****

**InformAll (formerly RIDLs) criteria for describing, reviewing and evaluating practice in information literacy** **training**

**INTRODUCTORY NOTES**

The criteria are intended to describe and review practice in information literacy training for higher education researchers. They relate to all interventions aimed at developing researchers’ information-handling knowledge, skills and competencies, whether in the form of face-to-face sessions/courses or digital/online resources (thereafter referred to in this document as ‘courses or resources’). They serve three purposes:

1. Helping institutional staff who design and deliver courses and resources to describe and review them; the aim being to provide a structured and recognized way of presenting such interventions in online resources and demonstrating their value.
2. Providing a simple means of evaluating courses and resources, for use within or outside the institutions in which the interventions have been compiled; the aim being to assess their suitability and usefulness as transferable resources.
3. Serving as a prompt for a dialogue between training practitioners and learners, and providing a structure for such a dialogue.

The criteria thus take the form of a series of structured questions, set out in a table under two broad headings: describing and reviewing courses or resources; and evaluating courses and resources. These two parts are complementary, and in both cases, the criteria are articulated around a series of questions addressed directly at practitioners.

However, the criteria are not intended as a prescriptive or rigid tool, nor as a means of assessing the performance of training practitioners: instead, they provide the latter with a self-help framework to assist them with the formulation and delivery of their resources. Practitioners may additionally use the criteria as a form of accreditation, or as a basis for providing guidance / support in the devising of training material.

The full criteria are available at <http://www.researchinfonet.org/infolit/ridls/ridls-criteria/> . The pages below are a shortened version, structured in exactly the same way as the full document, but offering a preliminary checklist consisting mostly of questions for which the answer is either yes or no. For those who wish, the full criteria provide an opportunity to explain in greater detail the approach taken by practitioners.



**The criteria are endorsed by the CILIP Information Literacy Group**

**InformAll (formerly RIDLs) criteria for describing, reviewing and evaluating courses and resources – preliminary checklist**

The full InformAll criteria enable practitioners to design, review and assess courses and resources in depth. You can use this preliminary checklist to help decide whether the full criteria should be applied to a particular intervention. Answering NO is an indication that you may need to refer to the full criteria in order to fully explore the situation. It is recommended that the full criteria should be used in the design of any new course.

**Part A: criteria for describing and reviewing your course or resource**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preamble** | | | | |
| Have you defined clear aims, objectives and learning outcomes for the course/resource? | | | | Y/N |
| **1.1 Learners: who is it aimed at? Name of course/resource:** | | | | |
| * + 1. What career stage(s) is the course/resource addressed at? * Undergraduate student * Postgraduate/research student * Postdoctoral/Research Fellow * Tenured researcher (lecturer, reader) * Professorial/senior level * Other |  | | | |
| * + 1. What disciplinary area(s) is the course/resource addressed at? | |  | | |
| **1.2 Need** | | | | |
| * + 1. Have you undertaken an assessment of learners’ needs? | | | Y/N | |
| * + 1. Does the course/resource fit the broader professional needs of the learners? | | | Y/N/NA | |
| * + 1. Does the course/resource fit with your institutional and/or departmental policy and practice on researcher development? | | | Y/N | |
| * + 1. Does the course/resource relate to expectations or requirements from relevant professional bodies? | | | Y/N | |
| * + 1. Can the course/resource be transferred or adapted to suit other needs or contexts from the one for which it was designed? | | | Y/N | |
| * + 1. Is the course/resource accessible, particularly for learners with special needs or disabilities such as visual impairment? | | | Y/N | |
| **1.3 Demand** | | | | |
| * + 1. Is the course/resource a response to demand from learners? | | | | Y/N |
| * + 1. Is participation by learners in previous similar training activities a factor in helping you determine demand? | | | | Y/N |
| **1.4 Meeting requirements** | | | | |
| * + 1. Does the course/resource or resource take into account of: | | | |  |
| * Current level of skill | | | | Y/N |
| * Years of experience | | | | Y/N |
| * Disciplinary areas | | | | Y/N |
| * + 1. Are there any prerequisites in terms of what learners need to know already in order to derive the most benefit from the course? | | | | Y/N |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * 1. **Areas of information literacy covered** | | | |
| What area(s) of information literacy does the course/resource cover?   * Information searching and discovery * Critical evaluation and analysis of information sources * Citation and referencing * Data management and curation * Plagiarism, fraud, copyright and other relevant legal issues * Data protection and/or freedom of information * Publishing and dissemination of research results (including open access) * Other (please specify) |  |  | |
| **2.2 Learning outcomes** | | | |
| Have you communicated the aims, objectives and learning outcomes from the course/resource? | | | Y/N |
| **2.3 Use of frameworks** | | | |
| Is the course/resource informed by   * Researcher Development Framework (RDF) * Seven Pillars of Information Literacy * Other (please specify, e.g. QAA Subject Benchmark Statements) | | | Y/N  Y/N  Y/N |
| **2.4 RDF Information Lens** | | | |
| Have you made use of the Researcher Development Framework’s (RDF) Information Lens? | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3.1 Approach** | | |
| What is the format of the course/resource?   * + Classroom-based courses (lecture or workshop)   + Individual tuition   + Online courses   + Training material (printed or digital)   + Other |  | |
| **3.2 Training providers** | | |
| * + 1. Who designs and delivers the course/resource? * Library * Faculty * Graduate school * IS department * Other (please specify) |  | |
| * + 1. Do the trainers all have the relevant level of skills and qualification? | | Y/N |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3.3 Support, dissemination and promotion** | |
| * + 1. Is there sufficient support required to run the course or manage the resource in terms of: |  |
| * Personnel | Y/N |
| * Facilities | Y/N |
| * Finance | Y/N |
| * + 1. Is the course/resource well-advertised? | Y/N |
| 1. If the resource is online, is it available outside the institution? | Y/N/not applicable |
| 1. Has it been deposited in online facilities such as Jorum? | Y/N/not applicable |
| 1. Is the resource free to use outside the institution? | Y/N/not applicable |

**Part B: criteria for evaluating your course or resource**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4.1 Numbers** | | | |
| How many learners have taken part in the course or used the resource? | |  | |
| **4.2 Feedback** | | | |
| Did participants give feedback on: | |  | |
| * Whether learning objectives met | | Y/N/didn’t ask | |
| * Quality of course/resource | | Y/N/didn’t ask | |
| * Originality of course/resource | | Y/N/didn’t ask | |
| * Attractiveness of course/resource | | Y/N/didn’t ask | |
| **5.1 Impact on knowledge and skills** | | | |
| Have you evaluated changes in learners’ knowledge, skills and competencies resulting from the course/resource? | | | |
| **5.2 Behaviour and attitudes** | | | |
| Have you evaluated improvements that may be attributable to the course/resource in terms of:   * Attitudes * Confidence * Behaviour * Performance and practice |  | | |
| **5.3 High-level impact** | | | |
| * + 1. Have you evaluated the broader impact of the course/resource in terms of: * Extent to which recipients have become better learners and/or researchers * Ways in which the institution has benefitted |  | | |
| * + 1. Has there been any feedback from the departments in which the recipients study/work? | | | Y/N |
| **5.4 Challenges/barriers** | | | |
| Have you encountered any challenges and/or barriers (including lack of resources) when implementing the course/resource? | | | Y/N |
| **5.5 Steps taken** | | | |
| Have you taken any steps to improve the course/resource as a result to any of the evaluation, as covered by the previous questions? | | | Y/N |