UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

Information Literacy, Inclusion, and the Public Good (INST 614) – 3 credit hours
Spring 2015 Syllabus

A. Instructors, Office Hours, & Contact Information
Paul T. Jaeger, Ph.D., J.D.
Associate Professor and Diversity Officer, College of Information Studies
Office hours: Tuesdays 12:00-2:00pm, HBK 4121D
Via phone (301-405-1741) or email (pjaeger@umd.edu).

Please allow for email responses within 24-hours Mon-Fri and 48 hours on weekends and holidays.

B. Description of Course
"Speak truth to power? Rather speak truth to the powerless" – Leonard Cohen

A large portion of the activities of information professionals have become educational in the digital age. Information literacy and inclusion are the crux of the public good that all information organizations provide to their users. Librarians, often utilizing public access technology, assist users with locating and understanding information; archivists need to guide users through materials; and information managers need to train employees to effectively use new systems. This course will focus on the educational and psychological dimensions of helping and supporting new users to become information literate and experienced users to remain included.

C. Details and Goals of Course
The primary goals of this course are to prepare students to understand:
- Key educational approaches to teaching information literacy
- Psychological factors that promote and inhibit information inclusion
- Educational functions of different information organizations
- Impacts of policy and funding on information literacy and inclusion
- Pedagogical theories related to information
- Best practices in information literacy and inclusion programs
- Evaluation of information literacy and inclusion programs
- Information literacy and inclusion as central to the public good mission of information organizations

D. Course Approach and Expectations of Student Participation
This course meets once a week on Tuesdays from 6:00-8:45 in room HBK0105. The course will be conducted as a seminar. It is essential that every student participates in the discussions of course materials. Participation means active involvement in class discussions. Students read the assigned readings for each week PRIOR TO THAT WEEK. The students are expected to question, challenge, argue, and discuss issues and topics related to that session's readings. Failure to participate in the course will result in a letter grade of F for this component.

E. Classroom Environment
As a graduate seminar, the classroom environment should be professional and respectful. Discussions should be based on course readings and critical thinking. Issues of policy can involve strongly held beliefs and current political controversies. Remember – your classmates may have different perspectives on issues than you, but they still deserve your respect. As another aspect of respect in the classroom environment, turn off or mute all phones and other communication devices during each class session. If you use your laptop or mobile device in the classroom, limit the usage to course-related reasons (i.e., taking notes).

F. Students with Disabilities
Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should: (1) register with and provide documentation to the Disability Support Services office, and (2) discuss any necessary academic accommodation with their teachers. This should be done **at the beginning** of the semester.

G. Extensions
Timeliness is an essential component of graduate work, and extensions will only be available during personal emergencies. Students who need to request an extension should discuss the matter in advance with the professor. If an extension is granted, the work must be submitted within the extension period to avoid grade penalties. Unexcused delays in submission will receive an automatic 10% deduction for every day late.

H. Academic Honesty
Work submitted in this course will be individual and original, in line with the University's Academic Honor Code and Honor Pledge. Engaging in any academic dishonesty will result in consequences in line with university policies. Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to plagiarism, cheating, buying work, multiple submissions of the same paper, forging signatures, submitting fraudulent documents, and facilitating the academic dishonesty of others. When writing papers, be sure to carefully and thoroughly cite all materials you use in writing your paper and make sure all ideas and quotations are properly acknowledged. Please visit http://www.studenthonorcouncil.umd.edu/code.html for more information on the University's Code of Academic Integrity.

I. Syllabus Change Policy
This syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice.

J. CourseEvalUM
Participation in the evaluation of courses through CourseEvalUM is a responsibility that students hold as members of our academic community. Student feedback is confidential and important to the improvement of teaching and learning at the University. Please use http://www.courseevalum.umd.edu to complete course evaluations at the end of the semester.

K. Course Materials
There is no required text for the course. All readings will be available to students online or in another accessible format. Nearly all the required journal article readings are accessible through the University's library e-journal/database holdings accessible at http://www.lib.umd.edu.

L. Assignments and Grading
Your grade in this course will be based on four items:
1. Class participation (25%)
2. Information Literacy Lesson Observation (25%)
3. Information Inclusion Portfolio (50%)

Guidelines for written materials for the course include:
- Full name and paper title at the top of the paper
- Double-spaced
- 12-point Arial or Calibri font
- 1-inch margins
- In-text citations and references section in APA style (http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/).
- Numbered pages should be numbered
- Consistent formatting
- Free of grammatical errors and typos

All papers are due via electronic submission to pjaeger@umd.edu by midnight on the date they are due. Late submissions will receive an automatic 10% deduction for every day late.

1. Classroom participation (25% of final grade). This seminar is a discussion-based course. Students are expected to complete all readings, to think through the issues raised in the readings, and to articulate thoughts on the materials in class. Clearly, you need to attend class to participate in the discussions. Attendance will be taken every week, with absences being excused in cases of illness, religious observances, and other reasons in line with university policies, or if the university is closed due to inclement weather.

In order to receive an excused absence, you must notify the instructors in advance of the class meeting.

Assessment: Your classroom participation will be graded based on the insightfulness of your comments; your careful consideration of other students' comments; and your ability to draw on the course readings, external resources, and personal experiences to justify and support your claims.

2. Information Literacy Lesson Observation (25% of final grade, **due Week 7 by midnight**). Before Week 7, you should arrange to observe an information literacy lesson taught at the information organization of your choice. This could be an academic, public, or school library or a government or archival institution. It would be wise to align the information organization you choose for your observation with the type you choose for the context of your Information Inclusion Portfolio, although that is not required. After you have observed a lesson, you should write a 5-7 page paper discussing the type of organization, goals of the lesson, the context of the lesson (including the characteristics of the audience), the content within the lesson, the teaching style in which the content was presented, whether the lesson was part of a larger instructional program, successful practices in the lesson and/or instructional program, improvements that

might be made to the lesson and/or instructional program, and any other observations you made about the lesson. You can include comments from the participants and the teacher as well.

Assessment: Your paper will be graded based on the details of the lesson and its context; the analysis of and reasons for the successes and opportunities for improvement of the lesson and/or instructional program; your adherence to the length requirement; your adherence to the formatting and citation requirements; evidence of critical thinking; and clarity and precision of thought in your writing. Your paper should follow the guidelines for written materials provided above.

3. Information Inclusion Portfolio (50% of final grade, **due Week 14 by midnight**)
Building on course readings and discussions, your information literacy lesson observation, and research into other initiatives, this assignment will result in the creation of a plan for an information inclusion program and lesson in an information organization. The final version of the Portfolio should be approximately 15 pages, made up of: a context/needs assessment, program overview, a sample teaching plan for the program, and a cover letter describing your pitch to the appropriate supervisor for why the program should be initiated. This Portfolio should be presented in a way that demonstrates your knowledge of information literacy issues and instruction, as well as the need for inclusion in program designs.

A draft of each part of the Portfolio will be due separately – for feedback from the instructors but no grade – as detailed below:
- Context/needs assessment (**draft due Week 9**)
    - The student can choose any information organization, the issues the plan will address, and the goals of the plan, but the best Portfolios will focus on populations that have been largely ignored by organizations to this point. The context and needs assessment section should address the populations that will most likely be participants, the benefits to those populations, the potential barriers to recruitment, and the potential psychological barriers to participation, as well as the best practices available for addressing these issues. The context and needs assessment section should use findings from research to justify the approaches employed and, where applicable, point to existing programs in which these approaches are currently being employed. This section should be approximately 4-5 pages in length.
- Program overview (**draft due Week 10**)
    - The program overview should cover the program goals, the information needs addressed, the logistics of the program (length, anticipated budget, the setting, etc), and a rough schedule of the individual lessons that will be taught during the program. You need only to list the topic that each lesson will cover; you will choose one of these lessons to flesh out in the teaching plan component of the portfolio. This section should be approximately 4-5 pages in length.
- Teaching plan (**draft due Week 11**)
    - After determining the lesson on which you want to focus, you will develop an in depth teaching plan for this topic. The plan should be detailed enough that someone who has never taught the course can pick it up and carry out the lesson. You should include: lesson objectives, an outline of the lesson, materials needed,

and assessment strategies. This section should be approximately 5-6 pages in length.
- Cover letter/pitch (**draft due Week 12)**
  - o After completing the other three parts of the portfolio, you will write a one-page cover letter for your project to the supervisor who would give you approval for carrying out the plan. This should sell the idea and summarize the context, information needs, audience, general teaching plan, and why it will benefit both your organization and your user group. This section should be 1 page in length.

The final submission of the Portfolio in Week 15 will include each of these elements and your grade for the assignment will be based on these final versions.

Assessment: Your paper will be graded based on your inclusion of the elements listed above; your use of research and professional resources to justify the elements of your plan; the connections between the elements of the Portfolio; your adherence to the length requirement; your adherence to the formatting and citation requirements; evidence of critical thinking; and clarity and precision of thought in your writing. Your Portfolio should follow the guidelines for written materials provided above.

M. Letter Grades

A+ 97-100	B- 80-82	D 63-66
A 93-96	C+ 77-79	D- 60-62
A- 90-92	C 73-76	F 0-59
B+ 87-89	C- 70-72	
B 83-86	D+ 67-69	

N. Weekly Topics and Readings

WEEK 1: SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE PUBLIC GOOD (JAN 27)
- Becker, S., Crandall, M. D., Fisher, K. E., Kinney, B., Landry, C., & Rocha, A. (2010). *Opportunity for all: How the American public benefits from Internet access at U.S. libraries*. Available: http://impact.ischool.washington.edu **[Note: only read Executive Summary]**
- IMLS. (2011). *Building digital communities*.
  Available: http://www.imls.gov/assets/1/workflow_staging/AssetManager/2141.pdf
- Thompson, K. M., Jaeger, P. T., Taylor, N. G., Subramaniam, M., & Bertot, J. C. (2014). What digital needs. *Library Journal, 139*(14), 36.
- Zickuhr, K., & Smith, A. (2012). *Digital differences*. Washington DC: Pew Internet and the American Life Project. Available: http://www.pewinternet.org/2012/04/13/digital-differences

WEEK 2: CIVIC EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS (FEB 3)
- Auld, H. S. (2004). Patrons, customer, users, clients. *Public Libraries*, March/April, 81-87.
- Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Sarin, L. C. (2012). Forbes Folly: The lessons of being labeled the worst master's degree. *American Libraries*, *43*(9/10), 30-33.

- Budd, J. M. (1997). A critique of customer and commodity. *College & Research Libraries*, July, 309-320.
- Cathcart, R. (2008). Librarian or social worker: Time to look at blurring the line? *Reference Librarian, 49*(1), 87-91.
- Johnson, C. A. (2010). Do public libraries contribute to social capital? A preliminary investigation into the relationship. *Library & Information Science Research, 32*, 147-155.
- Westbrook, L. (2015). "I'm not a social worker": An information service model for working with patrons in crisis. *Library Quarterly, 85,* 6-25.

WEEK 3: VALUING LITERACY AND INCLUSION (FEB 10)
- Analysis section of Digital Inclusion Survey site. Available: http://digitalinclusion.umd.edu/content/analysis
- DaCosta, J. W. (2010). Is there an information literacy skills gap to be bridged? *College & Research Libraries, 71*(3), 203-222.
- Jaeger, P. T., Bertot, J. C., Kodama, C. M., Katz, S. M., & DeCoster, E. J. (2011). Describing and measuring the value of public libraries: The growth of the Internet and the evolution of library value. *First Monday, 11*(7). Available: http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/3765/3074
- Morris, P. & Shin, H. S. (2002). Social value of public information. *The American Economic Review*, *92*, 1521-1534.
- Peterson, A. (2014). Why the death of net neutrality would be a disaster for libraries. *The Washington Post*, May 16. Available: http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-switch/wp/2014/05/16/why-the-death-of-net-neurality-would-be-a-disaster -for-libraries

WEEK 4: ASPECTS OF LITERACY (FEB 17)
GUEST SPEAKER: ELIZABETH DE COSTER
- Bawden, D. (2001). Information and digital literacies: a review of concepts. *Journal of Documentation, 57*(2), 218–259.
- Kuhlthau, C.C. (1991). Inside the search process: Information seeking from the user's perspective. *Journal for the American Society of Information Science, 42(*5), 361-371.
- Lankes, R.D. (2008). Trusting the Internet: New approaches to credibility tools. In M.J. Metzger & A.J. Flanagin (Eds.), *Digital Media, Youth, and Credibility* (101-122). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Tuominen, K., Savolainen, R., & Talja, S. (2005). Information literacy as a sociotechnical practice. *The Library Quarterly,*75(3), 329-345.

WEEK 5: EDUCATIONAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL, AND SOCIAL FACTORS (FEB 24)
GUEST SPEAKER: LINDSAY SARIN
- Horrigan, J. B. (2007). A typology of information and communication technology users. Available: http://www.pewinternet.org
- National Public Radio. (2011, June 29). Closing digital divide, expanding digital literacy. Available: http://www.npr.org/2011/06/29/137499299/closing-digital-divide-expanding-digital-literacy
- Richtel, M. (2012, May 29). Wasting time is new divide in digital era. *New York Times*. Available: http://nytimes.com

- Wayne, T. (2010, December 12). Digital divide is a matter of income. *New York Times*, B3.
- Yelton, A. (2012). Who are smartphone users? *Library Technology Reports*, 48(1), 5-8.

WEEK 6: THE PRIVILEGED AND THE UNDERSERVED (MARCH 3)
GUEST SPEAKER: STEVEN DODGE
- Boris, L. (2005). The digital divide and its impact on the rural community. *Rural Libraries*, *25*(2), 7-35.
- Fairlie, R. W. (2005). *Are we really a nation online? Ethnic and racial disparities in access to technology and their consequences*. Santa Cruz: University of California.
- Jansen, J. (2010). *The better-off online*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Rainie, L. (2010). Internet, broadband, and cell phone statistics. *Pew Internet & American Life Project*. Available: http://www.pewinternet.org

WEEK 7: LITERACY AND INCLUSION IN PUBLIC POLICY (MARCH 10)
GUEST SPEAKER: URSULA GORHAM
- ***Information Literacy Lesson Observation* due**
- FCC. (2010). *The national broadband plan: Connecting America*.
  Available: http://www.broadband.gov/
- Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610*, 22-44.
- Jaeger, P. T., Bertot, J. C., Thompson, K. M., Katz, S. M., & DeCoster, E. J. (2012). The intersection of public policy and public access: Digital divides, digital literacy, digital inclusion, and public libraries. *Public Library Quarterly, 31*, 1-20.
- Rundle, H. (2014). Who are you empowering. *In the Library with the Leadpipe*.
  Available: http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2014/who-are-you-empowering/
- Stevenson, S. (2009). Digital divide: A discursive move away from the real inequalities. *Information Society, 25*, 1-22.

WEEK 8: NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK (MARCH 15-22)

WEEK 9: IMPROVING LITERACY AND INCLUSION (MARCH 24)
GUEST SPEAKER: CHRISTINE KAMT
- **Draft Context/needs assessment section of Portfolio due**
- Brandtweiner, R., Donat, E., and Kerschbaum, J. (2012). How to become a sophisticated user: A two-dimensional approach to e-literacy. *New Media & Society,* 12(5): 813-833.
- Mackey, T. R., & Jacobsen, T. E. (2011). Reframing information literacy as meta-literacy. *College & Research Libraries, 72*, 62-78.
- Marcum, J. W. (2002). Rethinking information literacy. *Library Quarterly, 72*, 1-26.
- Matteson, M. L., Chittock, S., & Mease, D. (2015). In their own words: Stories of emotional labor from the library workforce. *Library Quarterly, 85*, 85-105.

WEEK 10: LITERACY AND METHODS OF ACCESS (MARCH 31)
GUEST SPEAKER: ELIZABETH LARSON

- **Draft Program overview section of Portfolio due**
- Click, A., & Petit, J. (2010). Social networking and Web 2.0 in information literacy. *International Information & Library Review, 42*, 137-142.
- Luo, L. (2010). Web 2.0 Integration in information literacy: instruction: An overview. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36*, 32-40.
- Thompson, K. M. (2008). The U.S. information infrastructure and libraries: A case study in democracy. *Library Review, 57*(2), 96-106.
- Waller, V. (2009). The relationship between public libraries and Google: Too much information. *First Monday,* volume 14, number 9, at http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/2477/2279

WEEK 11: STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING LITERACY (APRIL 7)
GUEST SPEAKER: NATALIE TAYLOR
- **Draft Teaching plan section of Portfolio due**
- Cifuentes, L. & Ozel, S. (2006). Resources for attending to the needs of multicultural learners. *Knowledge Quest, 35*(2), 14-20.
- Gustafon, K. & Branch, R (2007). What is instructional design?. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.),*Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 16-25). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. Available: http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~etc-c/etc667/2006/readings/gustafson1a.pdf
- Rose, D.H. & Gravel, J.W. (2010). Universal design for learning. In E. Baker, P. Peterson, & B. McGaw (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Education, 3rd Ed.* Oxford: Elsevier. Available: http://www.udlcenter.org/sites/udlcenter.org/files/TechnologyandLearning_1.pdf
- Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services Division of Public Schools and Community Education, Florida Department of Education. (2002). *Designing lessons for the diverse classroom: A handbook for teachers*. Available: http://www.cpt.fsu.edu/ese/pdf/dsinlssn.pdf

WEEK 12: APPROACHES TO LITERACY AND INCLUSION IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES (APRIL 14)
- **Draft Cover letter/pitch section of Portfolio due**
- IMLS. (n.d.). *Public libraries and the workforce.* Available: http://www.imls.gov/about/workforce.aspx
- Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2009). E-government education in public libraries: New service roles and expanding social responsibilities. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 50*, 40-50.
- Kinney, B. (2010). The Internet, public libraries, and the digital divide. *Public Library Quarterly, 29*(2), 104-161.
- Leckie, G. J. & Hopkins, J. (2002). The public place of central libraries: Findings from Toronto and Vancouver. *Library Quarterly,* 72, 326-372.

WEEK 13: APPROACHES TO LITERACY AND INCLUSION IN EDUCATIONAL LIBRARIES (APRIL 21)
- Eisenberg, M., & Berkowitz, B. (n.d.) Big6 information skills. Available: http://nb.wsd.wednet.edu/big6/big6_resoruces.htm

- Meneses, J., & Momino, J. M. (2010). Putting digital literacy in practice: How schools contribute to digital inclusion in the network society. *Information Society, 26*, 197-208.
- Oakleaf, M., & Kaske, N. (2009). Guiding questions for assessing information literacy in higher education. *Libraries & the Academy, 9*, 273-286.
- Salvador, A. C., Rojas, S., & Susinos, T. (2010). Weaving networks: An education project for digital inclusion. *Information Society, 26*, 137-143.
- Schloman, B. F., & Gedeon, J. A. (2007). Creating trails: Tool for real-time assessment of information literacy skills. *Knowledge Quest, 35*, 44-47.

WEEK 14: APPROACHES TO LITERACY AND INCLUSION IN ARCHIVES AND GOVERNMENT SETTINGS (APRIL 28)
- DigitalLiteracy.gov. Available: http://www.digitalliteracy.gov
- Jaeger, P. T., Bertot, J. C., Shuler, J. A., & McGilvray, J. (2012). A new frontier for LIS programs: E-government education, library/government partnerships, and the preparation of future information professionals. *Education for Information, 29*, 39-52.
- Taylor, N. G., Gorham, U., Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2014). IT and collaborative community services: The roles of the public library, local government, and nonprofit entity partnerships. *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age, 1*(1), 91-107.
- van Deursen, A. J. A. M., & van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2009). Improving digital skills for the use of online public information and services. *Government Information Quarterly, 26*, 333-340.
- Yakel, E. (2004). Information literacy for primary sources: Creating a new paradigm for archival researcher education. *OCLC Systems & Services, 20*(2), 61-64

WEEK 15: EVALUATION AND BEST PRACTICES (MAY 5)
- ***Information Inclusion Teaching Portfolio due***
- Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2006). Gaps and bits: Conceptualizing measurements for digital divide/s. *Information Society, 22*, 269-278.
- Kumazi, K., & Franklin Hill, R. (2011). Are we there yet?: Results of a gap analysis to measure LIS students' prior knowledge and actual learning of cultural competence concepts. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 52*, 251-264.
- McCulley, C. (2009). Mixing and matching: Assessing information literacy. *Communications on Information Literacy, 3*, 171-180.
- Oakleaf, M. (2008). Dangers and opportunities: A conceptual map of information literacy assessment approaches. *Libraries & the Academy, 8*, 233-253.

WEEK 16: COURSE WRAP-UP (MAY 12)