Whether a librarian is new to the role of information literacy coordination or not, we often hear that attempts at information literacy curriculum integration failed because of discipline faculty’s “lack of respect” for librarians, or their reluctance to recognize the benefits of adopting information literacy student learning outcomes. As William Badke quipped, “Academic librarians are the Rodney Dangerfields of the academic world—they can’t get no respect,” when it comes to trying to persuade faculty about the curricular importance of information literacy (Badke, 2005: 64).

Sadly, Badke’s observations sometimes ring true. But the converse and often critically neglected side of the story resides in the fact that many librarians, even those enjoying the faculty status, fail to critically analyze how curricula should be developed within libraries. Librarians and libraries sometimes find themselves scrambling to best illustrate how information literacy instruction meets student learning needs both within and outside their libraries. This problem partially occurs due to librarians’ lack of formal training and/or experience in creating curricula. Our lack of preparation tends to lead to short lived and ill-prepared library instructional efforts that fail because they stand alone outside of curricular tie-ins. These efforts often leave students missing the vital information literacy connections that research skills have in associated courses or disparate disciplines. More attention needs to be paid to how curricula is successfully developed outside our domain by faculty, departments, and colleges. Many academic
librarians do not make it a practice to examine the concurrent pressures, both external and internal, being placed on curricular reform in order to better gauge their future attempts at garnering curricula integration and/or developing standalone courses. Academic librarians and libraries must strategically align themselves with curricular approval entities and assessment processes on their campuses in order to better achieve information literacy integration across the curriculum.

This chapter will provide readers with an overview of the typical ways to implement and incorporate information literacy curriculum into required university course offerings. Attention will be paid to identifying discipline based curricular practices and collaborative opportunities for participation and planning. In addition, both past and present library instructional formats and the concept of curriculum mapping will be discussed to highlight best practices for strengthening information literacy curricular programming. An overview of recent pressures placed upon higher education curricular reform will be discussed in order to provide background on the competing curricular issues that often appear to detract attention away from information literacy. Examples of how curricula are developed with department, college, and university-wide will be explored in order to offer guidance to librarians working to increase the likelihood of success and curricular respect when it comes to integrating information literacy into both the course and programmatic levels of instructional content.

**APPRAOCHES FOR INTEGRATING IL INTO STUDENT LEARNING**

For as long as librarians have provided formal instruction on how to utilize library resources, attempts to gain entrance into curricular offerings could adequately be characterized as both hit and miss. Taking stock of academic librarians’ development of tours, self-guided workbooks, tutorials, and drop-in sessions and the like, historical sketches of the full arsenal of efforts to educate library users reveal a gradual and often painstaking progress to gain entry into curricular offerings. In programs that have enjoyed the most successes, both historically and presently, academic librarians have spent a great deal of time examining the curricular landscape of their institutions before they attempt to gain a greater share of student instructional hours (Rockman, 2002; Rader, 1995; Kirk, 1974).

While there will always almost certainly be questions about whether or not librarians or discipline faculty should take the lead role in establishing information literacy student learning outcomes and goals, the literature (Jenkins and Boosingher, 2003; Kraat, 2005; Raspa and Ward, 2000) shows that librarian leadership is growing in terms of respect from faculty and success in information literacy programming. However, leadership in the area of curriculum
development and information literacy programming must continue to work in collaborative parallels. Patrick Ragains correctly identifies the need for all stakeholders on campus to come to a shared understanding when it comes to curriculum development and information literacy curriculum integration planning and programming. He states that,

In order for curriculum or campus-wide information literacy initiatives to succeed, faculty and librarians must expand their individual efforts, seek improved understanding of each other's expertise and interactions with students, and support each other's educational efforts. Deans and other administrators must influence programmatic shifts by encouraging the teaching of information literacy beyond isolated courses or pilot projects. (Ragains, 2001: 405–406)

**LIBRARY INSTRUCTION CURRICULAR FORMATS**

**PRE AND POST INFORMATION LITERACY**

Academic librarians have consistently worked to integrate library instruction and the undergraduate curriculum since the 1950s (Rader, 1995). However, the idea of an academic library offering a curriculum on a college campus is a fairly recent idea in relation to the history of libraries. As Terrence Mech notes,

Librarians tend to forget that reference services, much less proactive cooperative library instruction efforts, are still relatively recent innovations within American higher education. Until the last half of the nineteenth century academic libraries offered very little to faculty or students... reference services did not assume an important role in college libraries until the 1940s and 1950s, and did not become a major activity before the 1960s and 1970s. (Mech, 1990: 82)

What therefore do we mean when we talk about information literacy curriculum? Library instruction within reference and public services units is still a relatively new endeavor that varies in terms of approach from institution to institution. According to Webster's Dictionary, curriculum can be defined as the courses offered by an educational institution and/or a set of courses constituting an area of specialization. But if we look past this traditional definition framed around lecture hours and classroom content delivery, curriculum has also recently been defined as the structure of the educational process and the framework for planning educational experiences (Regan, 1980).

The instructional programming of academic libraries certainly falls within the framework of planning educational experiences. However, typically that is where the comparison starts to fade as the majority of academic libraries do not typically offer more than one unit bearing course embedded into the college curriculum. Nor do instructional efforts typically involve strategically balanced
offerings of instructional content that aim to avoid repetition and move beyond an orientation to resources both physical and electronic. Without planning and regular assessment, a curriculum cannot likely achieve its targeted educational goals.

John Lubans, Jr. correctly identifies the reasons behind the historical lack of concrete and strategic curriculum development in the area of library and research skills when he writes,

Most library-use instruction is based on what we as librarians think library users need to know. It is this educated guesswork or perceived need on which many programs (tours, orientation lectures, a multitude of multimedia presentations, and formal courses in bibliography) have been based. ... Probably the major errors in basing programs only on perceived need is the redundancy inherent in such an approach and that such a shortsighted view does not generally get to the source of many information-use problems: the teacher/librarian relationship. (Lubans, 1974: 232)

Good curriculum development and instructional programming continually evaluates students learning needs in addition to surmising the perceived educational objectives. It should not be solely based on what individual librarians “think” students should know. Assessment and critical inquiry into student information seeking behavior patterns should drive the curricular efforts of reference and instructional services departments.

**THE INSTRUCTIONAL MENU OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP**

With the shift from bibliographic instruction to information literacy, academic librarians are shifting instruction away from resource-based presentations to an instructional focus based on student learning needs in terms of the complete research process. We are also moving away from a purely reactive model of initiating instruction to adopting proactive methods that integrate student information literacy development into course curriculum based on our professional investigations of student learning needs and collaboration with faculty. Grassian and Kaplowitz (2001) identify the initiation of instruction developing in three distinct ways: the reactive mode, the interactive mode, and finally the proactive mode. In the reactive mode, programmatic planning is predominantly motivated by library users’ questions. In the interactive mode, a faculty member or an external force typically requests the development of an instructional module. The final model, the proactive model, takes place when librarians plan ahead to develop instructional programming and curriculum that supports their research on existing instructional needs (Grassian and Kaplowitz 2001: 131–132). We can perhaps better visualize what Grassian and Kaplowitz describe is taking place in these three modalities by examining the chart below.
Faculty librarian collaborations and the building of relationships between the library and academic departments help to move the initiation of instruction away from a reactive mode or response to a proactive information literacy instructional mode. Once this change in the engagement of instruction is achieved to ensure the optimal student learning environment, the next step involves addressing how the instructional moment, regardless of its duration, is carried out and connected to long-term student learning opportunities.

**THE “ONE-SHOT” VERSUS THE “STANDALONE SEMESTER CREDIT-BEARING COURSE”**

When it comes to understanding the array of programmatic offerings that typify an academic library’s instructional program, it is important to understand how instruction has progressed within the field of academic librarianship. The typical instructional moment in library instructional programming, the classic “one-shot,” usually comes into the foreground. The literature of library and information science is replete with important studies that outline how librarians can better engage students during one-shot formats of instruction through the usage of active learning techniques, attention to diverse learning styles, and critical preparation of lecture content through constructive interactions with faculty (Choinski and Emmanuel, 2006; Sheesley, 2002). However, despite librarians’ best attempts to keep the one-shot method engaging and viable as the main format of library instruction delivery,
It has become clear that the [one-shot] demonstration-style information skills classes delivered out of curriculum context do not necessarily coincide with the students’ need for information, are sometimes not valued by students, and do not necessarily prepare them for the challenges of research, problem solving and continuous learning. (Orr et al., 2001: 457)

As Grassian and Kaplowitz (2001) note, the one-shot session has its advantages in terms of often requiring less preparation time than formal stand-alone courses and providing brief and positive interactions with a librarian that may motivate students to return to the library. However, the shortcomings of the format often outweigh the benefits. Within this instructional structure, learners typically only retain some of the covered concepts and attendance is often mandatory, negating the idea of engaging the learner at their best point of instructional need.

Realizing the shortcomings of the one-shot instructional model and working to increase student learning opportunities to improve research and information literacy skills, librarians have worked to increase the success of semester long stand-alone formal courses. While most librarians would rather see these concepts embedded into disciplinary course offerings, great successes at engaging students in courses that solely focus on the area of information literacy instruction have been achieved. Stand-alone formal course offerings that deliver information literacy instructional content can be delivered in many settings. Typically the instruction is synchronous and in-person. However, with the recent adoption of distance learning management systems, such as Blackboard and Web CT, remote instruction often takes place in both synchronous and asynchronous formats.

Semester long and/or formal information literacy credit courses can be related to a designated department curriculum or discipline. At California State University, Northridge, Chicanola Studies 230 Introduction to Chicanola Studies Research Methods is one example of a stand-alone course that exists in conjunction with a department’s targeted information literacy student learning outcomes. Many librarians, who state that they prefer teaching semester long courses, cite the in-depth opportunities they afford for engaging studies in information literacy and research through well designed course assignments. However, many note that the courses are time-consuming in their preparation and that students are often difficult to engage unless the course content directly links to coursework in their major course of study.

Far too often, academic librarians’ efforts for information literacy’s integration into unit bearing courses have often simply stopped at the creation of stand-alone information literacy courses taught by librarians. These one-unit elective courses typically only attract limited numbers of students. Undoubtedly, one unit library skills courses and one-shot information literacy instructional sessions expose students to critically needed information literacy skills. However, they
typically will not garner the same respect given to discipline-based semester long courses that are tied to departmental and programmatic learning outcomes which are assessed and reviewed through consultative processes across departments and sometimes even colleges. For this reason it is important for information librarians to study how successful curriculum is adopted and improved.

HOW IS CURRICULUM DEVELOPED OUTSIDE LIBRARIES?

It is often rare for academic librarians to have a front row seat for viewing how departments, colleges, and the university develop, reform, and improve curricula. In most universities curriculum development begins at the department level with attention being paid to disciplinary demands and standards either accepted regionally or nationally by professional associations, state standards, or often even accrediting bodies. Typically a subcommittee of faculty within a department is charged with overseeing the tasks of new course creation, course and/or program modification, and program review as it pertains to course content. Hopefully these same faculty members are also involved in departmental assessment efforts as they work to ensure that course objectives and student learning outcomes aligned with the curriculum remain relevant and correspond to student learning needs. After a department creates and reviews new curricula or modifications to current course offerings, the body of changes are typically further reviewed by either a college curriculum review board or the campus curriculum approval agency. Peer review is the critical component for success when it comes to the curriculum development process that occurs at the program, department, college, and university levels. Curriculum development also typically involves the participation of school deans, department chairs, and program coordinators, members of educational policy or curriculum review committees, as well as members of the academic affairs side of an institution. It is imperative to the success of information literacy curriculum integration and development for librarians to participate in university governance that works with curricular policies. If this is not possible, librarians should at least try to develop an awareness of the campus curriculum development process and its current pressures.

Hannelore Rader (1995) explained the importance of librarians learning all that they can about curriculum development and reform practices in order to improve the curricular placement of information literacy. She cites the research of Bjorner whom she credits with effectively, “discussing various philosophies of curriculum development discipline-based (found mostly in higher education), student-based (found in elementary schools), social-utilitarian-based (found in vocational training), and social reconstruction (found in religious or other strong ideological focused institutions)” (Rader, 1995: 296).
In my experience as the Information Literacy Coordinator at California State University, Northridge, since 2001, my elected role as a faculty member serving on the campus’ Educational Policies Committee has been of paramount importance when it comes to recognizing various and valid opportunities to design curricular integration for information literacy initiatives. The Educational Policies Committee meets twice a month throughout the academic year. Committee members are charged with critically reviewing all of the undergraduate curriculum proposals for new courses, programs, or modifications. From my service on this committee I have developed an awareness of the unique needs that departments are working to meet through their course offerings. My exposure to curricular programming processes across the university continues to help me, in my role as the Coordinator of Information Literacy, identify where needs are for information literacy curricular integration and what model of instructions might best meet a department’s needs.

According to the dean of my library, Susan Curzon, “There are nine models for teaching information literacy that can be used on any campus” (Curzon, 2004: 37). These nine models include: the introduction model, the on-demand/one-shot model, the stand-alone information literacy course model, the learning outcomes model, the demonstration of mastery model and/or entrance requirement model, the faculty focus model, the college readiness model, and when possible the General Education model (Curzon, 2004).

For most academic libraries working to integrate information literacy into the curriculum, the introduction model requires focusing on freshmen orientations and first year experience learning communities. The on-demand/one-shot model typically focuses on covering a targeted lesson plan within a limited time framework, typically 50 to 75 minutes in duration. The one-shot model remains a reactive model that takes place based on instructor requests for instruction. The learning outcomes model focuses on developing and then carrying out instruction based on the student learning outcomes that an academic department has adopted into their curriculum and course of study. The demonstration of mastery model and the entrance requirement model usually utilize a test to certify that a student has attained a pre-determined level of information literacy at a particular point in their undergraduate or graduate course of study or sometimes upon entrance to the university. The faculty focus model involves librarians working with faculty to train them on how to individually carry out information literacy instruction on their own through the development of assignments and other instructional methods. The college readiness model requires outreach services to work with K–12 teachers in the area to make sure that awareness of information literacy skills needs are clear. Finally the General Education model works to embed information literacy student learning outcomes into the required coursework and or section requirements of the courses required in the university’s general education program.
In my experience, the one common component faced in bringing any of these models to completion is the difficulty in developing unique information literacy curricula geared to meet the specific information literacy student learning outcomes that have been identified for that learning community or targeted population. This difficulty is a challenge shared by both librarians and faculty members struggling to determine which of the adopted information literacy student learning outcomes will become a focus within the course. Librarians can better prepare for these struggles by internally developing curriculum mapping tools that best illustrate how and when a student should be exposed to an information literacy concept or skills within their course of study.

**CURRICULUM MAPPING**

Curriculum mapping is a process that allows you to gain control and understanding over educational objectives and the instructional content that your department delivers. Curriculum mapping has been a common practice in K–16 education circles since the 1970s. It has recently gained recognition from library instruction experts as a valuable tool for helping librarians to better plan and implement instructional programming. Bullard and Holden (2006: 1) define curriculum mapping as “a systematic analysis of the content of courses in a curriculum. By using this process librarians can propose the best timing and placement for information literacy concepts across a course of study or the general education curriculum.” Additional research also shows that curriculum mapping provides both an internal and external means of communicating with colleagues about long-range and short-term planning, both within and outside one’s discipline. The process also helps to clearly identify gaps or repetition in instructional content (Koppang, 2004; Nash, 2004; Hinchliffe, Mark and Merz, 2003; Hayes-Jacobs, 1997).

Examples of libraries that have successfully implemented a curriculum mapping project to better define and reform information literacy curriculum offerings include the libraries of University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, the Vogel Library at Wartburg College in Waverly, Iowa, the Leddy Library at the University of Windsor in Ontario, Canada, and the George T. Potter Library of Ramapo College of New Jersey. The libraries at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign state that they view curriculum mapping as a way of “examining a program of study and the courses within that program in order to:

- understand curriculum structures and relationships
- gain insight on how students experience the discipline
- increase awareness of curricular content
• identify common or ‘gateway’ courses that students are required or choose to take
• reveal opportunities for library integration” (University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, 2003)

The drive to improve the instructional efforts and programming of academic librarians has grown over the past decade. Efforts to focus on the pedagogical improvement of instruction librarians and get a better handle on assessment efforts continue to grow and improve. Curriculum development and reform need to be an integral part of this process in academic libraries just as they have been in academic discipline and higher education as a whole. As many university libraries realize, student engagement and learning in information literacy instructional moments depends greatly on the content matching current information needs. In many cases, reform of both library instructional focus and content will be necessary in order to achieve effective delivery across campus curriculum. This is a critical need that must be met to obtain or maintain an information literacy curriculum’s integrity and respect with discipline faculty and students. As librarians at the John F. Kennedy Library at California State University, Los Angeles, note,

While some disciplines and departments have successful instructional liaisons with the library, information literacy skills have not been systematically developed across campus. The case can be made that our students experience unmet needs with regard to information skills instruction. Because information skills are not sequenced, students experience overlap and repetition during library instruction. (California State University, Los Angeles, 2005)

CURRICULUM REFORM PRESSURES WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION

Over the past two decades, the rapid changes in technology and external calls for accountability have forced the majority of faculty in academe to reexamine the curricular offerings in most academic disciplines in terms of both content and student learning outcomes (Rader, 1998). Calls for integrating life long learning examples into university-wide learning experiences have given rise to community-based service learning programming and calls for innovative collaborative partnerships both within and outside the university nationwide (Riddle, 2003; Lampert, 2003).

The concept and adoption of information literacy as an instructional goal within circles of higher education has propelled countless worldwide movements for curriculum change and educational reform (Bruce, 2002). Calls for information literacy to be embedded into curricular reform models are best
achieved when proponents, librarians and/or faculty, have a clear understanding of how they will work across course and modular instructional offerings to give students opportunities for learning and subsequential application and practice of introduced information literacy concepts.

After the fundamental process of mapping course content to information literacy student learning objectives and programmatic goals are underway, librarians and faculty will be much better situated to move onward to the next steps of strengthening the curricular connections between information literacy, general education or required university coursework, and overall campus assessment efforts. Small scale curricular reform must take place both internally within a library instructional program and within department library liaison communication practices. Regardless of whether the approach takes place through course integrated instruction or information literacy course content embedded strategically throughout the disciplines, curricular reform planning is needed in order to infuse information literacy into a broad based curriculum such as a general education program.

**GENERAL EDUCATION**

When librarians typically think of the ultimate sign of respect for information literacy curricular efforts they usually envision placement and adoption within their campus' general education program. The desire to see information literacy embedded into general education programming stems from many different reasons. Obviously placement within an undergraduate general education program better ensures student exposure to information literacy concepts and practices. In addition, general education programs are also regularly assessed in preparation for institutional benchmarking and accreditation review.

Another important factor that explains the drive to have information literacy student learning outcomes embedded into general education programming stems from the fact that both general education reform and information literacy simultaneously received a great deal of attention in the 1990s alongside the calls for technology's integration into college level coursework steadily entering the literature of higher education.

In the past 15 years many libraries and librarians have worked diligently to have a voice in the direction of their campus general education reform patterns (Jacobson and Mark, 2000). As Ilene Rockman correctly noted, “The reform movement of the 1990s saw some universities develop first-year experiences and seminars for undergraduates with courses focused on communication and composition skills (reading, writing, and critical thinking) as one method to deliver information literacy instruction” (Rockman, 2002: 186–187). For librarians, the challenge in all of these efforts is finding a way to be heard in the cacophony
of voices calling for reform in terms of general education and instruction that ensures that students graduate with a mastery of both information literacy and technological competencies.

In my own experience in working to establish my university library's role in our campus's planned general education reform, the important concept to grasp is that regardless of whether or not librarians enjoy faculty status, being an active contributor to the process of curricular reform is never a given. The curricular reform typically involved in overhauling general education programs is a messy business fraught with campus politics and academic departments jockeying for position within the structure of course offerings to guarantee necessary enrollment levels. It is often described in the literature of higher education as a process fraught with compromises and battles that necessitates the skills that a general would need in going to war (Kempcke, 2002).

I worked on California State University, Northridge's General Education (GE) Task Force as an elected member from the library faculty from 2003 until 2005. In comparison to previous campus committee service, my work on the GE Task Force was much more rigorous. All members of the committee were required to learn and study the history of how curricular reform had taken place at the university and within the larger California State University system. Every member of the committee learned to respect and listen to the various positions proposed by different represented disciplines.

My active role in revamping the entire curriculum undoubtedly helped information literacy achieve a stronger status in the newly adopted GE requirements set to take effect in the fall of 2006. Prior to this reform of the General Education Program, information competence was listed as a student learning outcome of the GE curriculum. However, the wording of the policy did not state how students would become progressively more information competent as they moved through general education courses. In short, prior to 2006 there was no way to identify which courses were working to help students improve in the area of information literacy. With the adoption of the newly revised general education plan in the spring of 2005, undergraduates are now required to complete two general education courses that have been designated as Information Competence (IC) bearing by the campus Educational Policies Committee. One IC bearing course must be completed within the Basic Skills section of the GE Program, the other in the Subject Exploration category requirement. Each existing and new course that wishes to be approved and designated as an IC bearing course in the University Catalog must also now undergo a process of certification and assessment on a scheduled basis.

While the strengthening of information competence's role within the general education program at my university is undeniable it is also imperative that librarians do not view a success like this as a fait accompli. Just because information competence is now strengthened in its positioning within the campus
curriculum, does not mean that the task of curriculum development is complete. Service on bodies like my campus's Educational Policies Committee and the literature of higher education both make it clear that there are currently three types of curriculum in existence on every college and university campus in the nation. These include: designed curriculum (the curriculum proposed for adoption by departments and programs), existing/actual curriculum (what is taught in the classrooms on a daily basis), and achieved curriculum (what students have learned). Continual participation and attention to campus entities responsible for assessment and faculty development in the areas of pedagogical improvement and curricular decision-making will remain a required part of making sure that information competence remains a healthy part of the student learning outcomes within the newly adopted General Education curriculum.

Faculty status certainly helps librarians attain membership on faculty committees, including, among others, curriculum and assessment related committees. But faculty status alone does not mean that this accomplishment will be a given on every campus. Therefore, in their role as department liaisons, librarians must regularly work to achieve successful outreach to faculty involved in ongoing departmental curricular reform in order to integrate information literacy and/or library instruction modules into the curriculum on a small scale. General Education reform is not a consistent part of every university's curricular reform rotation. At some institutions, reform of the General Education program may not take place for several years or perhaps even a decade. Working with faculty serving on department curriculum committees is often another very good way to learn more about the instructional needs that the library can assist in developing.

**CONCLUSION**

Opinions abound when it comes to theorizing about the "best" ways to develop and deliver information literacy instructional content both inside and outside of library classrooms. Moreover, there will always be competing educational movements and themes that seem to convince academic stakeholders on many campuses that information literacy is not necessarily the top choice for inclusion in current or future planned curricular reform initiatives within departments or across an institution. Convincing the entire campus that information literacy requirements should become a component of a general education program does not take place overnight. It is a long and often arduous process that requires diligence, patience, and attention to instructional programming taking place both within and outside the library.

In their article, "Competing Agendas in Higher Education: Finding a Place for Information Literacy," Loanne Snively and Natasha Cooper (1997)
shrewdly warn librarians of the dangers of ignoring the lessons of past curricular change processes regardless of their successes or failures. Searching for respect for information literacy within existing curricular structures involves understanding the depth of importance that many stakeholders on campus pay to the process. Curriculum is created through the travails of a consultative process that is often laden with historical politics within academe. Citing the words of Snavely and Cooper reminds us of the enormity involved in undertaking curricular change on any college or university campus. “Bok reportedly compared changing a college curriculum to moving a cemetery. Establishing an across-the-curriculum information literacy program is a tall order. Those involved in such an endeavor should take note of the experiences of those who have already been involved in curricular change” (Snavely and Cooper, 1997).

Clearly, participating in curriculum planning, both within and outside of libraries, should provide librarians with clarity about the educational objectives they wish to achieve in the classroom. This clarity is a key component to building a salable argument to include information literacy in curricula both in and outside of library instruction. As the literature on curriculum mapping and curricular decision making shows, it is also imperative for librarians to continually review the curricular requirements and syllabi for the departments they serve and regularly meet with faculty involved in creating new courses and/or revamping existing classes.

These are some of the best ways that librarians can communicate to campus program planners and clearly convey how information literacy instruction can be delivered to their students. Certainly this is no easy task. But it is important to develop a broad and flexible conception of information literacy curriculum that can encapsulate the needs of many departments and programs. Ilene Rockman probably said it best when she wrote,

So, what does an information literacy curriculum look like? It is campuswide; problem-based, inquiry based, and resource based (that is, it uses a variety of information resources); makes effective use of pedagogies and technologies; is learner centered; and integrated and articulated with a discipline's learning outcomes. It enhances and expands student learning through a coherent, systematic approach that facilitates the transfer or learning across the curriculum. (Rockman, 2002: 16)

It is also important to remember that the key to gaining respect for information literacy curriculum issues lies beyond just agreeing on definitions. The most important thing one can do is learn to listen and responsibly participate in the curriculum development process that is continually taking place on your campus.
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