paper</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online polling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clickers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation for conducting assessment. Participants can select multiple variables (N=301)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation for assessment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of my instruction plan</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in learning about it</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required by my institution</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly encouraged by my institution</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained in doing it</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges in conducting assessment
(N=499)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time in one-shot session</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to get buy-in from teaching faculty</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time for planning</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training in assessment</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from library colleagues</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the University</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of personal interest</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants can select multiple variables
ACRL Framework has been well adopted by 71% of the participants in this study, in comparison to findings from previous studies:

- A 2017 survey: 11% of the respondents used the Framework (Schulte & Knapp, 2017).
- A 2018 survey: 31% claimed that the Framework had some impact on their teaching (Julien et al., 2018).
- A 2018 survey: 10% of the community college librarians claimed that the Framework had an impact on their teaching (Wengler & Wolff-Eisenberg, 2020)

Among the adopters, 66% changed their IL learning objectives to include big picture and conceptual approach in instruction.

All elements of the Framework have been addressed frequently in opportune moments in classes.
Summary - Continued

- Course assignments and the Framework are most influential in guiding IL instruction. Nearly 1/3 of the librarians still follow the IL Standards.

- Most librarians (over 90%) teach one-shot, face to face, assignment integrated IL sessions.

- Limited class time was cited by the most as challenging for applying the Framework in instruction.

- Interactive activities are cited by the most for working well with the Framework.

- The new librarians who are trained only in the Framework seem to have no problem integrating it in their instruction, even for the one-shot sessions.
Many use the Framework concepts but not the language when speaking with faculty, students and administrators.

Criticism of the Framework includes theoretical, elitist, not measurable and impractical for the one-shot and for junior year or community college students. Many consider it suits credit courses and higher-level college students better. (Wengler, S., & Wolff-Eisenberg, C., 2020).

Most respondents (60%) assessed student learning outcomes, but some consider assessing for one-shot unreliable and meaningless.
Best practice

- Consider to incorporate the Framework and threshold concepts into instruction.
- It is critical to engage and communicate with teaching faculty and administrators to be on board with applying the Framework in IL sessions.
- Use simple language and get the ideas of the Framework across to students.
- Impossible to teach the entire Framework in one-shot. Build the IL Framework concepts into the multi-year curriculum or offer credit IL courses.
- Design interactive activities when teaching the Framework. For instance, learn Classroom Assessment Techniques (CAT) and other class activities.
Best Practice - continued

- It takes innovative measures to teach the Framework successfully. Help each other by sharing teaching materials at the Framework Sandbox at https://sandbox.acrl.org/resources

- Many librarians can benefit from more training on applying the Framework concepts and assessment in their IL instruction.

- Develop new approaches for assessment. Our literature review indicates that a shift took place from analyzing skills to evaluating student-produced research papers, presentations, e-portfolios, and other student-produced products (Gammons and Inge, 2017; Pitts and Lehner-Quam, 2019).
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