ChinaRxiv

AI translation · View original & related papers at
chinarxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202406.00181

A Stakeholder Perspective on Collaborative Models of Information Literacy Education in Foreign Universities: Postprint

Authors: Wan Xuexin, Zhao Xinyu, Yuan Yongcui

Date: 2024-06-13T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Changes in the information environment and user needs have driven innovation in the content, methods, and models of information literacy education. Collaborative cooperation among stakeholders represents an effective approach to enhancing the effectiveness of information literacy education. This article employs a case analysis methodology, examining the collaborative experiences and practices of stakeholders in information literacy education at foreign universities, to analyze the composition, functions, and roles of stakeholders in information literacy education and summarize the collaborative models of stakeholders in information literacy education at foreign universities. The collaborative models for information literacy education in Chinese universities can derive inspiration from these practices: clarifying stakeholders' interests and objectives to promote the sustainable development of collaborative relationships; actively participating in digital campus construction to enrich the targets and content of information literacy education; establishing collaborative assessment to improve collaborative mechanisms; and leveraging collaborative education to enhance librarians' status and demonstrate library value.

Full Text

Research on Collaborative Models of Information Literacy Education in Foreign Universities from a Stakeholder Perspective

Authors: Wan Xuexin[1], Zhao Xinyu[2], Yuan Yongcui[2]
[1]Dalian Maritime University Library, Dalian
[2]China Agricultural University Library, Beijing

Abstract Changes in the information environment and user demands have

prompted innovations in the content, methods, and models of information literacy education. Collaborative cooperation among stakeholders represents an effective approach to enhancing the effectiveness of information literacy education. This article employs case analysis methods to examine the collaborative experiences and practices of stakeholders in information literacy education at foreign universities, analyzing the composition, functions, and roles of stakeholders in information literacy education and summarizing collaborative models among stakeholders in foreign university information literacy education. The collaborative models for information literacy education in Chinese universities can gain several insights from these experiences: clarifying the interests and objectives of stakeholders to promote sustainable collaborative relationships; actively participating in digital campus construction to enrich the targets and content of information literacy education; establishing collaborative assessment mechanisms to improve collaborative frameworks; and leveraging collaborative education to elevate the status of librarians and demonstrate library value.

[**Keywords**] Information literacy education; Stakeholders; Collaborative models; University libraries; Embedded services

1 Stakeholders and Role Positioning in University Information Literacy Education

Identifying stakeholders in university information literacy education forms the foundation for establishing collaborative education models. Based on existing literature, the primary stakeholders in information literacy education include university library supervisory agencies, library associations, university library administrators, network information technology departments, university evaluation agencies, teaching management personnel, university-level academic committees, libraries, and students. According to the demands of stakeholders in university information literacy education, this article categorizes stakeholders into three levels—decision-making/design layer, collaborative execution layer, and direct beneficiary layer—and clarifies the collaborative tasks and objectives of each level to ensure maximum effectiveness from all participants.

Decision-making/Design Layer: This layer primarily includes university library supervisory agencies (such as campus compact programs), library associations, university evaluation agencies, university-level academic committees, and university library administrators. These stakeholders perform policy-making, supervision, and evaluation functions. For instance, the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) formulated the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* in 2000 and the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* in 2015, providing guidelines for information literacy education content and evaluation [10]. ACRL has also released supporting documents for specific disciplines, such as journalism, effectively optimizing teaching content [21]. The American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U)

requires universities to prioritize information literacy education through its Campus Compact program, which has received commitments from over 1,000 institutions [12]. To protect librarians' rights and interests, ACRL grants librarians faculty status, enabling them to enjoy the same promotion standards and benefits as professional teachers, thereby enhancing the recognition of teaching teams [13]. The University of Louisville's Delphi Center for Teaching regularly monitors information literacy education through inspections and confidential surveys, providing opinions that offer directions for improving content and formats while also elevating teaching team recognition [14].

Collaborative Execution Layer: This layer primarily includes librarians, teaching management personnel, and network information technology departments. Librarians, as practitioners of information literacy education, lead information literacy activities and shoulder primary responsibility for its implementation. Teaching centers and network information technology departments mainly provide resource and technical support. Teaching management personnel, teachers, and librarians serve as both executors and participants in information literacy education. Teachers, as the most critical partners in embedded information literacy education, directly influence the depth of integration and must properly balance deep embedding with appropriate embedding [17-18]. They can also promote the integration of information literacy with research and scholarship, providing references for forming interdisciplinary and collaborative knowledge production models [6]. The University of California, Berkeley's virtual community practice project, led by librarians with faculty and students recruited as academic consultants, successfully enriched information literacy curricula and promoted interdisciplinary exchange [20].

Direct Beneficiary Layer: This layer primarily includes students and teachers, who are the most direct beneficiaries of information literacy education. Student needs constitute the original impetus for implementing information literacy education. Teachers and librarians can focus on student needs and make timely adjustments. As participants in embedded information literacy courses, teachers and librarians can track teaching progress in real-time, collect student feedback and assignments for course evaluation, and apply evaluation content to course optimization, forming a perfect closed loop. Student learning outcomes serve as an important basis for evaluating university information literacy education. For example, the University of Minnesota Duluth team conducted comparative experiments between students who had taken library courses and those who had not, finding that the former group more actively modified search strategies when encountering difficulties, read more extensively, and demonstrated stronger awareness of seeking help from librarians [36]. Miami University and Boston University similarly used control groups to compare student assignments and course papers, discovering that students who completed the course exhibited higher quality reference sources, more standardized citation formats, and greater critical thinking [37-38].

[Figure 1: see original paper] Collaborative Relationship Model of Stakeholders

in University Information Literacy Education

2 Collaborative Models of Information Literacy Education in Foreign Universities

Library-Centered Principal Collaboration Model: Most collaborative projects established among on-campus stakeholders center the library as the core, embedding information literacy education into cutting-edge courses. In the University of Memphis' embedded librarian program, subject librarians teach students to develop search strategies and complete assignments, collaborating with faculty to design course tasks that guide students to deeply understand database functions [30-31]. This model integrates information literacy education into students' learning and research processes, promptly addressing problems in their academic studies, compensating for the limited knowledge scope of faculty teaching independently, and expanding the breadth and depth of information literacy education.

Embedded Guarantee Model Integrated into Student Learning Process: Information literacy curriculum maps serve as visual tools that integrate information literacy courses with student educational processes, timely addressing learning needs at different stages [21,33]. Curriculum maps enable analysis of intersections between specialized courses and information literacy education, providing opportunities for librarians to embed into specialized courses and increasing possibilities for librarian-faculty collaboration [33]. Berkeley College Library clearly marks curriculum maps with assessment points that directly serve as evaluation points, visually reflecting each responsible entity's duties and tasks and facilitating supervision and evaluation by decision-making layer stakeholders [21]. The University of North Carolina's team used curriculum maps to conduct comparative experiments between students who took library and writing center courses versus those who did not, finding that the former group demonstrated better information literacy capabilities, academic writing skills, and critical thinking [36-38].

Tool-Constraint Model Centered on Resource Integration: This model uses information literacy curriculum maps as binding tools. On one hand, curriculum maps enable analysis of intersections between specialized courses and information literacy education; on the other hand, they facilitate supervision and evaluation of decision-making layer stakeholders [21]. The maps provide practical plans for implementing embedded information literacy education, with all content directly usable as curriculum evaluation points. North Carolina State University Library's curriculum map-based information literacy education model research demonstrates how this approach helps evaluation teams and senior administrators supervise implementation and promote accountability [33].

Collaborative Assessment Model for Evaluating Information Literacy Education Effects: Collaborative assessment leverages the expertise of multiple stakeholders to achieve multi-perspective evaluation, making curriculum as-

sessment more scientific. In the Assessment in Action project, evaluation teams comprising librarians, writing centers, and IT offices comprehensively assessed courses by combining library usage data provided by librarians, student performance records from faculty, and student data from administrative departments [35]. This multi-faceted evaluation effectively demonstrated that information literacy education positively impacts student grades, information literacy abilities, and academic writing skills. Queens University of Technology's team developed data dashboards to monitor and analyze consultation frequency and other data, conducting comparative analyses between participating and non-participating students to observe information literacy education's impact [43].

3 Implications for Collaborative Models of Information Literacy Education in China

Clarify Stakeholder Interests and Objectives to Promote Sustainable Collaboration: Establishing effective cooperative relationships that serve stakeholders constitutes a crucial first step for university information literacy education. Collaboration must respect stakeholder demands, overcome biases, integrate resources, and commit to common goals. The University of Louisville's faculty, academic advisors, and librarians jointly created the "Find Your Way" inquiry-based course to help undergraduates develop professional competencies, expanding librarians' educational content while helping faculty improve teaching methods [21]. The University of Minnesota Library, IT center, and cross-disciplinary research and writing center jointly created an information literacy toolkit that aggregates databases, course-specific local databases, online services, and information research tutorials, enabling one-stop access to core information resources and greatly satisfying online learners' needs [34].

Actively Participate in Digital Campus Construction to Enrich Education Targets and Content: Exploring the relationship between information literacy education and student learning success reveals that improving information literacy helps advance digital campus construction, which in turn increases information literacy education's reach and enriches its content. Deja et al. [39] consider university libraries as central forces in digital transformation. LaGuardia Community College Library collaborated with teaching centers to implement "Digital Competence Pedagogy," integrating digital communication skills into information literacy education [40]. Ohio State University Library actively established collaborative relationships with digital scholarship centers, jointly developing data collection plans and embedding services throughout the scientific research lifecycle to support talent cultivation and digital campus construction [41]. This process incorporates library information literacy education into evaluation metrics, recognizing librarians as institutional builders and curriculum innovators [45].

Establish Collaborative Assessment to Improve Collaborative Mechanisms: Constructing evaluation and assessment mechanisms for information literacy education provides effective guarantees for its implementation. Assess-

ment should evaluate the entire educational process, not just learning outcomes. Foreign university libraries mobilize stakeholders to document student performance, assignments, and changes in information literacy capabilities. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), one of six regional accreditation agencies for U.S. higher education, requires all accredited institutions to jointly develop talent cultivation quality evaluation systems with on-campus stakeholders, incorporating information literacy education into evaluation indicators [46]. China's information literacy education remains in a stage emphasizing practice over assessment, but teaching effectiveness evaluation has begun attracting practitioners' attention. Only by establishing diversified, systematic collaborative assessments and strengthening application of evaluation results can we continuously clarify information literacy education's connotation and attract more stakeholders.

Leverage Collaborative Education to Elevate Librarian Status and Demonstrate Library Value: Domestic librarians are often positioned as teaching support staff, with their teaching and academic levels frequently questioned by university administrators. Collaborative information literacy education provides an important pathway to demonstrate librarians' value and capabilities. Niimi's research found that university teachers perceive librarians as valuable collaborators in research projects [44]. Through case analysis, collaborative education not only helps libraries obtain more funding and support but also demonstrates library value, attracting more stakeholders to participate and continuously improving education content and formats.

4 Conclusion

With the rapid development of the information environment, the content, methods, and models of information literacy education require continuous innovation to meet evolving needs. Stakeholders in university information literacy education involve students, teachers, librarians, teaching management personnel, supervisory agencies, and others. To enhance information literacy education effectiveness, university libraries must deeply analyze these stakeholders' needs, coordinate their interests and conflicts, and establish long-term collaborative mechanisms through resource integration. This article analyzes collaborative practices and experiences of stakeholders in foreign university information literacy education, demonstrating benefits for students, faculty, libraries, and universities. It fully reflects the ACRL *Framework* concept of integrating information literacy with teaching, research, and scholarship, and the core idea of combining information literacy with teaching and research processes. Domestic university libraries can fully learn from foreign collaborative teams to promote information literacy education development and innovation.

References

[2] Kliewe. Value creation in university-industry relationships: a stakeholder relationship value perspective[D]. Coventry: Coventry University, 2015.
[3] Donaldson T, Preston E. The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications[J]. Academy of Management Review, 1995(1): 65-91.
[4] Turon P. Firm, stakeholders, value dynamics and social economic progress. The Spanish pharmaceutical industry[D]. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2015.
[6] Association of College & Research Libraries. Framework for information literacy for higher education[EB/OL]. [2023-02-26]. https://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues
[8] Shang Xianli. Research on information literacy education and services at Maastricht University Library in the Netherlands[J]. Library Science Research, 2021(22): 33-41.
[9] Li Jinfang. On the integration of information literacy education and academic guidance[J]. Library and Information Service, 2020(18): 42-48.
[10] ALA. Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education[J].
[11] Association of College & Research Libraries. Guidelines, standards, frameworks-Listing by topic[EB/OL]. [2023-06-26]. https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardsguidelinesto
[12] Nutefall.
[13] Alabi.
[14] Detmering.
[15] McAfee.
[16] Bernstein.
[17] Pinto.
[20] Carroll J, Mallon N. Using digital environments to design inclusive sustainable communities of practice in academic libraries[J]. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2021(5): 102380.
[21] Charles H. Using information literacy curriculum maps as a means of communication and accountability with stakeholders in higher education[J]. Journal of Information Literacy, 2015(1): 47-61.
[22] Winner C. Librarians as partners in the classroom: increasing the imperative[J]. Reference Services Review, 1998(26): 25-30.
[23] Ferer E. Working together: library and writing center collaboration[J]. Reference Services Review, 2012(4): 543-557.
[24]
[25] Dubicki E, Bucks S. Tapping government sources in course assignments[J]. Reference Services Review, 2018(1): 29-41.
[26] Dubicki E. Mapping curriculum learning outcomes to ACRL's Framework threshold concepts: a syllabus study[J]. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2019(3): 288-298.
[27] LeMire S, Sullivan D, Kotinek J. Embracing the spiral: an action research assessment of a library-honors first year collaboration[J]. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2019(5): 102042.

[28] Dong H. Adapting during a pandemic: a study using rapid prototyping instructional system design model to create online instructional content[J]. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2021(3): 102356.
[29]
[30] Pleshkan V, Singarella I. Advancing nursing students' transition to evidence-based practice: embedding a librarian in an advanced nursing research course[J]. Journal of the Medical Library Association, 2022(2): 228-232.
[31] Mader S, Gibson C. Teaching and learning centers: recasting academic librarians as educators and change agents[EB/OL]. [2023-02-25]. https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/17689.
[33]
[34] Butler T, Veldof R. Information literacy toolkit: meeting the needs of large research universities[J]. Academic Exchange Quarterly, 2002(4): 2232-2234.
[35] Brown K, Malenfant J. Academic library impact on student learning and success: findings from assessment in action projects[R]. Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, 2017.
[36] AiA. University of Minnesota-Duluth: project description[EB/OL]. [2023-06-25]. https://apply.ala.org/aia/docs/project/13916.
[37] AiA. Boston University: project description[EB/OL]. [2023-06-25]. https://apply.ala.org/aia/docs/project/13956.
[38] AiA. University of Miami: project description[EB/OL]. [2023-06-25]. https://apply.ala.org/aia/docs/project/13932.
[39] Deja M, Rak D, Bell S. Digital transformation readiness: perspectives from academic library and information literacy outcomes[J]. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2021(5): 102403.
[40] Stadler D, Rojas C. Supporting institutional objectives by embedding mission-critical competencies in credit-bearing library instruction: a study[J]. New Review of Academic Librarianship, 2019(2-4): 171-189.
[41] Longmeier M, Murphy A. Framing outcomes and programming assessment for digital scholarship services: a logic model approach[J]. College & Research Libraries, 2021(2): 142.
[42]
[43] AiA. Queensland University of Technology: project description[EB/OL]. [2023-06-25]. https://apply.ala.org/aia/docs/project/13928.
[44] Niimi.
[45] Fagan J, Ostermiller S, Price J. Faculty perceptions of academic librarians: experts, connectors, and resource stewards[J]. Review of Academic Librarianship, 2022(1): 79-116.
[46] Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Resource manual for principles of accreditation: foundations for quality enhancement[EB/OL]. [2023-06-25]. https://sacscoc.org/app/uploads/2019/08/2018-POA-Resource-Manual.pdf.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.