

**Training Curriculum for *Connecting Learners to Libraries*:  
Review of Recent Research and Survey Findings**

**Learning Needs for Librarians in Washington**

December 16, 2004

a research report from the

**The Information School of the University of Washington**

prepared for the

**Washington State Library**

by

**Matthew L. Saxton**

Assistant Professor

[msaxton@u.washington.edu](mailto:msaxton@u.washington.edu)

The Information School

University of Washington

Box 352840

Mary Gates Hall, Suite 370

Seattle, WA 98195-2840

tel: (206) 616-2542

fax: (206) 616-3152

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| List of Tables  | 3  |
| Executive Summary   | 4  |
| Purpose and Methodology                                     | 5  |
| Recommendations   | 7  |
| 1. Communication across Institutional Cultures              | 8  |
| 2. Establishing Common Vision and Formal Planning Process   | 15 |
| 3. Knowledge of Public and School Library Work Environments | 19 |
| 4. Information Literacy as a Community Challenge            | 22 |
| 5. Common Usage of Digital Resources                        | 25 |
| 6. Outcomes Based Assessment Techniques                     | 27 |
| Appendix A: Survey Instrument                               | 29 |
| Appendix B: Correlation Matrices                            | 34 |
| Bibliography  | 35 |

## List of Tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1. Respondent's Position by Region                                | 6  |
| Table 2. Library Staff Size by Region                                   | 6  |
| Table 3. Frequency of Communication with School Librarians              | 9  |
| Table 4. Current Types of Collaboration                                 | 10 |
| Table 5. Types of Collaboration   | 11 |
| Table 6. Type of Collaboration by Frequency of Communication            | 11 |
| Table 7. Comparison of Public Librarian and Classroom Teacher Responses | 12 |
| Table 8. Concern About Common Goals or Conflicting Management Style     | 17 |
| Table 9. Concern about Administrative Support and Cost-Sharing          | 18 |
| Table 10. Concern about Interagency Awareness                           | 20 |
| Table 11. Current Involvement in Information Literacy                   | 23 |
| Table 12. Type of Activity by Staff Size                                | 23 |
| Table 13. Type of Activity by Region                                    | 24 |

## Executive Summary

To prepare librarians to develop proposals and projects under the Connecting Learners to Libraries initiative, this report presents six recommendations for developing training curriculum. These recommendations are based on existing reviews of the literature, planning documents from Northwest agencies, and a survey of public librarians in Washington State. The recommendations are stated as learning needs:

1. Librarians need to learn how to communicate across institutional cultures and establish a formal plan for communication.
2. Librarians need to learn a process for establishing common vision and goals for information literacy across both school libraries and public libraries.
3. Public librarians and teacher-librarians need to become familiar with each other's work environments and institutional cultures.
4. Librarians need to learn how to identify the stakeholder agencies in their local community that can provide a learning opportunity for information literacy.
5. Librarians need to learn how to identify the availability of digital resources across institutions, maximize the learning opportunities provided by Statewide Database Licensing (SDL), determine the strengths and weaknesses of these resources, and identify common access structures across resources.
6. Librarians need to learn how to apply outcomes based assessment techniques for continuous evaluation of information literacy learning.

This report presents a rationale for each need and suggestions of what should be implemented in the curriculum.

## Acknowledgements

This report was sponsored by the Washington State Library (WSL) as part of a federally-funded grant program administered by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), an executive agency. Early drafts of this report were reviewed by the Steering Committee of the *Connecting Learners to Libraries Initiative*. The author wishes to thank both WSL and IMLS for their support, and give special thanks to the members of the Steering Committee for their work in the research process.

## Purpose and Methodology

The purpose of this report is to determine the learning needs of librarians who want to initiate, lead, and develop collaborative instructional projects between public and school libraries for the purpose of increasing and improving information literacy in their local K-12 student population. Recommendations from this report will be used to guide the development and implementation of a training curriculum for librarians who will be undertaking such collaborative projects as part of the *Connecting Learners to Libraries* project, a grant initiative administered by the Washington State Library (WSL). More information on this grant initiative is available at <http://www.secstate.wa.gov/library/libraries/projects/connecting>.

The recommendations reported here are based on findings gathered from existing literature reviews and planning documents from two Northwest agencies: Multnomah County Library, Oregon (MCL) and Washington State's Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction (OSPI), and a survey conducted in August 2004 by the *Connecting Learners to Libraries* project (*Connecting*) of public librarians in Washington State. These sources, cited throughout the report, informed the design of a survey for public librarians that was developed to obtain a more accurate picture of the attitudes, opinions, and experiences of public librarians and the nature of collaboration between public libraries and school libraries in Washington state.

The survey instrument (see Appendix A) consisted of 35 questions addressing 4 topics: level of communication and familiarity with local teacher-librarians, the degree and nature of previous collaboration with local schools, level of involvement in information literacy programs, and demographic characteristics of the respondent. Most of the items in the survey were close-ended multiple choice questions, but the survey also included four open-ended questions. Two questions were particularly useful in encouraging respondents to share their experiences:

**Question 28: What were the greatest rewards and benefits you discovered from participating in collaborative projects with local schools?**

**Question 29: What were the greatest challenges you discovered from participating in collaborative projects with local schools**

The survey solicited 213 returns from librarians who indicated they were directly engaged in providing library services to youth and teens. Most of the responses came from librarians working in Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, or Snohomish counties (41.3%), although other counties in Western Washington (36.2%) and Eastern Washington (21.6%) were also well represented. While just over half of the respondents identified themselves as either Children's or Youth Librarians, the sample also contained representation of managers and paraprofessional staff (see Table 1). Library size was measured by size of staff. In terms of staff size, the responses exhibit a normal distribution with the largest number of responses (31.5%) coming from libraries with

11-20 staff members (see Table 2). Overall, responses to this survey are widely distributed across a range of geographic regions, job positions, and library sizes.

Responses are from individual librarians and not institution. Multiple staff members from the same library responded to the survey. When interpreting results of the survey, readers must bear in mind that they are examining the opinions of individuals and those individuals' knowledge and awareness of local schools.

**Table 1. Respondent's Position by Region**

|                                       | Eastern Washington | Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, or Snohomish Counties | Western Washington, other counties | No Response | Total         |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Library Director                      | 4                  |   | 2                                  |             | 6<br>2.8%     |
| Branch Manager / Service Manager      | 13                 | 10  | 28                                 |             | 51<br>23.9%   |
| Children's Librarian                  | 9                  | 40  | 18                                 | 1           | 68<br>31.9%   |
| Young Adult Librarian                 | 7                  | 25  | 10                                 |             | 42<br>19.7%   |
| Adult Services Librarian              | 1                  | 10  | 4                                  |             | 15<br>7.0%    |
| Library Associate / Library Assistant | 8                  | 3   | 13                                 | 1           | 25<br>11.7%   |
| Library Clerk                         | 2                  |   | 1                                  |             | 3<br>1.4%     |
| Other                                 | 2                  |   | 1                                  |             | 3<br>1.4%     |
| Total                                 | 46<br>21.6%        | 88<br>41.3%   | 77<br>36.2%                        | 2<br>0.9%   | 213<br>100.0% |

**Table 2. Library Staff Size by Region**

|             | Eastern Washington | Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, or Snohomish Counties | Western Washington, other counties | No Response | Total         |
|-------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1-2 staff   | 14                 |   | 4                                  |             | 18<br>8.5%    |
| 3-5 staff   | 9                  | 6   | 17                                 |             | 32<br>15.0%   |
| 6-10 staff  | 10                 | 7   | 18                                 |             | 35<br>16.4%   |
| 11-20 staff | 4                  | 41  | 21                                 | 1           | 67<br>31.5%   |
| 21-40 staff | 6                  | 24  | 9                                  | 1           | 40<br>18.8%   |
| 41 or more  | 3                  | 10  | 7                                  |             | 20<br>9.4%    |
| No Response |                    |   | 1                                  |             | 1<br>0.5%     |
| Total       | 46<br>21.6%        | 88<br>41.3%   | 77<br>36.2%                        | 2<br>0.9%   | 213<br>100.0% |

## Recommendations

In 2003, the Washington State Library launched the Connecting Learners to Libraries initiative funded by the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS). The overall goal of this project is to seek to improve student's ability to effectively locate, evaluate, and use information to become independent life-long learners, and to increase students' ability to meet the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs). The specific objectives include:

1. Increase awareness in public library and school communities of K12 students' information literacy behaviors.
2. Improve public libraries staffs' knowledge of Washington State EALRs, especially as assessed in the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), and research models as they relate to K12 students' information literacy skills.
3. Improve school communities' knowledge of public library programs and services as they relate to K12 students' information literacy skills.
4. Provide funding for collaborative projects between public libraries and schools focused on improving students' information literacy skills.

In order to prepare librarians to submit effective proposals for this initiative, the Washington State Library will develop and implement a training curriculum to provide instruction on the skills necessary for participants to achieve successful planning and completion of their projects.

The objectives of the *Connecting Learners to Libraries* project are unlikely to be attained unless the training curriculum addresses the obstacles which have inhibited interagency collaboration in the past. Librarians not only need to increase their knowledge of information literacy and develop or enhance their teaching skills, but also learn skills for collaborating effectively and communicating clearly. However, acquisition of new skills and knowledge is of little value unless librarians adopt an underlying philosophy of the purpose of information literacy education and the nature of the challenge for providing that education in our society. All librarians must recognize that increasing information literacy is a community problem, and that different libraries and other agencies in the community can contribute to effective strategies for developing lifelong learners in all segments of the community. While the *Connecting Learners to Libraries* project is targeted at a specific audience and type of collaboration (public library-public school), the success of this project is rooted in the idea that the opportunity to learn and practice information literacy skills permeates all aspects of life, and that no single institution can meet all of the community's needs. Strategic collaboration and broad communication are critical keys to achieving desirable levels of information literacy in the population.

Public libraries and school libraries operate in different organizational cultures, each with unique management and reporting structures, institutional goals, regulatory restrictions, oversight mechanisms, and reward systems. Furthermore, professionals in both types of institutions often have different certification requirements. Consequently, they often take different courses in graduate school, read different professional

literature, attend different conferences, and participate in different continuing education events. Opportunity for collegial interaction between public librarians and teacher-librarians is low, leading to a lack of awareness about the duties, resources, and facilities of each institution. Beyond the formal procedural structure of any collaborative project, public librarians and teacher-librarians must adopt a proactive stance in creating community-centered opportunities to interact more frequently and regularly. Such efforts will also require a commitment of staff time from the administration of both institutions.

Technology can be useful as both a tool for teaching and a focal point for fostering professional interaction. The increasing sophistication of digital technology, the expanded access to networked information, and the task of learning how to find, use, evaluate, and communicate information effectively for everyday living has been the primary motivating factor for teaching information literacy skills outside the classroom. The literature is replete with examples of collaboration between agencies that center on the joint creation of online resources, sharing online resources, or learning about online resources. Given the wide market penetration of major vendors and the popularity of statewide database licensing, both school and public libraries are often purchasing products with the same interface, and this commonality may be a useful starting point for teaching students the same research skills as they move between institutions. Professional development events that teach how to use specific software or products, manage technology strategically, or address policy and social issues concerning technology are natural venues for public librarians and teacher-librarians to meet.

The following recommendations are given in accordance with the themes of recognizing information literacy as a challenge for the whole community, increasing interagency awareness between professionals, and using technology and digital resources held in common as a means to providing instruction across institutions.

### **1. Librarians need to learn how to communicate across institutional cultures and establish a formal plan for communication.**

Styles of communication vary widely across different institutions, even when these agencies are of the same type, and planning is required to clarify expectations for communication by each partner. Librarians must learn how to determine the optimal form of communication channels, frequency of communication and acceptable intervals between messages, distinguishing between official and informal communication, and correct for miscommunication (i.e.. failed expectations).

Fitzgibbons notes in her extensive review that multiple studies conducted in the 1980s and 1990s identified poor communication between public and school librarians, and suggested that this factor may be a primary cause for the low level of collaboration, even though most librarians agreed that collaboration would be beneficial to students. Specifically, researchers identified more time to meet and more personal interaction, and the designation of liaisons as specific strategies for opening communication channels. In her summary, Fitzgibbons notes that communication is the most critical

element for developing any type of collaboration, and that communication requires planning and commitment to be successful (Fitzgibbons 2000).

Based on both user surveys and focus groups, Multnomah County Public Library determined it needed to improve communication with its eight area school districts to facilitate the development of collaborative programs. Of particular note, school librarians indicated a preference for phone calls and personal visits over email, and most indicated that they do not read flyers. Suggested strategies for improving communication included encouraging public librarians to make phone calls, arrange site visits, and to “job-shadow” (Bush and Oehlke 2002, 8).

Connecting Survey results indicate that a basic level of communication is taking place between public and school librarians in Washington state. Almost half of public librarians surveyed indicate they communicate with school librarians about once every few months, and 29% indicated that they communicate more frequently (see Table 3). Almost all respondents indicated that they knew the names of school librarians in their local area, which is a promising improvement over earlier reports that approximately a third of public librarians could not name a single high school or junior high school librarian in their local community (Callison 1991). The overwhelming majority of respondents (60-80%) indicate that they make school visits, perform book talks at school, and have a summer reading program.

**Table 3. Frequency of Communication with School Librarians**

| Question 1: How often do you communicate with the school librarians in your local community? |                   |                             |                    |                   |             |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Never  | About Once a Year | About Once Every Few Months | About Once a Month | About Once a Week | No Response |
| 14<br>6.6%   | 32<br>15.0%       | 103<br>48.4%                | 53<br>24.9%        | 10<br>4.7%        | 1<br>0.5%   |

However, this base level of communication is not leading to deeper relationships or awareness that will be necessary to establish effective information literacy programs. **66% of librarians surveyed indicated that local schools did not provide homework alerts to the public library.** 50% do not present technology demonstrations, and 58% do not have any shared electronic network links. Communication concerning students’ work and the digital resources available to them will be essential for future collaboration (see Table 4).

**Table 4. Current Types of Collaboration**

|  | Yes          | No           | Don't Know  | No Response |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Question 2: Do you know the names of any school librarians in your local area?</b>  | 198<br>93.0% | 15<br>7.0%   | NA          | ---         |
| <b>Question 3: Have you ever visited a local school library in order to meet with school staff?</b>                              | 148<br>69.5% | 61<br>30.0%  | NA          | 1<br>0.5%   |
| <b>Question 4: Have you ever visited a local school library in order to interact with students?</b>                              | 164<br>77.0% | 48<br>22.5%  | NA          | 1<br>0.5%   |
| <b>Question 5: Does your library have a staff member who acts as liaison to local schools?</b>                                   | 172<br>80.8% | 34<br>16.0%  | 6<br>2.8%   | 1<br>0.5%   |
| <b>Question 6: Is your library currently involved in any collaborative project with local schools?</b>                           | 146<br>68.5% | 56<br>26.3%  | 11<br>5.2%  | ---         |
| <b>Question 7: Does someone from your library staff present book talks at local schools?</b>                                     | 167<br>78.4% | 43<br>20.2%  | 3<br>1.4%   | ---         |
| <b>Question 8: Does someone from your library staff present technology demonstrations to students or staff at local schools?</b> | 95<br>44.6%  | 108<br>50.7% | 10<br>4.7%  | ---         |
| <b>Question 9: Do the local schools provide your library with homework alerts?</b>   | 65<br>30.5%  | 142<br>66.7% | 6<br>2.8%   | ---         |
| <b>Question 10: Do the local schools direct reference questions to your library?</b>   | 120<br>56.3% | 53<br>24.9%  | 40<br>18.8% | ---         |
| <b>Question 11: Does your library offer a summer reading program?</b>  | 210<br>98.6% | 2<br>0.9%    | 1<br>0.5%   | ---         |
| <b>Question 12: Are there electronic network links between the local schools and your library?</b>                               | 70<br>32.9%  | 124<br>58.2% | 18<br>8.5%  | 1<br>0.5%   |

Almost all librarians surveyed indicated that their libraries collaborate with local schools in offering library orientations and reading promotions (see Table 5). Such activities are traditional outreach activities for public libraries, and do not require extensive communication and effort to invite local schools to participate. Other types of activities require greater levels of communication. Of those who indicated that their libraries collaborate with local schools in database instruction or professional development activities, almost 40% indicated they communicate once a month or more frequently. Of those who collaborate on professional development activities, almost 60% indicated they communicate once a month or more frequently (see Table 6).

**Table 5. Types of Collaboration**

| <b>Question 13: If your library is currently collaborating with local schools, please indicate which types you provide:</b> | Yes          | No           |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| Library orientations or tours   | 172<br>80.8% | 41<br>18.2%  |
| Reading promotion   | 183<br>85.5% | 30<br>14.1%  |
| Storytelling  | 109<br>51.2% | 104<br>48.8% |
| Database instruction  | 106<br>49.8% | 107<br>50.2% |
| Essay / short story / poetry contests   | 69<br>32.4%  | 144<br>67.6% |
| Science Fair  | 7<br>3.3%    | 206<br>96.7% |
| Career planning   | 18<br>8.5%   | 195<br>91.5% |
| Cooperative purchase of online databases  | 2<br>0.9%    | 211<br>99.1% |
| Professional development activities   | 24<br>11.3%  | 189<br>88.7% |

**Table 6. Type of Collaboration by Frequency of Communication**

| <b>Type of Activity by Amount of Communication</b> | Less frequently than once a month | Once a month or more frequently |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| All Respondents<br>(n=212)                         | 149<br>70.3%                      | 63<br>29.7%                     |
| Library orientations or tours<br>(n=171)           | 118<br>69.0%                      | 53<br>31.0%                     |
| Reading promotion<br>(n=183)                       | 126<br>68.9%                      | 57<br>31.1%                     |
| Storytelling<br>(n=108)                            | 72<br>66.1%                       | 36<br>33.0%                     |
| Database instruction<br>(n=106)                    | 65<br>61.3%                       | 41<br>38.7%                     |
| Essay / short story / poetry contests<br>(n=69)    | 46<br>66.7%                       | 23<br>33.3%                     |
| Science Fair<br>(n=7)                              | 6<br>85.7%                        | 1<br>14.3%                      |
| Career planning<br>(n=18)                          | 10<br>55.6%                       | 8<br>44.4%                      |
| Cooperative purchase of online databases<br>(n=2)  | 1<br>50.0%                        | 1<br>50.0%                      |
| Professional development activities<br>(n=24)      | 10<br>41.7%                       | 14<br>58.3%                     |

Note: The sample size for each type of collaboration only includes those who also responded to the question about frequency of communication, causing some variation from the numbers presented in Table 5.

A moderate correlation ( $3.1 < r < 5.9$ ) exists between library orientations, reading promotion, storytelling, and database instruction, suggesting that these activities co-occur more frequently than other types of collaborative activities (see Appendix B for correlation matrix). This may suggest that the conditions which make it possible to coordinate one of these four activities are also conducive to coordinating the others, or that the level of communication required for all three is relatively similar. While the correlation is not particularly strong, the concentration of responses suggests that these areas may be natural points of shared interest. These natural points are a perfect place to begin forming ideas for collaborative projects. None of the other collaborative activities are highly correlated (for all pairs,  $r < .31$ ). The evidence suggests that patterns of co-occurrence of different types of collaborative activities do not exist, or to rephrase, participation in one type of activity does not predict participation in another.

Six of the questions in the *Connecting* survey were derived from another survey conducted by OSPI earlier in the year. While attempting to keep the phrasing of questions consistent, the direction of the question in the OSPI study is the “reverse” of the one used in the *Connecting* survey, asking librarians about schools instead of asking teachers about the public library. A comparison of the “Yes” responses of public librarians and classroom teachers reveals areas of agreement and misperception (see Table x). Both groups appear to have a similar awareness of summer reading programs. Teachers have a slightly greater awareness of directing questions to the public library and of links from the school site to the public library. This variation is likely to result from the fact that not all students who are referred will follow up with the public library, and librarians are probably less aware of all the sites linking to their resources than the teachers who are actually using those links. Librarians are slightly more aware of homework alerts than teachers, suggesting that some alerts may be coming from the school librarian or a single teacher in the school. The greatest disagreement is seen in the area of book talks and technology demonstrations. Teachers may be unaware that the public library offers such services, or alternatively may not be able to take advantage of such offerings.

**Table 7. Comparison of Public Librarian and Classroom Teacher Responses**

|  | % Yes Librarians | % Yes Teachers |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Question 7:</b> Does someone from your library staff present book talks at local schools?                                     | 78.4%            | 31.4%          |
| <b>Question 8:</b> Does someone from your library staff present technology demonstrations to students or staff at local schools? | 44.6%            | 12.7%          |
| <b>Question 9:</b> Do the local schools provide your library with homework alerts?   | 30.5%            | 23.9%          |
| <b>Question 10:</b> Do the local schools direct reference questions to your library?   | 56.3%            | 62.7%          |
| <b>Question 11:</b> Does your library offer a summer reading program?  | 98.6%            | 97.4%          |
| <b>Question 12:</b> Are there electronic network links between the local schools and your library?                               | 32.9%            | 37.9%          |

Note: Question numbers and phrasing refer to the *Connecting* survey instrument and not the OSPI survey instrument.

When asked about the greatest rewards of collaborating with school librarians, some respondents cited establishing informal communication with the school librarians as a key benefit in and of itself:

Respondent 18: *“Communication with the school librarian - providing insight into the needs of their school that the public library might satisfy. More information on curricular needs...”*

Respondent 42: *“...One of the great things is when a teacher comes in and we start talking and they didn't even realize they could bring their class here for a tour, instruction, stories, talk about summer reading program, etc. etc. etc.”*

Others wrote about how initial communication progressively leads to a greater level of cooperation overall:

Respondent 5: *“It is very rewarding to meet with school librarians and plan school visits. I have given out public library cards and information during lunch at a local middle school, and have the opportunity to promote all teen programs at my library to teens by doing class visits in the schools. Several times a year both high school and middle school classes come to the public library for instruction. ... I also promote the high school honors English class summer reading list by having the list available for students and doing a summer display with the required readings.”*

Respondent 117: *“Getting to know the staff and facilities helped to work together more effectively on future projects.”*

Respondent 144: *“Once you are in the door and have done something you become more visible and then the teachers /principals/american volunteers begin calling you more.”*

However, numerous respondents felt that lack of communication would be a serious obstacle to successful collaboration. When asked about the greatest challenges they encountered while collaborating with school librarians, they indicated:

Respondent 2: *“... we've tried many times to attend school faculty meeting - the schools don't seem interested in having us there.”*

Respondent 34: *“Time to communicate and pull everything together.”*

Respondent 109: *“Communication is always the tough part, we are all busy people. and as staff changes, the relationships between schools and libraries are constantly needing reinvention and attention.”*

Respondent 99: *“... I try to attend teacher's meetings annually, but last time my time was used to decide on the color of the new carpet.”*

Respondent 203: *“Communication... Working truly collaboratively, so that input from all was possible.”*

Others noted that it takes times to develop good communication and personal relationships:

Respondent 26: *“In a previous job (different state) the local school teachers saw the library as a resource, and I had several who would bring the classes in for database training and work on school projects. I'm relatively new to this location, so I'm still building the support base here.”*

Respondent 206: *“... I used to work with one of the high school librarians who would call for assignment alerts & have me do displays at the school promoting summer reading at the public library, but she is now retired & I haven't made the same connections with the new librarian.”*

Both public and school librarians must improve their communication skills if we are to accomplish more than the tour/reading program/storytelling platform of interagency collaboration. As one librarian phrased it, his or her library wasn't involved in any collaboration, *“...other than offering library tours to interested teachers/classes or going to the schools to promote the summer reading program (Respondent 17).”*

The training curriculum must address these issues by teaching librarians:

- To plan for communication in terms of recognizing each other's preferred channels and preferred times of day.
- To commit to maintaining regular communication, including both formal and informal channels.
- To learn how to cross-promote; rather than relying on a single medium or document (e.g. e-mail or flyer), use a multiplicity of communications tools and methods to ensure your message reaches public library staff, school staff, students, and parents in your service community.
- To select a librarian in both institutions to serve as a liaison, and to understand the duties the job entails.
- To begin the year with a mailing (both physical and virtual) to school/public library staff and follow with regular updates (a joint newsletter or other joint communication written by staff from both institutions would be ideal).
- To identify topics of interest for both public librarians and teacher-librarians that can serve as the basis for joint continuing education events.
- Remember that preparing for Autumn must happen Spring – don't wait for Summer!

## **2. Librarians need to learn a process for establishing common vision and goals for information literacy across both school libraries and public libraries.**

Both types of libraries serve the K-12 student population and have similar goals in terms of reading promotion and helping users become improve their research skills. However, the teaching methods and evaluation mechanisms for each institution will differ greatly. Librarians should be introduced to a model that defines the teaching role for both institutions, the nature of interaction that professionals have with the student in each institution, and the type of assessments each institution is capable of conducting. Librarians may then discuss how such a model applies to their unique, local situation. From this, librarians will understand how the goals of each institution will complement each other and how each institution makes a distinct contribution to the total outcome.

Fitzgibbons affirms that public libraries have always had an educational role, even though that goal has not always been explicitly identified, and public librarians do not self-identify as teachers or instructors. She further reports that public libraries are providing an increasing number of educational services: preschool literacy, parent education, family literacy, homework centers, and home schooling. This overlap in terms of both the target population (K-12 students and their families) and the types of services offered by both public and school libraries can lead to the development of complementary and reinforcing programs. However, no single library can provide all the necessary services, and achieving a common recognition of each other's educational roles is a prerequisite to effective collaboration (Fitzgibbons 2000).

Multnomah County Public Library recognized that their school related services were scattered across multiple departments and branches, and that greater centralization and the appointment of a services coordinator would help outreach to the local school districts (Bush and Oehlke, p.11-12) Given the cost and effort of this type of reorganization, such action would also make an overt statement that the public library not only supports education but is an active participant in helping local schools meet the learning objectives of their students.

Respondents to the survey frequently commented how their personal experiences helped them recognize shared objectives in serving students:

Respondent 19: *"Kids know me by name; kids & their parents seek me for reading advisory, etc....!"*

Respondent 20: *"After visiting a school, kids from that school come to the public library and are very excited to see someone they know and have met at school!"*

Respondent 109: *"I think these projects remind us that we all have the same goal, which is to help kids learn and grow and explore. We come from different backgrounds, and have different approaches, but we all have the good of the children in mind."*

Respondent 121: *"I feel like book-talking is a very important service to the students as they use both public and school libraries to find the books."*

Respondent 141: *"... From my visits to talk with faculty at schools, I've been able to help teachers gather materials, track down elusive articles, create booklists, etc. I've made a lot of friends in the schools, both teachers and students, and it feels so good to know that the library is an active part of their education."*

Respondent 145: *"Recognition by students/parents/staff that our skills and services overlap and in some cases match closely..."*

Respondent 183: *"In former jobs, I participated in collaborative projects initiated by school personnel that I already had personal relationships with. The rewards were greatest in knowing that, in each case, two individuals were able to bridge the gap between school and public library, to the benefit of the students."*

Respondent 185: *"... Collaboration with school librarians and teachers in an activity that supported the school goals and the library goals."*

Respondent 212: *"It has provided an opportunity for sense of achievement for both school/public library - easy to recognize our common goals when we support one another."*

Other respondents noted that collaborative projects helped students identify them and build continuing relationships. Students came to see the public librarian as someone who was connected with their education, and able to assist them with their schoolwork:

Respondent 25: *"The greatest reward is that children connect the public library with a person. A person that they would, hopefully, feel comfortable asking for homework help or a good read..."*

Respondent 55: *"I feel that my connection with the schools allows me to get to know the students and develop a positive image of the public library for them. Having the children recognize me as the librarian is very beneficial."*

Respondent 110: *"Going to the schools helps to promote the library and develops a community spirit with both the teens and the librarians."*

Respondent 177: *"...Children love to see us at their school and then again at the library. Also, the teachers who do become knowledgeable about our services get very excited and are loyal users."*

As noted earlier, many respondents expressed concern about communication, but none of respondents expressed a specific instance from their experience of finding the goals of public libraries and school libraries to be contradictory.

However, survey results confirm that concerns about common goals are evident in Washington. 73% of public librarians surveyed expressed Great or Some Concern about the ability to identify common goals across public and school libraries, and 57% expressed Great or Some Concern about conflicting management styles across institutions (see Table 8).

**Table 8: Concern about Common Goals or Conflicting Management Style**

| Do you feel that any of the following issues may be a cause for concern in terms of collaborating with local schools? |             |              |               |             |
|---|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
|   | No Concern  | Some Concern | Great Concern | No Response |
| <b>Question 15: Failure to identify common goals between public library and local schools</b>                         | 53<br>24.9% | 129<br>60.6% | 27<br>12.7%   | 4<br>1.9%   |
| <b>Question 16: Conflicting management style between your public library and local schools</b>                        | 84<br>39.4% | 97<br>45.5%  | 26<br>12.2%   | 6<br>2.8%   |

One explanation may be that difficulties are more likely to arise in terms of logistics and work culture conflicts, and not in terms of aligning institutional missions. For example, schools view interactions with students on a long-term basis as they advance from grade to grade, while public libraries are more frequently oriented on one-time encounters. During a focus group discussion at MCL, one teacher noted that successful programs to help children and teens use the library should start early and need to build progressively. She stated, “You can’t just come in and dump it into a senior class (Grove-Quirk Insight, Ltd. 2001, 17).” One Connecting survey respondent agreed, noting:

Respondent 63: *“I was an academic librarian before, and did lots of this--it needs to happen earlier.”*

Beyond establishing common vision and goals, the task of managing long-term projects across different organizational types is difficult, and will require partners to adopt procedures that may be unfamiliar to them in their own environment. Reporting and scheduling methods that are conventional (i.e. assumed) in one institution will appear foreign to the other. A formal planning process should describe explicitly how to decide on common objectives, how scheduling and deadlines will be determined, what channels of communication will be used, how frequently partners expect to communicate, and how to deal with unexpected obstacles or delays. Furthermore, good planning is useless unless adequate resources are committed. Librarians need to learn how to budget for instructional programs by understanding all the components of distribution, interaction, and marketing costs and how to estimate requirements accurately. Librarians need to learn how to manage a formal planning process and adopt a cost model for identifying the true costs of collaborative projects.

Less than third (32.4%) of those surveyed indicated that lack of administrative support from their own library was of Some or Great Concern, but almost half (47%) indicated that unequal cost sharing would be of Some or Great Concern. 18.8% of respondents

expressed Great Concern about inadequate facilities at the school library, while only 12.7% expressed Great Concern about inadequate facilities at the public library. In sharper contrast, 23.0% of respondents expressed Great Concern about inadequate collections at the school library, while only 5.6% expressed Great Concern about inadequate collections at the public library. Clearly, respondents had more confidence in their own institution to support collaboration than that of potential partners (see Table 9).

**Table 9: Concern about Administrative Support and Cost-Sharing**

| Do you feel that any of the following issues may be a cause for concern in terms of collaborating with local schools? |              |              |               |             |
|---|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
|   | No Concern   | Some Concern | Great Concern | No Response |
| <b>Question 17: Lack of administrative support from your library system</b>   | 140<br>65.7% | 53<br>24.9%  | 16<br>7.5%    | 4<br>1.9%   |
| <b>Question 18: Unequal sharing of costs</b>  | 106<br>49.8% | 79<br>37.1%  | 21<br>9.9%    | 7<br>3.3%   |
| <b>Question 19: Inadequate facilities at the school library</b>   | 59<br>27.7%  | 109<br>51.2% | 40<br>18.8%   | 5<br>2.3%   |
| <b>Question 20: Inadequate facilities at your public library</b>  | 110<br>51.6% | 72<br>33.8%  | 27<br>12.7%   | 4<br>1.9%   |
| <b>Question 21: Inadequate collections at the school library</b>  | 38<br>17.8%  | 123<br>57.7% | 49<br>23.0%   | 3<br>1.4%   |
| <b>Question 22: Inadequate collections at your public library</b>   | 126<br>59.2% | 73<br>34.3%  | 12<br>5.6%    | 2<br>0.9%   |
| <b>Question 23: Lack of time</b>  | 11<br>5.2%   | 97<br>45.5%  | 104<br>58.8%  | 1<br>0.5%   |
| <b>Question 24: Not enough staff to conduct off-site visits</b>   | 19<br>8.9%   | 99<br>46.5%  | 90<br>42.3%   | 5<br>2.3%   |

Such concern may arise from a lack of awareness and familiarity of the others' institution. Another reason for this concern may be the strained budgets of the public schools that make administrators and teachers alike reticent about taking on any additional projects. In Multnomah County, Oregon, teachers participating in a focus group discussion expressed that because of budgetary constraints they were only willing to partner on projects that promised large rewards for little effort or expense. School administrators and teachers need assurance that collaboration will not lead to excessive costs or an unrealistic time commitment on the part of school staff. (Grove-Quirk Insight, Ltd. 2001, 16 and 20).

In agreement with teachers, public librarians also saw staff time as a critical obstacle to collaborating. 58.8% expressed Great Concern about lack of time to pursue collaborative projects, and 42.3% expressed Great Concern that they did not have enough staff to conduct off-site visits. These two items raised more concern among public librarians than any other items in the survey.

The training curriculum must address these issues by teaching librarians:

- To identify similarities in the mission of both public libraries and local schools
- To define priorities, establish reasonable time-frames, and adopt an incremental approach to building effective collaboration
- To adopt a modular or capsule approach to designing instructional programs in order to best facilitate progressive patterns of learning and facilitate insertion of content by local teachers
- To communicate program costs explicitly, both money and time, to assure local schools that collaboration will provide valuable benefits without becoming a cost burden
- To explain the grant development process from initial vision to completing a competitive proposal; librarians must learn how to turn an idea into a well-structured plan with a high likelihood of success.
- To learn how to write effective letters of support and assist community partners in preparing these documents.

### **3. Public and School librarians need to become familiar with each other's work environments and institutional cultures.**

Public and school librarians may have a stereotypical image of each other stemming from a low awareness of each other's job requirements. In her description of the Connecting Libraries and Schools Project (CLASP) in New York, Tice wrote, "The school librarian is no longer seen as a lone staff member with a cushy job, but as a professional colleague with valuable resources and a connection with public librarians (Tice 2001, 13)." Echoing this same theme, one of the public librarians responded:

*Respondent 91: "... we have been working to forge stronger links with school, and the payoff is more respect, and educators commenting on all the fine programs we offer."*

The professional image of both public and school librarians was improved as a result of collaboration.

Fitzgibbons writes about the necessity for public librarians to know about the school curriculum, and notes that one critical area where public libraries can support the school library is by providing additional curriculum-related materials for both students and teachers (Fitzgibbons 2000). Multnomah County Library recognized that enhancing the collection in curricular areas would be a powerful resource for interagency collaboration, but such collection development also required a deeper understanding of the school curriculum by public librarians and continued feedback from school librarians (Bush and Oehlke 2002, 9). In addition, access to such resources could be improved by modifying the library's website to include guides and finding aids specifically written to assist teachers and school librarians (Bush and Oehlke 2002, 11). Ryan agrees and further explains that the purpose of creating a well-designed website is to make it easy for

teachers and administrators to find out what the public library can do and easy to communicate or follow up with questions (Ryan 2001, 17).

Public librarians need to become familiar with the curriculum and educational standards in Washington State, and how those standards are applied in the curriculum of the local school districts. Educational standards are complex, detailed, and comprehensive. Furthermore, standards are constantly evolving and have changed since the time librarians were students themselves or from when they may have studied such standards in graduate school. Consequently, these combined factors lead librarians to overestimate their understanding of current standards, and must dedicate some time to continuous study. In addition to a thorough review of current standards and assessment requirements, librarians must learn how these standards are applied locally, and must be taught how to read the curriculum guides and maps commonly used as planning documents by school districts today.

In the survey, public librarians may be overestimating knowledge and awareness of school curriculum. 73.2% of those surveyed indicated that lack of knowledge of school curriculum was of some concern, but only 10.3% indicated it was of great concern. In contrast, 25.8% felt Great Concern that school staff lacked knowledge of what the public library could offer (see Table 10). Clearly, public librarians felt they had a better understanding of what schools needed and that schools had a poorer understanding of what the public library could offer. One could surmise that a survey of school librarians would likely show a similar bias with the positions reversed.

**Table 10: Concern about Interagency Awareness**

| Do you feel that any of the following issues may be a cause for concern in terms of collaborating with local schools? |             |              |               |             |
|---|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
|   | No Concern  | Some Concern | Great Concern | No Response |
| <b>Question 25: Lack of knowledge of school curriculum</b>  | 32<br>15.0% | 156<br>73.2% | 22<br>10.3%   | 3<br>1.4%   |
| <b>Question 26: School's lack of knowledge about your library</b>   | 27<br>12.7% | 129<br>60.6% | 55<br>25.8%   | 2<br>0.9%   |
| <b>Question 27: Lack of Collaborative Experience</b>  | 57<br>26.8% | 128<br>60.1% | 24<br>11.3%   | 4<br>1.9%   |

Lack of awareness is not strictly a problem for public librarians. Sullivan states that getting teachers into the public library just to discover what's available is essential. The public library should try to organize an in-service event or "open house" for teachers. The public library should also take responsibility for scheduling and publicizing the event, rather than expecting the principal or school secretary to do all the administrative work (Sullivan 2001, 14).

From the past experiences, public librarians were pleased with the increased awareness across both types of libraries that resulted from collaboration. When asked about the greatest rewards, several commented:

Respondent 38: *"...awareness on one another parts of services offered and a better understanding of one another's institutions."*

Respondent 41: *"Greater school staff awareness of my abilities and availability lead to more frequent use of my library services."*

Respondent 42: *"...One of the great things is when a teacher comes in and we start talking and they didn't even realize they could bring their class here for a tour, instruction, stories, talk about summer reading program, etc. etc. etc."*

Respondent 189: *"Awareness of their needs, patterns, other activities we could link to."*

Respondent 194: *"Appreciation expressed by teachers and other school staff, increased awareness among school staff of their public library and its value to them and their students"*

One of the benefits for public librarians is the ability to reach children that don't necessarily come to the public library, and to interact with them in ways that would not be possible without the school connection. When asked about the greatest rewards from collaboration, some respondents wrote:

Respondent 36: *"Satisfaction of reaching all kids at least one grade level or school with information about library services, resources and materials not available at the school."*

Respondent 63: *"The greatest reward is knowing that I have contributed to the critical thinking and life-long INFORMATION literacy of a student (and their teachers!)"*

Respondent 76: *"Yes, we have always collaborated with our local school. From weekly class visits, some included story time or book talks... The greatest reward was to have a non reader, become a reader and cherish their library privileges."*

Respondent 211: *"After a history project where kids did some research at the library, I've acted as a judge at their presentations at the schools. It tied it all together, both for kids and staff."*

The curriculum must address these issues by teaching librarians:

- To be proactive: Public librarians should take the lead in contacting schools and meeting with teacher-librarians, teachers, and administrators; teachers and teacher-librarians should visit their local public library and schedule a time to meet with staff.
- To accept the time pressures and fluid scheduling that is part of both library and school environments: always confirm appointments with staff close to the

meeting date, be open to changes, and plan how to raise the energy level for late afternoon meetings (bring snacks! Plan games!).

- To implement and participate in job-shadowing exercises between public and school libraries; rotate the schedule so that all of the librarians serving children and youth have an opportunity to “walk a mile in each others’ shoes.”
- To give public librarians an outline or model for developing a brief presentation they can give to school staff describing the services and resources they can offer.
- To give school librarians an outline or model for developing a brief presentation they can give to the public library staff describing the services and resources they can offer.
- To learn about the certification requirements educational background of professionals and technical staff working in schools and public libraries and examine how the compare/contrast in both environments.
- To discuss how teachers and librarians develop instructional programs and gain approval for new endeavors: to understand the lesson-planning process and curriculum-mapping, working with trustees and advisory boards, and drawing support from Friends groups or PTAs.
- To learn essential skills for working with teens and children in long-term relationships.

#### **4. Librarians need to learn how to identify the stakeholder agencies in their local community that can provide a learning opportunity for information literacy.**

Part of the underlying philosophy of the CLASP project is clearly identified on the project homepage (<http://www.nypl.org/branch/services/clasp.html>):

“Our schools cannot bear the full burden for developing reading skills in young people. Meeting this challenge requires the cooperation of parents, caregivers, teachers, community groups . . . *and libraries.*”

The same principle can be extended from reading literacy to information literacy. Schools cannot succeed alone. Information literacy skills must be valued and reinforced by the larger community.

When asked if their library participated in information literacy activities, almost half of those librarians surveyed responded Yes (see Table 11). However, many public librarians fail to draw a distinction between reading literacy and information literacy, and do not have a clear conceptualization of the latter. In the open-ended responses, librarians wrote favorably about their summer reading programs, storytelling, and giving book-talks. While such activities promote fundamental reading skills, the purpose of the *Connecting Learners to Libraries* initiative is to raise the level of instruction being offered that helps students to find, access, use, and communicate information.

**Table 11: Current Involvement in Information Literacy**

|  | Yes          | No          | Don't Know  | No Response |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Question 9: Is your library currently involved in any activities designed to help students improve their information literacy skills?</b> | 105<br>49.3% | 84<br>39.4% | 23<br>10.8% | 1<br>0.5%   |

When asked about specific information literacy activities, public librarians gave a less ambiguous response. Only about a third (34.9%) of librarians reported that their library offered single training sessions, and less than a tenth offer a series of sessions (8.5%) or provide online tutorials (7.1%). Over a third (39.6%) reported that the staffs at their library make site visits to local schools, but from respondents' comments it appears that a large number of these visits are probably to deliver book-talks. The size of the library staff does not appear to be a strong predictor of the type of activity with one exception – libraries with a staff size greater than five were more likely to perform site visits, probably for the obvious reason that a library branch with a smaller staff would have to close or curtail some service in order to make a site visit (see Table 12).

**Table 12. Type of Activity by Staff Size**

|                           | 1-2        | 3-5         | 6-10        | 11-20       | 21-40       | 40+         | Total       |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total Libraries in Sample | 18         | 32          | 35          | 67          | 40          | 20          | 212         |
| One-time sessions         | 4<br>22.2% | 6<br>18.8%  | 11<br>31.4% | 28<br>41.8% | 14<br>35.0% | 11<br>55.0% | 74<br>34.9% |
| Series of classes         | 2<br>11.1% | 1<br>3.1%   | 5<br>14.3%  | 6<br>9.0%   | 3<br>7.5%   | 1<br>5.0%   | 18<br>8.5%  |
| Online tutorials          | 1<br>5.6%  | 2<br>6.3%   | 2<br>5.7%   | 6<br>9.0%   | 4<br>10.0%  |             | 15<br>7.1%  |
| Staff visits to schools   | 3<br>16.7% | 11<br>34.4% | 15<br>42.9% | 30<br>44.8% | 15<br>37.5% | 10<br>50.0% | 84<br>39.6% |
| Staff visits to centers   |            | 4<br>12.5%  | 5<br>14.3%  | 8<br>11.9%  | 3<br>7.5%   | 3<br>15.0%  | 23<br>10.8% |

Note: Total sample is 212 since one librarian did not respond to the question of staff size (see Table 1). Percentages in each cell represent a portion of the total libraries in the sample, and not row or column percentages. The categories for type of activity are not mutually exclusive.

Region of the state was a better predictor of the type of collaborative activity. Librarians in Eastern Washington were less likely to make site visits or offer classes, perhaps due to a larger number of libraries with smaller staffs in the sample or the distances involved in more rural communities that discouraged travel. In Western Washington, librarians in the less populated counties were more likely than librarians working in the more population intensive counties to offer a series of courses and to make site visits to community centers. One possible explanation may be that libraries in smaller communities experience greater ties across the community and are more prepared to nurture continuing relationships with library users (see Table 13).

**Table 13. Type of Activity by Region**

|                           | Eastern Washington | Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, or Snohomish | Western Washington – other counties | Total       |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Total Libraries in Sample | 46                 | 88   | 77                                  | 211         |
| One-time sessions         | 7<br>15.2%         | 40<br>45.5%                                | 26<br>33.8%                         | 73<br>34.6% |
| Series of classes         | 3<br>6.5%          | 5<br>5.7%                                  | 9<br>11.7%                          | 17<br>8.1%  |
| Online tutorials          |                    | 8<br>9.1%                                  | 7<br>9.1%                           | 15<br>7.1%  |
| Staff visits to schools   | 10<br>21.7%        | 40<br>45.5%                                | 33<br>42.9%                         | 83<br>39.3% |
| Staff visits to centers   | 2<br>4.3%          | 7<br>8.0%                                  | 14<br>18.2%                         | 23<br>10.9% |

Note: Total sample is 211 since two librarians did not respond to the question of region (see Table 2). Percentages in each cell represent a portion of the total libraries in the sample, and not row or column percentages. The categories for type of activity are not mutually exclusive.

Many respondents commented on the satisfaction of seeing students improve their reading ability, develop their critical thinking skills, and learn to use the library more effectively. One of the benefits for public librarians resulting from collaboration is to have the chance to witness this growth in the student that is only possible through collaborative effort:

Respondent 76: *“Yes, we have always collaborated with our local school. From weekly class visits, some included story time or book talks, to purchasing literature based performers for the school. The greatest reward was to have a non reader, become a reader and cherish their library privileges.”*

Respondent 122: *“The greatest reward and benefit of collaborating with schools on various projects is getting children excited about reading! I also love when children visit my branch after I've been to their schools and not only do they remember my visit but are interested in establishing a connection with the library's resources.”*

Respondent 127: *“With "All Kids Read" the greatest value and inspiration came from the diverse group of partners (schools, library, theatre) working together to build a stronger connection with students. Together we were much stronger than working in isolation.”*

In general, public librarians are probably less familiar with models of information literacy than school librarians, and would benefit from a thorough introduction to the concept. Public librarians have lots of experience in working with children on school assignments, and may have useful advice to help teachers improve the quality of assignments in order to improve students' understanding of the research process and how to use library resources. Teacher-librarians are more likely to have knowledge of information literacy,

helping students, and working with teachers, but are probably less likely to be aware of how the resources of the public library can assist them in performing their work.

The curriculum must address these issues by teaching librarians:

- To identify potential partners in the community; participants should be given some “pre-homework” to complete before arriving in the form of a worksheet that will guide them through enumerating the libraries, schools, after-school programs, homework centers, community centers, recreational programs, and other agencies where students might practice information literacy skills.
- To understand the different teaching methods and types of instruction that public libraries and schools are able to provide, and be aware of these complement one another.
- To plan training events for other care-givers/volunteers in the community about library resources. For example, invite the tutors from a homework center/after-school program run by the local Boys and Girls Club to visit the public library and learn how to use the available resources.
- To promote and utilize activities in the community that increase information literacy (e.g. a workshop targeted at teens offered by a local clinic about finding health information).

**5. Librarians need to learn how to identify the availability of digital resources across institutions, maximize the learning opportunities provided by Statewide Database Licensing (SDL), determine the strengths and weaknesses of these resources, and identify common access structures across resources.**

Teaching students how to use online resources effectively is critical to enabling them to find and access information in a digital environment and also how to communicate their work to others. Even though information literacy requires students to master a range of skills that is broader than competent use of technology, facility with using computers and navigating the Internet are fundamental to mastering other skills such as evaluating information sources and communicating information. The challenge of helping students and other library users to work with online resources effectively creates a common opportunity for both public libraries and schools to work together.

Teaching others how to use digital resources are valuable skills that librarians can share with teachers. During a focus group discussion, teachers from Multnomah County indicated that they did not feel “tech savvy” and saw teaching technology as a difficult task. Training sessions and orientations led by librarians would improve teachers’ skills and also boost teacher confidence in this area. Alternatively, several teachers indicated that something as basic as a webliography tailored to a school assignment would probably be even more valuable than yet another workshop (Grove-Quirk Insight 2002, 19).

Several respondents indicated that they were involved in providing database demonstrations for local schools. Such demonstrations either took place during a public library tour or during a site visit to the school by a public librarian. During these sessions, teachers learned as much as the students.

Respondent 11: *“Database demonstrations presented a better idea to students of what the difference is between a database and an internet page. The kids were very focused on the material presented.”*

Respondent 31: *“... The public librarian also teaches classes at the school on how to use the library online resources to do research on the particular topic being studied. This type of complex collaborative project is a wonderful experience for the students who become familiar with the resources of their local library. The teachers also get instruction on how to do online research effectively right along with the kids...”*

Respondent 99: *“I participate in annual Freshman classes on using our website as a springboard for research.”*

Respondent 108: *“Visited w/ local HS staff to review online access to my library district's catalog & databases--staff seemed thrilled as were unaware of online access & resources in lib. Saw increased use by HS students in library after the demo. Increased cooperation with HS staff RE: homework alerts & questions as to what we had that could fit their curriculum.”*

Respondent 210: *“Last year I got my foot in the door by going to all the elementary school staff meetings and demonstrating the databases that I thought they would find most useful.”*

Digital resources held in common might be the most effective ones to use as the central piece of their instructional program. Those resources made available to Washington schools and libraries through SDL form a natural platform to build on in planning collaborative instructional efforts. Alternatively, resources that are only available at the public library may be of particular value to the student and also those which the student has never used before. Learning how to use each other's unique resources should be an immediate objective, and cross-training events will foster familiarity and collegiality. After gaining a certain degree of familiarity, librarians can deepen their analysis to determine coverage strengths across institutions and identify gaps that need to be filled for the students.

The curriculum must address these issues by teaching librarians:

- To identify the online resources in the local schools; as part of “pre-homework” librarians should be asked to list the library automation software used in their local schools and the full-text databases being offered, beginning with those resources made available through SDL.

- To plan instruction specifically for teachers delivered in stages over the course of the school year, and to ask to present during regular in-service training at local schools.
- To utilize training materials and techniques being used at the school library for databases and other resources which are held in common (e.g., *ProQuest*, *eLibrary*) in order to reinforce regular instruction, and to develop a similar training approach for resources that are only held at the public library.
- To plan instruction for students at different grade levels in stages over the course of the school year using age-appropriate resources and curriculum-related or assignment-related topics as examples.
- To develop assignment-related online guides and tutorials that can be linked from both the school and public library websites.

## **6. Librarians need to learn how to apply outcomes based assessment techniques for continuous evaluation of information literacy learning.**

If information literacy is a community challenge, and if the desired outcomes are a benefit to the entire community, then multiple methods and measures of these outcomes are useful for assessing the depth of learning and benefit that is achieved. Public libraries and school libraries have different levels of access to their user population and are subject to different laws governing the type of information they may collect, analyze, and share regarding their service populations. Similar methods of outcomes assessment are not possible at both institutions. Librarians must learn that a given outcome can have many indicators that can be measured at multiple times. Librarians must also learn how to use different types of measures in different situations to grasp a fuller picture of the learning taking place. Adopting the philosophy of continuous evaluation is necessary to gain any sense of change in the student population over the extended time required for lessons in information literacy to be learned and applied.

Librarians must learn how to utilize outcomes-based evaluation (OBE) in order to demonstrate how projects funded under the *Connecting* initiative will make a difference in the lives of the students being served. OBE is an approach that is concerned with ascertaining the positive changes that occur as the result of a new program rather than merely examining what events or activities have taken place. One of the key requirements for conducting OBE is that participants must identify *a priori* the indicators that would signify the desired change or outcome is occurring. This approach makes it easy for librarians to gauge the success of their project and also “tell the story” of what they’ve achieved by describing how their intended audience has benefited. Project participants in the *Connecting* initiative will be provided with a logic model outlining outcomes and indicators that will facilitate planning and proposal preparation. Librarians will need to be conversant with the principles, procedures, and application of OBE in order to report their project achievements effectively.

The curriculum must address these issues by teaching librarians:

- To understand the underlying philosophy of OBE.
- To distinguish between short-term and long-term outcomes for both public libraries and schools.
- To define outcomes in terms of visible indicators that signify change.
- To define levels of success based on these indicators that reflect the different institutional goals of public libraries and schools.
- To use multiple means of observation to gauge each outcome at multiple locations and multiple times.
- To report project performance in terms of user benefit instead of staff activity.

## Appendix A: Survey Instrument

### ***Connecting Learners to Libraries Initiative - Public Library Survey***

Please distribute the link for this survey (<http://purl.org/net/connect>) to any public library staff member who directly serves teens or children.

Your participation in this survey will help us identify the current level of collaboration between public libraries and school libraries, and provide us with information about your experiences and concerns regarding future collaboration. The results of this survey will be used to plan and develop training programs to be offered by Washington State Library's Connecting Learners to Libraries Initiative.

If your position involves direct service to children or teens at a branch of a library system, please respond to the following questions as they reflect your role as a staff member of your particular library branch or building. If your position is at the system-wide level, please respond to the questions as they reflect your library system as a whole.

The survey is completely voluntary and anonymous. It will only take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your participation!

**Question 1.** How often do you communicate with the school librarians in your local community?

- Never
- About once a year
- About once every few months
- About once a month
- About once a week

|   | Yes                   | No                    |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Question 2.</b> Do you know the names of any school librarians in your local community           | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 3.</b> Have you ever visited a local school library in order to meet with school staff? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 4.</b> Have you ever visited a local school library in order to interact with students? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

|   | Yes                   | No                    | Don't Know            |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Question 5.</b> Does your library have a staff member who acts as liaison to local schools?  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 6.</b> Is your library currently involved in any collaborative project with local schools?                                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 7.</b> Does someone from your library staff present book talks at local schools?  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 8.</b> Does someone from your library staff present technology demonstrations to students or staff at local schools?        | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 9.</b> Do the local schools provide your library with homework alerts?  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 10.</b> Do the local schools direct reference questions to your library?  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 11.</b> Does your library offer a summer reading program?   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 12.</b> Are there electronic network links (such as shared card catalog access) between the local schools and your library? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Question 13.** If your library is currently collaborating with local schools, please indicate which type of projects you provide by checking all that apply from the following list:

- Library orientations or tours
- Reading promotion
- Storytelling
- Database instruction
- Essay / short story / poetry contests
- Science fair
- Career planning
- Cooperative purchase of online databases
- Professional development activities

**Question 14.** Has your library been involved in any other types of collaborative projects with the local schools? If yes, please describe:

[Text box for open-ended response]

Do you feel that any of the following issues may be a cause for concern in terms of collaborating with local schools?

|  | No Concern            | Some Concern          | Great Concern         |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Question 15.</b> Failure to identify common goals between your public library and local schools | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 16.</b> Conflicting management style between your public library and local schools     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 17.</b> Lack of administrative support from your library system                        | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 18.</b> Unequal sharing of costs   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 19.</b> Inadequate facilities at the school library                                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 20.</b> Inadequate facilities at your public library                                   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 21.</b> Inadequate collections at the school library                                   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 22.</b> Inadequate collections at your public library                                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 23.</b> Lack of time   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 24.</b> Not enough staff to conduct off-site visits                                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 25.</b> Lack of knowledge of school curriculum   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 26.</b> Schools' lack of knowledge about your library                                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>Question 27.</b> Lack of collaborative experience   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Question 28.** Have you ever participated in collaborative projects with local schools in the past? If yes, what were the greatest rewards and benefits you discovered from participating in collaborative projects with local schools?

[Text box for open-ended response]

**Question 29.** What were the greatest challenges you encountered?

[Text box for open-ended response]

Information literacy is the ability to effectively locate, evaluate, and use information. Many public libraries are involved in activities and programs that help students improve their information literacy skills.

**Question 30.** Is your library currently involved in any activities designed to help students improve their information literacy?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

**Question 31.** If yes, please indicate which statement(s) best describe the types of activities your library is involved in? Please check all that apply:

- One-time classes or training sessions
- Providing a series of classes
- Providing online tutorials
- Library staff visits to local schools
- Library staff visits to local community centers

**Question 32.** What other types of information literacy activities, events, or programs is your library currently involved in?

[Text box for open-ended response]

To help us analyze your responses, please tell us a little about yourself.

**Question 33.** Please indicate your position in your library:

- Library Director
- Branch Manager or Service Manager
- Children's Librarian
- Young Adult Librarian
- Adult Services Librarian
- Library Associate or Assistant
- Library Clerk
- Other

**Question 34.** Approximately how many people work at least 10 hours per week at your library building? Only count employed staff; do not count volunteers.

- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- 11-20
- 21-40
- 41 or more

**Question 35.** Please indicate in which geographic region your library is located:

- Eastern Washington
- Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, or Snohomish Counties
- Western Washington other than Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, or Snohomish Counties

Thank you for completing the survey! We appreciate your time and assistance.

## Appendix B: Correlation Matrix

The following matrix illustrates the degree of co-occurrence of various activities based on survey responses (N=213). For each cell both the Pearson correlation coefficient (r) and the significance level is reported (p).

The Pearson correlation coefficient indicates strength of association between two items. A '0' indicates no co-occurrence, while a "1" indicates perfect co-occurrence. The evidence below indicates that the activities are not highly correlated, suggesting that participation in one activity is not likely to predict participation in another.

Significance (p) indicates the degree to which observations are likely to be consistent for the entire population or are merely an aberration of the sample being examined. A significance level of .005 ( $p < .005$ ) suggests that the observations reported here are likely to occur 99.5% of the time a sample is drawn. Observations satisfying this requirement are shaded in the table below.

|                             | <b>r</b>                   |                            |                             |                            |                            |                             |                            |                            |            |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| <b>p</b>                    | Tours                      | Read. Promo                | Story.                      | DB Inst.                   | Ess. Cont.                 | Sci. Fair                   | Car. Plan.                 | Coop. Pur.                 | Prof. Dev. |
| Orientations/<br>Tours      | 1                          | ----                       | ----                        | ----                       | ----                       | ----                        | ----                       | ----                       | ----       |
| Reading<br>Promotion        | <b>.350</b><br><b>.000</b> | 1                          | ----                        | ----                       | ----                       | ----                        | ----                       | ----                       | ----       |
| Storytelling                | <b>.333</b><br><b>.000</b> | <b>.253</b><br><b>.000</b> | 1                           | ----                       | ----                       | ----                        | ----                       | ----                       | ----       |
| Database<br>Instruction     | <b>.343</b><br><b>.000</b> | <b>.322</b><br><b>.000</b> | <b>.183</b><br><b>.007</b>  | 1                          | ----                       | ----                        | ----                       | ----                       | ----       |
| Essay/Story<br>Contests     | <b>.185</b><br><b>.007</b> | <b>.251</b><br><b>.000</b> | <b>.074</b><br><b>.282</b>  | <b>.194</b><br><b>.005</b> | 1                          | ----                        | ----                       | ----                       | ----       |
| Science<br>Fair             | <b>.023</b><br><b>.736</b> | <b>.075</b><br><b>.278</b> | <b>.127</b><br><b>.064</b>  | <b>.027</b><br><b>.693</b> | <b>.041</b><br><b>.550</b> | 1                           | ----                       | ----                       | ----       |
| Career<br>Planning          | <b>.148</b><br><b>.030</b> | <b>.123</b><br><b>.073</b> | <b>.128</b><br><b>.062</b>  | <b>.305</b><br><b>.000</b> | <b>.150</b><br><b>.028</b> | <b>.039</b><br><b>.575</b>  | 1                          | ----                       | ----       |
| Cooperative<br>Purchases    | <b>.048</b><br><b>.490</b> | <b>.039</b><br><b>.567</b> | <b>-.002</b><br><b>.974</b> | <b>.000</b><br><b>.995</b> | <b>.141</b><br><b>.040</b> | <b>-.018</b><br><b>.795</b> | <b>.145</b><br><b>.034</b> | 1                          | ----       |
| Professional<br>Development | <b>.099</b><br><b>.151</b> | <b>.059</b><br><b>.392</b> | <b>.170</b><br><b>.013</b>  | <b>.210</b><br><b>.002</b> | <b>.198</b><br><b>.004</b> | <b>.018</b><br><b>.798</b>  | <b>.159</b><br><b>.021</b> | <b>.273</b><br><b>.000</b> | 1          |

## Bibliography

- Bush, Mary, and Vailey Oehlke. 2002. The Public Library's Role in Student Success: a Planning Grant to Determine Best Practices for Multnomah County Library: Final Report. Available online at .  
<http://www.cascadelink.org/ear/pslp/FinalReportGeneral.doc>.
- Callison, Daniel. 1991. A National Survey on Public Library and Secondary Library Cooperation: Do They Know Each Other? *Indiana Media Journal* 13:17–21.
- Fitzgibbons, Shirley A. 2000. School and Public Library Relationships: Essential Ingredients in Implementing Educational Reforms and Improving Student Learning. *School Library Media Research* 3. Available online at  
<http://www.ala.org/ala/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume32000/relationships.htm>.
- Grove-Quirk Insight, Ltd. 2001. Seeking Partnerships Between Multnomah County Library and Local Schools: A Candid Conversation with Primary, Middle, and High School Teachers. Available online at  
<http://www.cascadelink.org/ear/pslp/teachersFG.pdf>.
- Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction, State of Washington. 2004. Library Survey Results for Washington State High Schools [Preliminary Draft presented at the Washington Library Media Association 2004 conference].
- Ryan, Sara. 2001. Be Nice to the Secretary and Other Ways to Work Successfully with Schools. *Journal of Youth Services in Libraries* 14:3 (Spring), 15-17.
- Sullivan, Ed. 2001. Connect with Success: A Few Tips for Public Library-School Cooperation. *Journal of Youth Services in Libraries* 14:3 (Spring), 14.
- Tice, Margaret. 2001. Queens Borough Public Library and the Connecting Libraries and Schools Project. *Journal of Youth Services in Libraries* 14:3 (Spring), 11-13.