June 2004

The Work and Goals of the STS Task Force on Information Literacy for Science and Technology

Virginia A. Baldwin
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, vbaldwin2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/library_talks

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/library_talks/12

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Conference Presentations and Speeches by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.
The Work and Goals of the STS Task Force on Information Literacy for Science & Technology

Virginia Baldwin
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
ALA Annual June 28, 2004
www.unl.edu/vbaldwin

Early History

- Task Force formed in January 2002
- Task Force Charge
  - Standards, PI’s and Outcomes
  - Based on ACRL ILC standards
  - Relate to Science & Technology disciplines
  - Determine organization
  - Collaborative input
  - Report and solicit STS member input

Related Web Sites
- ACRL IL Standards: http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/standards.pdf
- ACRL Strategic Directions: 1.0 Society recognizes the contributions that academic and research libraries and librarians make in higher education, scholarly communication, and civic development. http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/aboutacrl/whatisacrl/acrlstratplan/strategicplan.htm
- The work of the STS Task Force on Information Literacy supports goals 1.4-1.5 in its efforts to redefine information literacy in the context of science and engineering information, teaching and learning. The Task Force members have developed a web site delineating standards for science and technology information literacy.
- More information and the standards will be presented at the Poster Session immediately following

Task Force Members
- Virginia Baldwin, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Engineering, Physics, and Astronomy Librarian, Task Force Chair
- C.J (Catherine Woodworth) Wong, Yale University, Science Librarian, Responded to announcement in Spring 2002 Issue of STS Signal
- Sheila Young, Arizona State University, Science Reference Librarian/Engineering, on ARL Learning Outcomes Workgroup, Responded to information posted by Tom Volkening to the ELD list about the possibility of STS-ELD collaboration on information literacy
- Ibironke Lawal, VCU, Engineering and Science Librarian, Biotechnology, Chemistry, Mathematics – Invited initial TF member
- Daureen Nesdill, University of Utah, Science Librarian, New Member from 2004 ALA Midwinter Task Force meeting
- Barbara McAlpine, Trinity University, Science Librarian, New Member from 2004 ALA Midwinter Task Force meeting
Task Force Former Members
- Sherry Durren, Georgia Perimeter College, Information Literacy Librarian, *Responded to announcement in Spring 2002 Issue of STS Signal*
- Jennifer Laherty, California State University at Hayward, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Communicative Sciences and Disorders, Geology, Health Sciences, and Nursing – *Invited initial TF member*
- Elizabeth I. Hanson, Indiana University, Life Sciences, *Responded to announcement in Spring 2002 Issue of STS Signal*

Highlights of the Process

- **2002**: recruitment of TF members, *STS-Signal*, began bibliography and literature review
- **2002**: Development of thematic issue of *Science & Technology Libraries (Information and the Professional Scientist and Engineer)*: for a look at information literacy requirements of the practicing scientist and engineer
- **Meeting at ALA Midwinter 2003**
  - Document review assignments
  - Decision: Limit TF to 7 members
  - Decision: Subject area coverage: Physics, Engineering, Chemistry, Mathematics, Geosciences, and Life Sciences
- **Established TF Web site and bibliography of resources**

Highlights of the Process con’t
- **2003** February & March Yahoo Chat Sessions
  - Reported on documents for disciplinary standards
  - Discussed applicability of statements in the regional accreditation standards
  - Decided to review the documents again for references to critical thinking skills and ethical issues
- **Eastern Illinois University Booth Library model**
  - Combined ACRL standards 4 and 5 into standard 4 and created a new standard
  - The information literate student understands that information literacy is an ongoing process and one component of lifelong learning. Booth Library
  - The information literate student recognizes the need to keep current regarding new developments in his or her field and understands that … STS Task Force

Highlights of the Process con’t
- **Reporting**
  - STS Council
  - *STS Signal*
  - ASEE/ELD liaison reports
  - SLA/Sci-Tech Division Board meetings
  - Task Force Web site – drafted standards, key to the references, quotes from the references
Highlights of the Process con’t

- ALA Midwinter 2004 – Action items
  - Review of the five drafted standards for clarity, completeness, accuracy, references
  - Review distributed monographs
  - Complete outcomes for standard 5
  - Task Force report to STS Signal
  - Develop poster session
  - Add email form to TF Web site for comments
  - Solicit comments from listserv

Highlights of the Process con’t

- Documents and Resources Cited
  - Regional Accreditation Standards
  - Discipline Specific documents
  - National Environmental Health Science and Protection Accreditation Council
  - American Chemical Society, Committee on Professional Training
  - Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology Inc. (ABET)
  - Monographs
  - Web site: CAL POLY: Introductory Competencies in Specific Disciplines

Draft of the Standards

- Indicate divergence with ACRL standards
- Five standards, one entirely new
- Annotate sources
- Key to References

- Regional Standards documents – disciplinary related, interrelatedness, work with others, ethical use of information, continued learning
- Discipline documents – professional ethics, group or team work, multi-disciplinary teams, life-long learning, effective communication, critical evaluation
- Monographs – synthesis/summary of findings, current awareness, archiving/preservation, literature of professional associations, external vs internal sources

Synopsis of the Standards

- Standard One: Identifying the need for information
- Standard Two: Procuring the information
- Standard Three: Evaluating the information, revising search strategy, obtaining more information
- Standard Four: Using the Information
- Standard Five: Lifelong learning
Listserv Responses Solicited
- STS-L
- ASEE/ELD-L
- SLA/Sci-Tech Division
- Slapam-L (Physics Math Astronomy Division)
- ALA/ACRL/IS officers and committee chairs via Keith Gresham
- IATUL via Jay Bhatt (liaison from ASEE/ELD)
- ELD-ILit - ASEE/ELD/ listserv via Stephanie White (member SLA/Sci-Tech Division and ELD)

Contributions from the Listserv Inquiry
- Standard One
  - PI 2: Understands cultural differences in science based knowledge systems and in the development of knowledge.
  - PI 2: recognizes how the use and importance of archival information may vary with each discipline
- Clarification
- Standard Two
  - PI 1: Considers experts or other researchers as potential information resources.
  - PI 2: Uses other methods of search term input such as structure searching and image searching, specific to the discipline or information retrieval system.
  - PI 2: Follows citations and cited references to obtain additional, pertinent articles.
  - PI 2: Recognizes similar features among different interfaces (such as: print, e-mail, and save options, search fields, controlled vocabulary).

Contributions from the Listserv Inquiry cont’d
- Standard Three
  - PI 1: Understands how to read a scientific paper efficiently and can use sections, such as the abstract or conclusion to decide whether to include the source.
  - PI 2: Understands and uses statistical treatment of data as evaluative criteria.
- Clarification
- Standard Four
  - PI 1: Demonstrates an understanding of intellectual property, copyright, and fair use of copyrighted material and research data.
  - PI 2: ... what constitutes plagiarism and does not represent work attributable to others as his/her own. This includes the work of other members of research teams.
  - PI 3: Acknowledges all contributors, funding sources, grants, etc.

Contributions from the Listserv Inquiry cont’d
- Standard Five
  - PI 3: Transfers information access skills to new subject areas.
- Clarification
Where Do We Go From Here?

Completion and Adoption
■ Incorporate additional Input
□ Listservs and organization board members
□ Additional documents
■ Write a background, introductory statement
■ Submit a final document to STS – Signal and College & Research Libraries News
■ Request adoption by STS – inclusion on the STS Web site
■ Submit the standards to the ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee (SAC) – Member Paul Beavers will be our liaison – SAC agenda for 1/2005

Potential of the Standards
■ Useful in research consultation and library instruction
■ Adoption university-wide, discipline-wide
■ Collaborative development of library instruction test banks that address specific aspects of the standards
■ Collaborative assessment projects
□ Project SAILS (Project for the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) at Kent State University. http://sails.lms.kent.edu/index.php
□ STS Task Force member CJ Wong with her Biology professor husband won one of three SAILS grants – and represents the science & technology disciplines, as well as the Task Force work!