

Sabina Cisek  
Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland

Maria Próchnicka  
Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland

The 3rd Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries International Conference  
(QQML2011), 24 - 27 May 2011 Athens Greece

## Selected methodological issues in creating the Information Literacy development strategies

### Abstract

Information Literacy (IL) is a key competence enabling individuals (human beings) to participate efficiently in the knowledge society, and constitutes the basis for effective learning and successful professional development. The information literate society essentially determines the development of regions and local communities, and contributes to the welfare of nations. Consequently, Information Literacy has to be a matter of an organized, planned and rational action on the European and national levels. The governments and other authorities need to formulate and apply informed IL development strategies to ensure acquisition and progress of information competences throughout people's lifetime. But, at the moment, there is no established or commonly agreed-on methodology for working out the Information Literacy strategies, nor are there ready tools or techniques to be used for that purpose.

In this paper the selected research results of the EMPATIC project, connected with formulating strategies or strategic models for Information Literacy development, are described, with focus on the methodological aspects.

When creating such a strategy its two main dimensions have to be considered, that is its formal structure, e.g. components, frame, length, appendices, and its subject content related to – inter alia – the level and context of Information Literacy, formal and informal learning environments, implications for teaching.

During the designing process the crucial elements of strategic modeling: 1. context (meaning and dimensions of IL, role in the civic/knowledge society), 2. mission (mainstreaming of information literacy at the national and EU level), 3. vision (information literate citizens, business, government, society), 4. goals (raising society-wide IL awareness, institutionalization of IL, integrating IL in curricula in all levels and sectors of education system in Europe), 5. actions, 6. standards and performance indicators, and 7. stakeholders have to be taken into account.

The analysis of 87 projects in the Information Literacy area from years 1994-2010, supported in most cases by the European Union, has been conducted. They are divided across four learning sectors (schools, higher education, vocational training and adult education). The findings of the investigation – the 20 most illustrative cases – are used as the basis for developing generic strategic models for Information Literacy as well as defining its implications for training of teachers, IL standards and associated performance indicators.

## Introduction

This text concerns some aspects of Information Literacy (IL) in Europe. The selected results of the EU-funded EMPATIC (Empowering Autonomous Learning through Information Competencies) project, connected with creating strategies or strategic models for Information Literacy development, are described and enriched by the reflection on the emerging methodological issues. The study has an exploratory character, seeking to collect and analyze possible challenges, contexts, determinants, elements and factors that should be taken into account when formulating a model strategy for IL development. The paper does not aim to propose a “fully functional” or “complete” IL strategy; it is not possible at the present stage of research.

To start with, the term “Information Literacy” has at least three meanings:

1. a field of study, a research area, a scholarly discipline (the disciplinary perspective)
2. a social phenomenon, feature of a society, goal of an educational policy (the political/social perspective)
3. a form of a personal competence, knowledge, skills, the cognitive acquisition of individuals (the cognitive perspective) (Basili 2008).

In this study the perspectives 2 (social) and 3 (cognitive, individual) are prevailing.

In addition, we also follow the way of thinking predominant in the Alexandria Proclamation, where we read:

“Information Literacy

- + comprises the competencies to recognize information needs and to locate, evaluate, apply and create information within cultural and social contexts;
- + is crucial to the competitive advantage of individuals, enterprises (especially small and medium enterprises), regions and nations;
- + provides the key to effective access, use and creation of content to support economic development, education, health and human services, and all other aspects of contemporary societies, (...); and
- + extends beyond current technologies to encompass learning, critical thinking and interpretative skills across professional boundaries and empowers individuals and communities” (Alexandria Proclamation 2005).

Information Literacy as a social phenomenon (perspective 2) and – in particular – as a cognitive feature of individuals (perspective 3) is indispensable for:

- + effective and fruitful life of human beings in the today’s civic/knowledge society
- + successful business
- + development of regions and local societies
- + well-being of nations (ALA/ACRL 2010), (Alexandria Proclamation 2005), (Corrall 2008, p. 26).

Thus, if Information Literacy (and not solely information infrastructure, technology or access) is a *sine qua non* condition of economic, social and personal growth and success, then it has

to be coordinated on both national and European levels, and should be a matter of established and well-considered governmental policy and strategy.

Having the above statements in mind we can come back to the main focus of that paper, i.e. selected methodological issues related to strategic modeling of Information Literacy development. The purpose of that strategic modeling, in turn, is to create the appropriate environment for the sustainable development of information culture of societies (perspective 2) and individuals (perspective 3). The strategy of IL development is formulated against a background of the European and national educational policies' goals, and connected with the lifelong learning (LLL) challenge. The wider context is made of the knowledge-based economy/society, within which knowledge becomes the main asset and education is a form of investment (Bengtsson 2009).

This text consists of three parts, entitled "Information Literacy as a Key Competence in the Knowledge-Based Economy", "Contexts and Selected Assumptions of the Strategic Model for Information Literacy Development", "Strategic Model for Information Literacy Development – the Formal and Methodological Considerations" and ends with "Conclusions and Recommendations".

## Information Literacy as a Key Competence in the Knowledge-Based Economy

Information Literacy is one of the key competences, essential for the effective lifelong learning, personal and professional fulfillment as well as the quality of social life. In the fundamental documents, that is *The Prague Declaration. Towards an Information Literate Society* (2003) and *The Alexandria Proclamation. Beacons of the Information Society* (2005), Information Literacy is perceived not only as "a prerequisite for participating effectively in the Information Society" but also as a "part of the basic human right of lifelong learning" (The Prague Declaration 2003). Both documents also stress the role of governments, that "should develop strong interdisciplinary programs to promote Information Literacy nationwide as a necessary step in closing the digital divide through the creation of an information literate citizenry, an effective civil society and a competitive workforce" (The Prague Declaration 2003).

At the same time, the European Union institutions have initiated in the member states a series of actions, strategic in nature, and related to deep changes in the educational systems and qualifications acquiring. Those undertakings are connected with establishment of the European area of lifelong learning and concern mainly creating national strategies in this domain (European area of lifelong learning 2009). Acceptance of the lifelong learning perspective leads to re-orientation of the entire educational system, changing focus from teaching to learning, and close relations between qualifications and comprehensively described learning outcomes, acquired by participating in different forms of learning (formal, informal and non-formal).

In the publication entitled *Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. European Reference Framework* competencies are understood “as a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes appropriate to the context” (European Communities 2007). Key competences, in turn, embrace “those which all individuals need for personal fulfillment and development, active citizenship, social inclusion and employment” (European Communities 2007). There are eight of them: “1. Communication in the mother tongue, 2. Communication in foreign languages, 3. Mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology, 4. Digital competence, 5. Learning to learn, 6. Social and civic competences, 7. Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship, 8. Cultural awareness and expression” (European Communities 2007). Unfortunately Information Literacy is not *explicite* indicated here as a key competence, however in the detailed description of the “Digital competence” we read “Skills needed [for a digitally competent individual S.C., M.P.] include the ability to search, collect and process information and use it in a critical and systematic way, assessing relevance and distinguishing the real from the virtual while recognizing the links. Individuals should have skills to use tools to produce, present and understand complex information and the ability to access search and use Internet-based services. Individuals should also be able to use IST to support critical thinking, creativity, and innovation” (European Communities 2007, p. 7). Nevertheless, Information Literacy is not exposed here and makes only a part of the digital competences, understood as “the confident and critical use of Information Society Technology (IST) for work, leisure and communication” and embracing “the use of computers to retrieve, assess, store, produce, present and exchange information, and to communicate and participate in collaborative networks via the Internet”. Thus, in the official EU document the cognitive aspects of Information Literacy, including recognizing the information need, evaluation, selection, perception and use of information, have been subordinated to „instrumental” ICT competences, mostly related to information management in the digital environment. This shows that Information Literacy is underestimated in Europe, both in the public debate as well as in action, what results in computer/digital/ICT literacy being the dominant issue.

In this respect, particularly important is the OECD approach. In document *The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies. Executive Summary* (OECD 2005) Information Literacy, named here “the ability to use knowledge and information interactively”, is recognized as a key one, independently of “the ability to use technology interactively”.

It is characterized as follows: “This key competency requires critical reflection on the nature of information itself – its technical infrastructure and its social, cultural, and even ideological context and impact. Information competence is necessary as a basis for understanding options, forming opinions, making decisions, and carrying out informed and responsible actions. Using knowledge and information interactively requires individuals to:

- ✚ Recognize and determine what is not known;
- ✚ Identify, locate and access appropriate information sources (including assembling knowledge and information in cyberspace);
- ✚ Evaluate the quality, appropriateness and value of that information, as well as its sources; and
- ✚ Organize knowledge and information” (OECD 2005, p. 11).

## Contexts and Selected Assumptions of the Strategic Model for Information Literacy Development

### The Conceptual Context

Information Literacy is frequently recognized as an essential competence enabling people effective adaptation to the rapidly changing cultural, social, technical, work-related etc. environment, inter alia – because of it's being a basis for lifelong learning. In the UNESCO's *Alexandria Proclamation on Information Literacy and Lifelong Learning* we read: "Information Literacy (...) is crucial to the competitive advantage of individuals, enterprises (especially small and medium enterprises), regions and nations; provides the key to effective access, use and creation of content to support economic development, education, health and human services, and all other aspects of contemporary societies (...)". And also: "Information Literacy lies at the core of lifelong learning. It empowers people in all walks of life to seek, evaluate, use and create information effectively to achieve their personal, social, occupational and educational goals. It is a basic human right in a digital world and promotes social inclusion of all nations" (The Alexandria Proclamation, 2005). The cited opinions implicate the suggestion that the strategic approach is needed when projecting models for Information Literacy development.

Jeremy Shapiro and Shelley Hughes use a metaphor of „liberal art” to characterize Information Literacy. That means information competencies enable people to act „universally”, to make enlightened decisions and to manage in all walks of life. Information knowledge and skills are universal and should be common in all spheres of social life and within all social groups, used through the whole life of individuals (Shapiro; Hughes 1996). Such holistic approach to information competencies, emphasizing their introductory character, universality, generality and continuous use, constitutes the major conceptual framework for creating strategic models of Information Literacy development.

That general statement involves the consequent, more detailed assumptions, related to the principles of the European area of Lifelong learning (Międzyresortowy Zespół do spraw uczenia się przez całe życie, w tym Krajowych Ram Kwalifikacji 2011, p. 3-4). Implementation of these rules of LLL has been named the most important strategic goal for the European cooperation in the domain of education and training until the year 2020 (Konkluzje ... 2009).

The following fundamental assumptions, making the basis for the strategic model for IL development, ought to be accepted.

1. It is reasonable to connect the model – seen in the context of creating the Europe-wide Information Literacy development strategy – with the other EU actions and conceptual frames, particularly those pertaining to lifelong learning and education. At the moment, the most important enterprise in this regard seems to be EQF – the European Qualification Framework for Lifelong Learning. In the European Commission document we read: "As an instrument for the promotion of lifelong

learning, the EQF encompasses all levels of qualifications acquired in general, vocational as well as academic education and training. Additionally, the framework addresses qualifications acquired in initial and continuing education and training. The eight reference levels are described in terms of learning outcomes. (...) In the EQF a learning outcome is defined as a statement of what a learner knows, understands and is able to do on completion of a learning process. The EQF therefore emphasizes the results of learning rather than focusing on inputs such as length of study. Learning outcomes are specified in three categories – as knowledge, skills and competence” (European Commission 2008, p. 3). Thus, the model should encompass all forms of learning, because information competencies can be acquired as a result of participating in different, equally important paths of education, including formal, informal and non-formal ones. This is related to the open attitude towards qualifications in general, and towards information competencies in particular. These can be gained independently of place, time and form of learning, “irrespective of the learning or institutional context from basic education, through school and unskilled worker levels up to doctoral or senior professional levels” (European Commission 2008, p. 4). The important thing is the appropriate description of Information Literacy competencies in terms of levels of qualification, learning outcomes and amount of work needed as well as ensuring comparability of the IL qualifications against the listed criteria.

2. Anyone may acquire information competences, not only pupils and students, but also adults working or not, senior citizens and small children.
3. A human being is placed in the center of the strategic model of IL development. This means that evaluation of any organizations engaged in the information competences development has to be done indirectly, through evaluation of the learning outcomes achieved by particular individuals. Here, as benchmarks or exemplars might be used *OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)* (OECD 2011a), *Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)* (OECD 2011b) and, of course, existing Information Literacy standards and performance measures (see Cisek; Próchnicka 2010).
4. Information Literacy development can only be achieved by implementing coherent policy and cooperation of different Information Literacy stakeholders of various backgrounds. Amongst them are (in alphabetical order)
  - a. Business organizations
  - b. Citizens (“everybody”) themselves
  - c. European Union agencies, in particular those connected with the education, lifelong learning and information society areas, e.g. EACEA (the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency)
  - d. Interested researchers, scholars
  - e. Libraries and the library and information science (LIS) communities and associations
  - f. Local authorities
  - g. National governments, including appropriate ministries (of education, information society, regional development etc.)
  - h. NGO – nongovernmental organizations

- i. Other interested individuals, e.g. Information Literacy bloggers, activists
  - j. School authorities, schools of different level and type, headmasters and teachers
  - k. Students
  - l. Universities and other higher education bodies
5. New approach to financing the IL education is needed. One should accept competitiveness in this respect, because what matters here are individual human beings and their achievements, that is – the learning outcomes. Being effective in „providing” appropriate learning outcomes should be the main criteria to select institutions providing training in Information Literacy.

## The “Real-life” Context

The second dimension of creating the strategic model of Information Literacy development, complementary to the theoretical assumptions recognizing IL as a key competence in the knowledge based economy/society, is made by analysis of the 87 „real-life” Information Literacy initiatives, “good practice cases” taking place in Europe in the years 1994-2010. This has been done within the EMPATIC project, and published in two reports *D1.1 – Report on Current State and Best Practices in Information Literacy (Final)* (Basili 2010) and *D4.2 – Illustrative Case Studies (Final)* (Cisek et al. 2010). One of the main goals was to find and describe the 20 “most illustrative” or “educative” Information Literacy projects in the school, higher education, adult and vocational learning sectors, in formal and non-formal settings, that might be used as a source of inspiration – coming from “practice” – for building the strategic model of Information Literacy development. Choosing the 20 most representative IL initiatives was a demanding exercise. Partly, because of the great diversity of the IL projects themselves, but mainly – due to the frequent lack of complete and reliable information about particular IL actions in Europe.

Finally, the following selection and evaluation criteria have been used:

1. Country – in which the IL project, initiative or activity had been implemented or developed;
2. EU funding program – being the source of funds for an initiative. It has been assumed that most of the selected projects are financed or co-financed by EU;
3. Focus, initiative-type, including sub-categories –
  - a. Initiatives/projects aimed at development of IL as a discipline of study (Culture of Information)
    - i. R&D
    - ii. Surveys
    - iii. Theory development (concepts etc.)
  - b. Initiatives/projects aimed at development of IL as social objective (e.g. the education policy)
    - i. Awareness development, policy and recommendation initiatives
    - ii. Education goals and strategies development
    - iii. Curricula development
    - iv. Resources and tools for learners, teachers, users’ development

- v. Teaching of teachers (IL educators) development
  - c. Initiatives/projects aimed at development of IL as cognitive acquisition of individuals;
- 4. Learning sector – to identify the best practices segmented by the educational environment. The sub-categories were projects’ destination for users groups –
  - a. School
  - b. HE = Higher Education
  - c. VET = Vocational
  - d. Adult
  - e. Transversal
- 5. Literacy area – to identify the most important areas of Information Literacy or related Computer Literacy, Digital Literacy, Internet Literacy, Media Literacy, etc.
- 6. Geographical/social range – with sub-categories that indicate the area of activity and the geographical and social range of an initiative –
  - a. Local (within one region or institution, one society)
  - b. National
  - c. European
  - d. International
- 7. Type of institution, organization, stakeholder – responsible for a project implementation –
  - a. Official (governmental) bodies
    - i. UE entities
    - ii. National governments, parliaments and their official agencies
    - iii. Local authorities, committees
    - iv. Other official bodies (e.g. international organizations)
  - b. Non-official bodies
    - i. Academia
    - ii. Business, companies
    - iii. LIS community
    - iv. NGOs
    - v. Professional bodies
    - vi. Research bodies
    - vii. Other

The analysis of the chosen 20 IL enterprises in Europe (see Cisek et al. 2010) brought some noteworthy findings.

First of all, no coherent Information Literacy policy actions are undertaken by the interested “industries” or societies, often a lack of involvement, commitment and funding from the government agencies, local authorities or the EU is observed within the selected “cases”, the strategic thinking is frequently missing. This observation is particularly important in relation to the school and higher education (HE) learning sectors, where the formal and – to some extent – compulsory education takes place. There admittedly have been successful projects in these sectors, for example including Information Literacy into curricula, preparing organization-wide IL policy, creation of tutorials (e.g. Information Literacy project of



Staffordshire University, Information Literacy module of National University of Ireland Galway, Trinity College Dublin, University College Cork, MA in Information Literacy at the University of Sheffield), but mainly of the local impact and range. The lack of strategic approach in the area of IL, demonstrated by governmental and local authorities responsible for the school and HE sectors, is particularly alarming. It has to be remembered that opportunity to acquire information skills during the formal compulsory education is the essential condition for the future information activity of all citizens in the context of lifelong learning.

Secondly, among the IL projects representative for the vocational education and training (VET) and adult learning sectors, particularly important because of the presence of some elements of strategic thinking, are initiatives under the auspices of UNESCO. These elements might give valuable suggestions to be used when formulating the concept of IL development strategic model, including:

1. supporting the processes of creation of national information policies, promoting the equal access to information
  - a. The Information for All Programme (IFAP) – established in 2000, aiming at creating the new opportunities of the information age and equitable societies through better access to information. IFAP try to promote and widen access to information in the public domain through the organization, digitization and preservation of information, support training, continuing education and lifelong learning in the fields of communication, information and informatics, support the production of local content and foster the availability of indigenous knowledge through basic literacy and ICT literacy training; promote the use of international standards and best practices in communication, information and informatics in UNESCO's fields of competence, and promote information and knowledge networking at local, national, regional and international levels (UNESCO 2011)
2. raising the qualifications of the library, archive, media and other information and documentation professionals to better utilize their competencies in the area of creating proper environment and initiating actions facilitating informal and non-formal learning of every citizen
  - a. Training of Information Professionals [http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=4476&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=4476&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
  - b. Training of Media Professionals [http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=4475&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=4475&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
3. educating future teachers or trainers in the domain of Information Literacy – to be the IL leaders in their local societies or neighborhoods
  - a. Training-the-Trainers in Information Literacy [http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=25623&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=25623&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

Thirdly, an interesting illustration of proper strategic thinking in the area of IL development is taking advantage of already existing organizations, their informational and educational potential and knowledgeable/skillful personnel. The ENTITLE project (Europe's New Libraries Together In Transversal Learning Environments) makes a good example here. On its webpage <http://www.entitlelll.eu/eng/Assessment-Framework> we read "ENTITLE aims to provide library and partner adult professionals, researchers and decision makers in Europe with a common, validated means of collecting and presenting data on the impact of their learning provision on learners, across their major target learning 'sectors' and to establish a basis upon which they can in future establish trends and developments in a manner which is convincing to strategic policy makers, funding bodies in the education, culture employment sectors etc.". And further at <http://www.entitlelll.eu/eng/About/Objectives> – "Public libraries have a number of natural advantages including: their strong roots in local communities, a tradition of partnership with schools and provision of learning-oriented services of various kinds for children; and an increasingly established role as part of Lifelong Learning 'landscape'. There is a strong political assumption, both implicit and explicit, that informal/non-formal learning organizations such as libraries have a vital job to do by supporting individual learners' needs, providing them with choices and flexibility, helping people to continue and return to learning, enabling adults to get a job or qualification, signposting and inspiring people to take up other courses, helping children to learn and supporting schools in diversifying children's experiences".

## Strategic Model for Information Literacy Development – the Formal and Methodological Considerations

In the preceding section of this paper we have tried to demonstrate that the strategic approach to Information Literacy development has strong grounds, resulting both from the educational strategies elaborated in Europe, based on the concept of lifelong learning, as well as the necessity of subordinating the existing numerous, though incidental and fragmentary IL initiatives to the unified, coherent policy.

Nevertheless, building any strategy for IL development is not an easy task, because of a few reasons.

- ✚ First of all, the notion and practice of Information Literacy themselves – as the previous research has shown (Basili 2008) (Batorowska 2009) (Derfert-Wolf 2005) – are multi-dimensional, have various aspects and contexts.
- ✚ Secondly, there is no established or commonly agreed-on methodology for working out the Information Literacy strategies. Sheila Corral, a well-known researcher in the field, states: "Further research is needed to review existing strategy models, tools and techniques and assess their suitability for IL strategy development (...)" and continues "Other areas suggested for future research include the investigation of relationships between IL strategies and other organizational strategies (...); and comparative studies of IL strategy development in different sectors (...)" (Corral 2008, p. 35).

- ✚ Thirdly, although there exist some formal strategic documents related to Information Literacy development, but they are of narrow scope and constrained to one organization, in particular – a university. Moreover, those strategies are usually not “proper” ones, that is – do not encompass all required elements and issues (Corrall 2008).

When creating a strategic model for Information Literacy development one has to take into account the two following aspects:

- ✚ The formal structure of a strategy – what should any strategic document include – e.g. components, frame, length, appendices, etc.
- ✚ The subject content – related to a particular area of Information Literacy, learning sector, etc.

Valuable guidelines for the content and structure of Information Literacy development strategies – in the teaching/learning environments – are given in the *Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline by the American Library Association / Association of College and Research Libraries (ALA/ACRL 2003)*. Although the terms “strategy” or “strategic model” are not used in that document, the elements proposed there are relevant to strategic thinking, and include:

- ✚ Mission
- ✚ Goals and Objectives
- ✚ Planning
- ✚ Administrative and Institutional Support
- ✚ Articulation with the Curriculum
- ✚ Collaboration
- ✚ Pedagogy
- ✚ Staffing
- ✚ Outreach
- ✚ Assessment/Evaluation.

To conclude, any strategy should embrace at least the following parts:

- ✚ Context – accepted values, assumptions, background, definitions, environment, situation analysis
- ✚ Mission/vision statement
- ✚ Aims/Goals/Objectives
- ✚ Actions – action plans, responsibilities, targets, timescales
- ✚ Standards
- ✚ Stakeholders
- ✚ Outcomes, performance measures
- ✚ References
- ✚ Appendices, e.g. illustrative best practice cases (Cisek; Próchnicka 2010).

At the moment, as it has been mentioned earlier, there are no ready tools or techniques for creating Information Literacy development strategies. The appropriate knowledge and methods coming from the Management Sciences achievements might be used here. Protzko,

reviewing already cited Corral (2008) paper, notices: “One or more strategic management models or tools available could improve IL strategy development, consistency, and coherency. (...) Conforming to strategic planning norms could strengthen IL strategy. Elements of models from the public or private sectors might be tailored to meet the specific needs of IL strategies. Further research could identify suitable strategy models for IL development. The process of implementing IL strategy should also be considered in future research” (Protzko 2008).

Issues of limitations associated with creating and implementing strategic models (strategies, operational plans) as well as conditions of the effectiveness of the strategic approach are being brought up by many authors. Their ideas may be used for creating the strategic model for the IL development.

George Philip (2007) discusses the purposefulness of any strategy building in the today’s quickly changing environment and notes that strategic planning is rather characteristic for the static settings. He – in that context – gives special attention to the success factors. The key success factor of strategies is their implementability. Philip writes: “... one of the major causes of SISP [System of Information Strategic Planning – S.C.; M.P] failure is the lack of understanding and emphasis on implementation issues. (...) These views are also in line with the calls (...) for an ongoing process of evaluation and review, and the consideration of implementation as a critical issue. Unfortunately, many planning decisions/documents and recommendations, rather than being proactively implemented, are left to gather dust on the shelf or in many instances implemented only partially” (Philip 2007, p. 250-251).

In addition, implementation of national lifelong learning (LLL) strategies has also been encountering difficulties, what in turn causes restraints and delays in introducing the IL development strategies. Jarl Bengtsson (2009) has identified and described several types of problems connected with implementing national LLL strategies, being frequently similar to difficulties recognized when building the strategic model for IL development in frames of the EMPATIC project. Bengtsson lists the three main reasons here: “The first one is the lack of workable and agreed strategies for implementation. Today’s agreed definition of LLL as learning from the cradle to the grave as far too vague, and not very useful in concrete policy action. (...) The second reason is the lack of a coherent and equitable system of financing LLL for all. (...) Existing systems tend to contribute to further inequalities in access to learning and education, not least for adults. The third reason for the slow implementation of LLL is the quite often underestimated resistance to change among the main stakeholders in the traditional system of education. We must always bear in mind that LLL represents a radical change from existing norms and patterns of learning as it is practiced today in traditional front-end education. Teachers and school leaders are still today trained for transmitting content and learning based on principles and norms dating back to the beginning of the last century. (...) Therefore, there seems to be an urgent need to reform teacher training in favor of a greater emphasis on how to teach students “to learn to learn” (Bengtsson 2009, p.4).

Sheila Corral (2008) has analyzed strategic documents, connected with the Information Literacy development in the higher education sector in United Kingdom as well as examined

possibilities of the application into the area of IL – the already existing, elaborated within Management Studies – methods and tools of creating development strategies (for companies, sectors etc.). She found that „all the strategies aimed to integrate IL into subject curricula by engaging stakeholders in collaborative partnerships. Common approaches included the adoption of professional standards and development of new methods of delivery, including e-learning. (...) Most strategy documents provided extensive contextualization, demonstrating the relevance of IL to corporate concerns; many included case studies of good practice. Few documents conformed to strategic planning norms: none provided mission or vision statements and several contained poorly specified objectives. The study concluded that corporate strategy tools, such as stakeholder mapping, portfolio analysis and customization models, could strengthen IL strategies. Future research could test the use of such analytical techniques to advance IL strategies in higher education and other sectors” (Corrall 2008, p. 26).

In spite of differences related to the area under strategic planning (information systems, national LLL implementation strategies, Information Literacy development in higher education) and the range of modeling, all cited authors agree that:

- + Broad contextualization of any strategy is needed,
- + Its scope has to be precisely specified,
- + Any strategy should be workable and its implementation, including preparing operational plans should be foreseen,
- + Marketing and PR should be undertaken to involve different internal and external stakeholders.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

To sum up, the desirable features of the strategic model for Information Literacy development are – among others – as follows:

- + The model is not a model of Information Literacy itself – but a model for Information Literacy development
- + Context is made of the European and national strategies for lifelong learning, includes EQF (European Qualification Framework) and National Qualifications Frameworks (NQF), and information access policies
- + The model is holistic, aiming at sustainable development of IL
- + The IL development strategic model is general (not generalized = simplified), allowing to “deduce” sub-models (for different sectors, institutions, regions etc.) and comprehensive, that is taking into account various possible conditions, contexts, forms, instances, realizations, etc.
- + IL development may be accomplished not only by learning, including school, higher education, adult, vocational, formal, informal, non-formal, „constrained” or lifelong education but also by other efforts/actions, including – awareness, organizational, political, research/scholarly, social, etc.

- ✚ The strategy for IL development is generic, also – not associated with any particular institution, so already existing methodological tools, prepare for creating corporate strategies are not of great use here.

“The impact should be put more on building strategies for the sustainable implementation of the IL policy, the inclusion of government, academic and other bodies’ activity. The emphasis ought to be put on:

- ✚ Development of transnational validated taxonomy of Information Literacy strategies
- ✚ Results of transnational mapping of distribution of Information Literacy strategies
- ✚ Guidelines for teachers and trainers to facilitate optimal use of user and student Information Literacy strategies” (Cisek et al. 2010).

“To create functional, detailed, and – what is most important – practically implementable strategic models for Information Literacy development in Europe further work is needed, going into two directions:

- ✚ working out the proper formal structure of strategic documents, adequate for the Information Literacy area
- ✚ working out the specific, learning sector oriented IL strategies content

This can only be done by the team-work of co-operating IL stakeholders of various backgrounds” (Cisek; Próchnicka 2010).

Information Literacy development ought to be a matter of strategic thinking, not left to library and information community only, and ad hoc actions. The strategy should be prepared by the key stakeholders in the process, working collaboratively.

## References

1. ALA/ACRL (1989). Presidential Committee on Information Literacy: Final Report. <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/whitepapers/presidential.cfm>
2. ALA/ACRL (2003). Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline. <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/characteristics.cfm>
3. ALA/ACRL (2010). Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency.cfm>
4. Basili, Carla (2008). Theorems of Information Literacy. A mathematical-like approach to the discourse of Information Literacy. In: Series III: ePublications of the Institute ILS of the Jagiellonian University. Ed. by Maria Kocójowa. No 5. Library: The Key to Users’ Success. Kraków: Instytut Informacji Naukowej i Bibliotekoznawstwa UJ. [http://www-old.inib.uj.edu.pl/wyd\\_iinb/s3\\_z5/basili-n.pdf](http://www-old.inib.uj.edu.pl/wyd_iinb/s3_z5/basili-n.pdf)
5. Basili, Carla (2010). D1.1 – Report on Current State and Best Practices in Information Literacy (Final). <http://empat-ic.eu/pol/Reports/D1.1-Report-on-Current-State-and-Best-Practices-in-Information-Literacy-Final>

6. Batorowska, Hanna (2009). Kultura informacyjna w perspektywie zmian w edukacji. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
7. Bengtsson, Jarl (2009). National Strategies for Implementing Life Long Learning (LLL): an International Perspective. <http://pure.pascalobservatory.org/sites/default/files/National%20Strategies%20for%20Implementing%20LLL%20-%20Jarl%20Bengtsson.pdf>
8. Cisek, Sabina; Krakowska, Monika; Próchnicka, Maria (2008). Information literacy education of pupils and students in Poland – diagnosis of the educational situation. In: Information Literacy at the crossroad of Education and Information Policies in Europe. Ed. by Carla Basili. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, p. 229-247.
9. Cisek, Sabina; Krakowska, Monika; Próchnicka, Maria; Wójcik, Magdalena (2010). D4.2 – Illustrative Case Studies (Final). <http://empat-ic.eu/pol/Reports/D4.2-Illustrative-Case-Studies>
10. Cisek, Sabina; Próchnicka, Maria (2010). D4.1 – Strategic Models for Information Literacy (Final). <http://empat-ic.eu/pol/Reports/D4.1-Strategic-Models-for-Information-Literacy>
11. Corral, Sheila (2008). Information literacy strategy development in higher education: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Information Management* Vol. 28, p. 26-37.
12. Derfert-Wolf, Lidia (2005). Information Literacy – koncepcje i nauczanie umiejętności informacyjnych. *Biuletyn EBIB* nr 1 (62). <http://ebib.oss.wroc.pl/2005/62/derfert.php>
13. European area of lifelong learning (2009). [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/education\\_training\\_youth/lifelong\\_learning/c11054\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/lifelong_learning/c11054_en.htm)
14. European Commission (2008). Explaining the European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning. [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/eqf/brochexp\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/eqf/brochexp_en.pdf)
15. European Communities (2007). Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. European Reference Framework. [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/ll-learning/keycomp\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/ll-learning/keycomp_en.pdf)
16. Konkluzje Rady Unii Europejskiej z dnia 12 maja 2009 r. w sprawie strategicznych ram europejskiej współpracy w dziedzinie kształcenia i szkolenia „ET2020” (2009). Dz. Urz. UE C 119 z 28.05.2009, s. 2-9.
17. Międzyresortowy Zespół do spraw uczenia się przez całe życie, w tym Krajowych Ram Kwalifikacji (2011). Perspektywa uczenia się przez całe życie. Warszawa 2011. [http://bip.men.gov.pl/images/stories/Karolina/plll2011\\_02\\_04.pdf](http://bip.men.gov.pl/images/stories/Karolina/plll2011_02_04.pdf)
18. OECD (2005). The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies. Executive Summary <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/47/61/35070367.pdf>
19. OECD (2011a). OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). [http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,3417,en\\_32252351\\_32235731\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,3417,en_32252351_32235731_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)
20. OECD (2011b). Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC). [http://www.oecd.org/document/57/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_33927\\_34474617\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/57/0,3343,en_2649_33927_34474617_1_1_1_1,00.html)

21. Philip, George (2007). IS Strategic Planning for Operational Efficiency. *Information Systems Management* Vol. 24 Issue 3, p. 247-264.
22. Protzko, Shandra (2008). Information Literacy Strategy Development: Study Prescribes Strategic Management Framework for Academic Institutions. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* Vol. 3 No. 4. <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/4149>
23. Shapiro, Jeremy J.; Hughes, Shelley K. (1996). Information Literacy as a Liberal Art. *Eudocom Review* Vol. 31 No. 2. <http://net.educause.edu/apps/er/review/reviewarticles/31231.html>
24. The Alexandria Proclamation (2005). Beacons of the Information Society. The Alexandria Proclamation on Information Literacy and Lifelong Learning. UNESCO. <http://archive.ifla.org/III/wsis/BeaconInfSoc.html>
25. The Prague Declaration (2003). Towards an Information Literate Society. <http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/19636/11228863531PragueDeclaration.pdf/PragueDeclaration.pdf>
26. UNESCO (2011). About Information for All Programme – IFAP. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/intergovernmental-programmes/information-for-all-programme-ifap/about-ifap/>