Scholarship is a Conversation
• What barriers exist when entering into the conversation of scholarship (or research)?
• How can we gain greater understanding of topics by examining the connections and ongoing narratives between different scholarly pieces?
• How do responsibilities shift when participating in the conversation as consumers, critics, or creators of information?

Research Evolves
• How could understanding of a topic be improved through uncertainty in the process of research?
• How can varying needs shape the importance of certain types of information?
• How can we know what we don’t know, and how can we figure out what is not there?

Authority is Contextual
• How or why do we decide if someone has authority on a topic?
• What might be expected of us as we become authorities ourselves?
• How might biases privilege some sources of authority and silence others, especially in terms of others’ worldviews, gender, race, sexual orientation, socio-economic class, etc.?

Knowledge is Co-constructed
• How can failure and mistakes help us in finding information?
• How might knowledge evolve to be co-constructed (is there such a thing as a single owner/creator of knowledge)?
• How do we critique and create information that can strengthen co-constructed knowledge within the conversation of research?

Information is Power
• How might the use or absence of citations impact the conversation of research?
• How could information be wielded by powerful interests in ways that marginalize others?
• How could something like open access change creation, publishing, and learning?
## Information Literacy Frames & Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship is a Conversation</th>
<th>Research Evolves</th>
<th>Authority is Contextual</th>
<th>Knowledge is Co-constructed</th>
<th>Information is Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recognize the metaphor of conversation to describe the purpose of research</td>
<td>• Formulate research questions based on curiosity and gaps in information or data available</td>
<td>• Determine attributes of authoritative information for different needs, with the understanding that context plays a role</td>
<td>• Critique and evaluate information to contribute to the construction of knowledge and make it stronger</td>
<td>• Value the Why of using citations, rather than solely focusing on the How (go beyond just avoiding plagiarism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify the contribution of specific scholarly pieces and varying perspectives to a disciplinary knowledge conversation</td>
<td>• Reflect on how the research process is iterative and requires persistence</td>
<td>• Recognize that traditional notions of granting authority might hinder diverse ideas and worldviews</td>
<td>• Implement strategies to recognize co-constructed knowledge and the role of a co-creator</td>
<td>• Identify scholarly publication practices and how they provide and/or hinder access to scholarly information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to the scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, through the lens of becoming a creator/critic</td>
<td>• Apply research methods that are appropriate for the need, context, and type of inquiry</td>
<td>• Acknowledge that oneself may be seen as an authority in a particular area, and recognize the responsibilities entailed</td>
<td>• Reflect on the usefulness of making mistakes in the search process and how research is not solely transactional</td>
<td>• Identify why some groups/individuals may be underrepresented or systematically marginalized within the systems that produce and disseminate information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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