



ILG research Bursary Proforma

April 2015.

(NB all boxes expand) (See pages 3 & 4 for instructions)

1. Project Title (maximum 10 words)

Awareness and ownership of information literacy skills within trainee teachers.

2. Principal Investigator

Andrew Walsh

Director, Innovative Libraries Ltd. 195 Wakefield Road, Lepton, Huddersfield. HD8 0BL.

Also Teaching Fellow, University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, Huddersfield. HD1 3DH.

Phone: 0795 1592748

andywalsh@innovativelibraries.org.uk

Publications: <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/view/authors/Walsh=3AAndrew=3A=3A.html>

Website: <http://innovativelibraries.org.uk/>

3. Co-Investigator(s)

n/a

4. Partner(s)

The Education and Training Consortium, Clare McClusky Dean, York St John University

5. Summary of the project – If the project is funded, ILG will use this in any publicity material or announcements. (Maximum 300 words)

Where does “How to teach...” & “What is...” info come from for new teachers and how can we influence this? This study asked a number of trainee teachers, along with their teacher trainers, in 2 universities and a number of FE colleges in England questions designed to elicit some answers to these questions. The trainee teachers were spread across a wide range of sectors, from Primary Education, to Adult Education in the community.

Primarily based on free text answers to a survey, the study looked for patterns in the beliefs expressed on what information skills are important and who should teach them, and aims to develop recommendations for where it may be possible to intervene and influence those beliefs for those interesting in building the information literacy of students and relationships between teachers and learning support workers such as librarians.

6. Risk assessment – Please state any risks you envisage on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being low and 5 being a high risk

| Risk outline | score | contingency |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| Access to staff and students | 1 | Range of courses from various settings available. |
| Availability of PI | 3 | PI has recently gone part-time in his job at the university, so has capacity. Clare McClusky Dean capable of stepping up to CI if needed, though this may extend time taken to complete. |
| Response rate low | 3 | Have access to tutors so have alternative routes to students |

7. Stakeholders

Key stakeholders:

Information Literacy Group.

The Education and Training Consortium, a partnership of Post-Compulsory Education and Training (PCET) providers delivering professional development and training, including teaching qualifications to staff working in a wide range of Post-16 settings.

The University of Huddersfield, who deliver education qualifications to students working, and intending to work in, Early Years, Primary, Secondary and Post-Compulsory settings.

York St John University, who also offer initial teacher training to students intending to work in Primary and Secondary settings, including undergraduate degrees in Primary Education with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) awards.

Other Stakeholders:

Schools, Colleges and other educational and training settings where the respondents may work.

School Libraries.

School Library Association (SLA).

School Libraries Group (SLG).

Academic and Research Libraries Group (ARLG).

Council for Learning Resources in Colleges (CoLRiC).

8. Aims and Objectives

Aim:

To investigate how trainee teachers and teacher trainers feel about information literacy, the skills that are important and where they think responsibility for teaching these skills lie.

Sectors to be covered include Primary Education (Key stage 2), Secondary Education (Key Stages 3 & 4), Further Education (mainly levels 3 and 4), and other post-compulsory education (including level 3 and below delivered in community settings).

Objectives:

- 1) Identify what information skills that trainee teachers and trainers in the selected samples feel are important.
- 2) Identify how trainee teachers and trainers in the selected samples learn how to teach information skills.
- 3) Identify where trainee teachers and trainers in the selected samples feel the responsibility lies to teach information skills.
- 4) For those respondents in formal school and college settings, to explore how they currently collaborate with school or college librarians to develop students information skills.

The objectives address the following issues of concern raised by the ILG:

- * Impact of IL in vocational education at level 3 or below.
- * Impact of collaboration between librarians and teachers on students IL skills.
- * An exploration of teachers’ perceptions of IL skills and how they are developed.

9. Milestones

| | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Design and test survey instrument | | | | | | |
| Launch / Run survey | | | | | | |
| Coding / Analysis of responses | | | | | | |
| Writing up articles & reports | | | | | | |
| Preparation of seminar materials | | | | | | |
| Submit final report | | | | | | |

Key milestones are to:

Design the initial survey instrument, including time to pilot with a test group and adjust accordingly.

Launch / Run the survey. This would be done partially through interested partners forwarding on

the instrument, hence the 6 week time allowance in case of delays passing the information onwards.

Coding / Analysis. This is spread out sufficiently to allow conversations between the PI and CI.

Writing up articles / reports. Priority would be given to the journal articles, then the report to ILG, with additional materials created depending on time.

Preparation of Seminar and other training materials. These would be done last, using some of the other outputs as support materials. Packages would be created that can be sent to parties interested in receiving one so they can see the full materials in advance. At least two different workshops and two different seminars would be produced (separate materials for librarians and teacher training institutions)..

Submit final report. To include a full list of other materials produced.

Not included in the above chart is a regular task of **blog and other social media** posts, with at least 2 blog posts scheduled per month.

1 additional work day is allowed for general admin, blog posts, updating the committee and any other tasks as required, spread throughout the length of the project.

This gives a total of 20 days work spread across a 6 month period.

10. Description (Maximum 1,000 words)

This research will use a qualitative approach to investigate how trainee teachers and teachers trainers feel about information literacy, the skills that are important and where they think responsibility for teaching these skills lie.

Teachers in schools, colleges and 3rd sector organizations have the potential to be powerful players in developing the information literacy of their students. In organizations, particularly educational organizations, that have formal library services, an important part of the librarian role can be to influence these teachers.

Past research has investigated perceptions of information literacy in differing subject areas and settings. This research will be primarily be concerned with discovering where trainee teachers feel *responsibility for teaching information literacy lies* and *where they have learned how to develop information literacy in their students*. We will ask what information skills they feel are important within their area of future work in order to set the rest of the information gathered in context, rather than it being the primary aim of the data collection. For those in formal educational settings such as schools and colleges, we will additional explore *collaborations with library staff*.

The data collection will be in the form of an online survey instrument split into three sections. The first section will collect basic demographic information such as sector the respondent works within. The second section will use multiple choice questions (with limited “extra information” or “other” categories) to collect information on the information skills the respondents see as important. The third section will be free text, asking open questions around how they learn how to teach information skills, where they feel the responsibility for teaching information skills lies, and (if appropriate) how they collaborate with librarians. This structure is intended to gather rich qualitative information to meet our key objectives, balanced by some basic and quick data collection around demographics and importance of different information skills. It is intended that this mix will result in a survey instrument that can be filled in within 10 to 15 minutes to ensure as many respondents as possible.

The pool of teacher trainers and trainee teachers we have to draw upon cover initial teacher

education across all age groups from key stage one to continuing adult education in community settings attending two universities in the North of England and approximately 20 FE colleges across England. The students are a mixture of pre-service and in-service trainees, so some are new to working in educational settings, but others have been working as teaching assistants, trainers, or other support roles within education before undergoing the course and may have been teaching without formal qualifications for many years. In addition to the initial teacher qualifications (such as PGCert, PG Diploma, PGCE, BA Primary) we will also include BA Education and Training at Huddersfield which is mainly previously qualified teachers in post-compulsory settings broadening their educational qualifications. The most strongly represented groups will be those new to teaching (within their first 1-3 years) across all sectors, along with experienced teachers / trainers in post-compulsory settings. It may be desirable to broaden out the population of experienced “school age” (key stages 1-4) teachers in a future study by replicating the study with this group in mind.

The qualitative information will be coded by themes arising from the free text, qualitative questions. Themes will be generated from the data and agreed in partnership between the PI and CI. Analysis will look for overall patterns in how respondents learn how to teach information skills, it will draw out relationships between the types of skills they feel are important and who they believe should be responsible for teaching them. It will also investigate relationships between sector / type of student (e.g. key stage in school, FE, adult learners) and the themes arising from their free text answers. Where the data is sufficient, we will look for patterns in the *development* of these ideas and opinions from the newest, most inexperienced teachers, to those who have been teaching for several years.

It is expected that we will see patterns in the overall analysis and in the sector specific analysis that will allow us to draw out recommendations for people wishing to influence the skills that teachers see as important, where the gaps may be in assumptions teachers make in the teaching of information skills (where they feel the responsibilities lie), in addition to the collaborations that may be built on that teachers have identified as valuable. These recommendations will be the ones that feed into reports and training that we offer at the end of the project.

11. Dissemination strategy (maximum 500 words)

Dissemination of the results of this research will be through talks, written material, and social media. A range of stakeholders will be targeted in the dissemination stage, across the education sector. Key outputs are summarised in section 12, “outputs” below, but are described in more detail here.

1) A suitable education conference will be identified in collaboration with the Education and Training Consortium and a paper submitted. The BERA and UALL conferences are both strong contenders for this.

2) Results will be presented at an Information Literacy Conference such as LILAC or ECIL during 2016. Focus will be on how to best collaborate with teachers and trainers to enable the development of information literacy.

3) At least one journal article to be published in a non-peer reviewed journal aimed at the Education and Training sector. The journal “Teaching in Lifelong Learning” may be appropriate (<http://consortium.hud.ac.uk/journal/>), but other options will be investigated in consultation with interested parties. Preference will be given to Open Access journals.

4) At least one journal article to be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal, with preference given to Open Access journals. Final selection of journal will depend on findings. If time and results allow, two

articles will be produced focusing on different parts of the research, with one targeted at an LIS journal such as JIL, and another aimed at an Education Journal.

5) Online seminars offered to groups such as ILG, SLA, and SLG aimed at school librarians and other interested parties to encourage understanding of, and collaboration with, teachers. Wherever possible, recordings of these to be made available openly after the events.

6) A workshop on developing best practice in this area will be prepared and offered to interested parties such as the ILG, SLA, SLG groups, as well as to teacher training institutions and colleges.

7) A 1,000 word report to ILG, including recommendations and ideas for further study, will be submitted as required.

8) Blog posts and tweets will be used to send updates of the project as it progresses. Once outputs start to be produced, all of these will be linked to via the project blog. All outputs, wherever possible, will be hosted on open repositories.

If possible, the material produced will also be re-worked and expanded into a short, practical book (20-30,000 words) and published by Innovative Libraries. The electronic version of the book would be made freely available under a Creative Commons licence. This does not form part of the formal dissemination strategy as it will be outside the timescales of the project plan. Any time gained if analysis and writing up finishes ahead of schedule may be used to start this task.

12. Outputs

The following are the key outputs in summary. Further outputs may be possible, so the following is not an exhaustive list, but rather a minimum list of outputs.

Wherever possible, outputs will be made open access.

- 1) Paper to be delivered to an appropriate education conference during the 2016/2017 academic year.
- 2) Paper to be delivered to an appropriate Information Literacy related conference during the 2016/2017 academic year.
- 3) An article to be submitted to a non-peer reviewed journal.
- 4) At least one article to be submitted to a peer reviewed journal.
- 5) Online seminars offered through existing interested parties.
- 6) Workshops prepared and offered to interested parties.
- 7) A 1,000 word report to ILG.
- 8) Updates and links to other outputs will be regularly posted to social media.

13. Evaluation strategy

We will evaluate the success of the project based upon:

- 1) Milestones (as shown above) being met. These will be reported on throughout the project as key milestones and outputs are met, or as required by ILG.
- 2) Acceptance of peer-reviewed articles (showing robustness of approach taken in methodology and analysis).

3) Publication of non-peer reviewed articles (showing effectiveness of dissemination outside the formal “academic” papers and impact).

4) Hits / Downloads of all materials produced, helping to show “reach” and impact (materials will be hosted in an institutional repository to aid data collection).

5) Attendance for workshops / seminars and feedback forms for these that ask how the material will impact on practice.

6) Tracking of enquiries via email, social media, or other routes about the project (showing “reach” and impact).

Some of these will be available for the 1,000 word report to ILG, though most of these will be gathered in the months following the end of the project and will be available as a report on the impact and reach of the project on request by the ILG.

14. Financial breakdown

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Staff costs, £400 per day, 20* days | £8,000 |
| Conference (x2) dissemination costs | £1,500 |
| Costs for workshop delivery (min of 2) | £500 |
| Total | £10,000 |

*Additional minor miscellaneous costs including printing will be absorbed within the “staff costs” section.

*Charged days are for project phase only and initial workshops, most dissemination time included as part of “normal” work hours afterwards.

ILG research bursary proforma - instructions

General comments

When writing your text, please be as concise and clear as possible. Write your bid for intelligent non-expert, avoid jargon, acronyms and abbreviations. Make sure that your bid addresses as many criteria as possible as specified in the call document. All word limits are to be strictly observed – exceeding the limit specified will automatically disqualify the application.

Where sections do not apply e.g., Co-Investigator please insert 'N/A'.

1. Project Title

Short and imaginative titles are preferred that capture the imagination and convey the essence of the project.

2. Principal Investigator

Please insert your full name, job title, affiliation, postal address, telephone number and email address. **The Principal investigator must be a member of the ILG.**

3. Co-Investigator(s)

These will be colleague(s) who will share the doing of the research and will incur their own costs. Please insert full name, job title, affiliation, postal address, telephone number and email address of all co-investigators

4. Partners

These will be individuals or organisation involved in the research but not actually carrying it out and therefore do not incur a cost. These could be 'research buddies' (academics or researchers you have enlisted to help with the methodology, etc.). Please insert full name, job title, affiliation, postal address, telephone number and email address of all co-investigators

5. Summary of the project

If the project is funded ILG will use this in any publicity material or announcements. (Maximum 300 words)

This is to be written in an informal style to communicate the project to the wider community and media.

6. Risk assessment

Please state any risks you envisage on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being low and 5 being a high risk

7. Stakeholders

This is anyone who might have a direct interest or who may benefit from the project – for example school children, teachers or business owners etc.

8. Aims and Objectives

These should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely) objectives that meet funders' criteria

9. Milestones

This is the detail of the project plan and can be in the form of a simple Gantt chart.

10. Description (Maximum 1,000 words)

This is the candidates opportunity to explain the project in more detail and could address issues such as why this project and why now? Also how the project will be carried out.

11. Dissemination strategy (maximum 500 words)

How will you make sure that your work and its findings reaches the widest possible audience? This might include all or some of the following: seminars, blogs, webinars, conference papers, press releases, YouTube etc.

12. Outputs

These are tangible artefacts such as webpages, blogs, a learning and teaching resource, peer reviewed journal articles, books, book chapters and so on.

13. Evaluation strategy (maximum 500 words)

The evaluation strategy should seek to answer the following questions:

How will progress of the project be monitored?

To what extent were the project objectives met?

What was the impact of the project?

What is the added value of the project?

14. Financial breakdown

This will include:

Amount requested and why for example, salary costs, travel and subsistence and conference fees.

This should be in the form of an itemised list of each separate cost. Maximum allowed £10,000, in practice we anticipate bids for smaller amounts than this.

If you have further queries about this form please contact:

Dr Geoff Walton: geoff.walton@northumbria.ac.uk

Andrew Walsh: a.p.walsh@hud.ac.uk

Please return this form to: cilipilg@gmail.com

Deadline for bids: 1st July 2015 and 1st December 2015

Successful candidates will be notified during August 2015 and January 2016

It is envisaged that projects will start between August 2015 and March 2016