2004

Developing state guidelines for school library media programs in Iowa: Plans for progress into the 21st century

Becky Stover Johnson
University of Northern Iowa

Developing state guidelines for school library media programs in Iowa: Plans for progress into the 21st century

Abstract

This research project, designed for Iowa school library media specialists, principals, and state education and legislative decision-makers, provides quantitative guidelines for library media program budgets, collections, staffing and facilities in Iowa schools. Research repeatedly has shown a link between these elements of a quality school library program and higher student achievement scores. Historically, standards and guidelines have been used to improve school library media programs. Modeled after previous guidelines developed in Iowa, this project is entitled Plans for Progress into the 21st Century. The literature review of this research project also offers an extensive look at the impact of school library media programs on academic achievement as well as a historic view of state and national guidelines and surveys, and evidence of their role in education.

Developing State Guidelines for School Library Media Programs in Iowa: Plans for Progress into the 21st Century

This Graduate Research Project

Submitted to the

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Division of School Library Media Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Northern Iowa

By
Becky Stover Johnson
January 2004

Abstract

This research project, designed for Iowa school library media specialists, principals, and state education and legislative decision-makers, provides quantitative guidelines for library media program budgets, collections, staffing and facilities in Iowa schools. Research repeatedly has shown a link between these elements of a quality school library program and higher student achievement scores. Historically, standards and guidelines have been used to improve school library media programs. Modeled after previous guidelines developed in Iowa, this project is entitled *Plans for Progress into the 21st Century*. The literature review of this research project also offers an extensive look at the impact of school library media programs on academic achievement as well as a historic view of state and national guidelines and surveys, and evidence of their role in education.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Background

Research clearly shows a strong correlation between quality library programs and student achievement (Lance, 1994; Lance, 2001; Lance & Loertscher, 2001; Krashen, 2002; Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, 2002). Over the past 50 years, researchers examined the impact of school library programs on student achievement nearly 75 times (Lance, 2001, Electronic version). Consistently, research has shown the value of a quality school library collection and a professionally trained library media specialist (Lance, 2001). A 2002 study of Iowa school media programs observed that:

> A strong LM program is one that is adequately staffed, stocked and funded. … As the staffing, collections and funding of LM programs grow, reading scores rise. … These findings indicate that incremental improvements in staffing and collections will yield incremental increases in reading scores. (Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, pp.viii-ix)

The 2002 Iowa study charges Iowa school decision-makers to address the need for and benefits of funding school library media programs, noting funding alone may be enough to improve academic achievement. Libraries are more about connections than collections. To gain the support of administrators, librarians need to show they are connecting students and teachers to the information that in turn results in improved learning, better reading skills, and higher academic achievement (Hartzell, 2002, p.31).

To help accomplish that in Iowa, this researcher developed quantitative state guidelines for school library program budgets, collections, staffing and facilities that media specialists and Iowa decision makers could use to improve Iowa's schools.

Chapter 1

Background

Research clearly shows a strong correlation between quality library programs and student achievement (Lance, 1994; Lance, 2001; Lance & Loertscher, 2001; Krashen, 2002; Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, 2002). Over the past 50 years, researchers examined the impact of school library programs on student achievement nearly 75 times (Lance, 2001, Electronic version). Consistently, research has shown the value of a quality school library collection and a professionally trained library media specialist (Lance, 2001). A 2002 study of Iowa school media programs observed that:

> A strong LM program is one that is adequately staffed, stocked and funded. … As the staffing, collections and funding of LM programs grow, reading scores rise. … These findings indicate that incremental improvements in staffing and collections will yield incremental increases in reading scores. (Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, pp.viii-ix)

The 2002 Iowa study charges Iowa school decision-makers to address the need for and benefits of funding school library media programs, noting funding alone may be enough to improve academic achievement. Libraries are more about connections than collections. To gain the support of administrators, librarians need to show they are connecting students and teachers to the information that in turn results in improved learning, better reading skills, and higher academic achievement (Hartzell, 2002, p.31).

To help accomplish that in Iowa, this researcher developed quantitative state guidelines for school library program budgets, collections, staffing and facilities that media specialists and Iowa decision makers could use to improve Iowa's schools.

Lance (1994) found that the size and variety of a school library's collection and the size of the total staff were key characteristics that impact student performance on standardized tests. In addition, spending was more linked to student achievement when characteristics of a particular school's student population and curriculum needs were taken into consideration.

McQuillan (1998) and Krashen (2002) emphasized the importance of children having access to books. Krashen asserted, "more access to books will result in more literacy development" (p.750). While poverty was a key predictor in student achievement in many studies, library staffing and availability of books were also "consistent predictors of achievement" (p. 753).

Signs of commitment to libraries on a national level included First Lady Laura Bush's sponsorship of the White House Conference on School Libraries June 4, 2002, and her push to get the Bush administration to commit $10 million to librarian recruitment (St. Lifer, p. 11). Robert S. Martin of the Institute of Museum and Library Services called the conference a "landmark event" and an avenue to demonstrate the important role good libraries play in promoting learning and student achievement (White House, p. 3). Additionally, the Reed Amendment allocated $12.5 million in federal grant money for school library materials, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, during the 2002-2003 school year. Senator Jack Reed said he hoped to increase that to $25 million for 2003-2004 and $25 million for 2004-2005 (Senator Reed, 2002, p.24). That came as part of the historic *No Child Left Behind* legislation, an education reform plan signed into law by President Bush on Jan. 8, 2002 (No Child). A link between strong good school library programs and improved literacy was acknowledged in the reform bill.

Increased support for school library programs was shown at the state level in California and Wisconsin. Great efforts were being made to improve the reading achievement of California students. As part of the California Reading Initiative, the state legislature initially allocated $158.8 million or approximately $28 per student for library materials. While the goal was to nearly double the state's school library book count to 20 relevant and current books per student, schools are allowed to purchase any materials that are either used or checked out of the school library. In addition to purchasing books, schools could buy resources such as "periodicals, microforms, AV materials, computer software, CD ROMs, and online resources." (California Department of Education, 2001, Electronic version). Unfortunately, California Governor Gray Davis later reduced that to $5 per student (St. Lifer, p. 11).

In Wisconsin, public school districts began receiving additional state funding for library materials in 1996 (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2002, Electronic version). Purchases from this fund were not limited to books. Schools could buy resources such as audiocassettes, videocassettes, instructional software, and electronic reference materials and subscriptions. The money came from the Common School Income Fund, which was the interest earned on loans from a state trust fund.

During the first six years of the program, each public school district received between $11.64 and $21.81 per child aged 4 through 20 living in the district the year before. In 1997-98, that amounted to $16.26 for each pupil enrolled in school. That amounted to more than twice the amount the average school district spent on library materials using local and general state funds (Wisconsin, Electronic version).

History of library standards.

While these efforts are worthwhile and encouraging, direction is needed as to how allocated funds best be spent. Librarians need standards or guidelines when it comes to making purchasing decisions, such as how many books to buy, how many computers they need for Internet access, or how many resources to purchase in electronic format.

For years educators have used standards as a way to improve student learning. The American Library Association first published national standards for secondary school libraries in 1920 (Gann, 1998, p.154). The standards, developed in 1918 by a National Education Association committee, included budgetary figures for salaries and materials, physical size and equipment needs, and qualifications and responsibilities for librarians. The first standards called for a book budget of at least 50 cents per student and a space capacity large enough to house up to 10 percent of the student population at any one time (p.155).

School library standards have been revised numerous times since then. Elementary school library standards were addressed in 1925 (p.159). More standards were released in 1945, this time by the American Library Association with the role of a school library expanded to mean more than a place and a collection (p.164). Staffing and collection recommendations were based on the number of students enrolled. For example, it was recommended that a school with 200 students have 2,000 books and a full-time librarian with clerical help (p.164).

Standards for School Library Programs was released in 1960 at the request of school administrators and librarians who felt the 1945 standards were "inadequate" and "out-of-date" (pp.170-171). Qualitative aspects of a school library program, including the administrative responsibilities of a librarian, the importance of a quality staff, and the

classroom teachers, were clearly emerging. The recommended collection size ranged from a minimum of 6,000 books to at least 10 books per student in larger schools (p.176).

Highlights of the 1969 standards included a political switch in terms from library to media, as the role of audiovisual materials was emphasized (p.179). At that time, it was recommended that standards be updated every two years (p.183). *Media Programs: District and School* was published in 1975 as an authoritative guide for policy makers to better understand the quantitative requirements for a school or district to reach qualitative goals (p.183-184).

National media organizations continued to provide quantitative guidelines through 1988 with the publication of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* by the American Association of School Libraries (AASL) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT). A major change can be observed in the 1998 *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*, which emphasizes the four roles of a media specialist and nine performance-based Information Literacy standards. Absent from the 1998 *Information Power* were quantitative guidelines for budget, collection, and facilities (AASL, 1998, p.vii). The 1998 *Information Power* does recommend at least "one full-time certified/licensed library media specialist supported by qualified staff" per school (p.103). AASL (1999) did follow up with a rubric that helps media specialists use target indicators to assess their program as basic, proficient or exemplary.

Several Iowa-specific documents have been available over the years. Those include the 1927 *Library Manual for the Public Schools of Iowa*, published by the State Board of Educational Examiners, and the 1992 *Plan for Progress in the Library Media Center PK-12,* released by the Iowa Department in 1992. *Plan for Progress*, put together as an educator's guide to building a quality library program, emphasized the following:

> To meet this challenge to develop an information literate student body, each school first must provide an adequate number of qualified, licensed library media specialists and support staff, and a library media center containing resources and equipment which will satisfy the curricular and recreational reading, viewing and listening requirements of students. (Iowa Department of Education, 1992, p).

Eleven years have passed since that set of Iowa guidelines was released.

The impact of new technology on libraries.

Technology has always driven changes in education. The number of public schools with Internet access grew from 50 percent in 1995 to 98 percent in 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001, Electronic version, p.155). During the 2000-2001 school year, schools had an average of one computer per 4.4 students and 77.7 percent of the nation's elementary and secondary schools had Internet access from the library media center (p.156).

New technologies, though they increase the amount of information and types of services available to the public, create a challenge for budget-strained library programs (Surprenant, 1984, p.23). Librarians are forced to make tough decisions about how much they can spend on print and how much they should spend on non-print resources, including those that are only available in electronic versions (p.23). Librarians are forced to find ways to provide patrons with equal access to all forms of information (p.25). With so many online databases available, librarians must choose which ones they can focus on learning to use and teach (p.23).

The World Wide Web, which had an estimated 7.4 million sites in 2001 (Mardis, 2001, Electronic version), has played a major role in the way libraries operate. Internet directories like Yahoo (http://www.yahoo.com), search engines like Google (http://www.google.com) and

licensed online databases such as EBSCOhost allow patrons to access information more easily and without even entering the physical doorways of a library.

Our libraries must reflect the fact that information has truly gone digital, with more and more information being made available in electronic format as time goes on (Johnson, 1997, p.1). Libraries, if they are to continue to serve as depositories of information, must adjust to the changes in information technology (Barker, 1997). Librarians must work to balance their print collections with electronic resources such as online catalogs, CD-ROMs, electronic databases and the Internet (Jankowska, 1998, p.126). In addition, the school library media program, as a vital support and extension of the classroom, will need to continue to provide up-to-date audiovisual materials and production technology such as digital cameras, programs on CD-ROM and on networked computers, and scanners for staff and students (Gann, pp.179-180).

As formats come and go, and changes are made to the curriculum, schools must adapt to keep their library collections dynamic (Alabama State Department of Education, 1999, Electronic version). "As education moves beyond the textbook and the classroom," school libraries become more valuable, "providing access to a collection of skillfully selected, organized, and managed resources in all formats" (Massachusetts, 1997, Electronic version).

A move toward more electronic resources that can be accessed outside the library walls changes the way library space will be used in the future (Lushington & Kusack, 1991, p.15). Changes or additions may need to be made to existing facilities to accommodate larger collections, the space needs of people using the library, and the addition of new services (Fraley & Anderson, 1990, pp. 17-22). Computers, printers, scanners and other developing technologies may require more space than stacks of books (Bass, 1987, p.105). Although space needs are difficult to put in concrete terms that apply to everyone, quantitative guidelines can be developed

as long as they are used in conjunction with the function and space needs at local schools (Schulzetenberg, 1984, p.478).

Effects of national, state guidelines.

Local school librarians have been relying on state and national guidelines for years. The Iowa *Plan for Progress* followed the release of national standards in 1988 (AASL & AECT). The 1988 *Information Power* provides budget formulas for media specialists to use in calculating budget figures needed to provide students with "access to a wide range of information resources" (p.70, pp.124-130). Variables that affect budget requests include the age of the collection, each library's strengths and weaknesses, changes in the school population, material costs and inflation (p.130). The physical space required to offer students a quality media program are addressed also (pp.131-139).

Staffing needs for a successful school library media program should be based on a variety of factors, including the school's size, staff and student expectations, and the degree of integration and involvement of the media program with the school's curriculum (p.56). An emphasis has been placed on the importance of having a professional direct the school library program:

> As library media centers have evolved from mere warehouses for materials and equipment to dynamic information and resource programs, the need for increased professional staffing has grown significantly (p.56).

A search of print and online sources found that at least seven states provide current school library media standards for administrators and media specialists to follow. Especially high standards are in place in Minnesota (Minnesota Educational Media Association, Electronic

version) and Massachusetts (Massachusetts School Library Media Association, Electronic version).

What makes Iowa unique?

Standards-based reform and accountability have been important topics among educators during the past decade, and Iowa is the only state without state-mandated academic standards (Education Week: Standards, 2002, Electronic version). Local school boards set these standards in Iowa; however, the Iowa Department of Education in 1998 began requiring school districts to report on statewide indicators of student performance (Stover, 1998, A1). Despite the statewide lack of standards, Iowa high school students have ranked between first and third nationally on ACT composite scores every year between 1989 and 2000, including first from 1990 to 1994 (Iowa Department of Education, 2001, Electronic version). Nearly 90 percent of Iowans 25 years or older are high school graduates, which ranks well above the national average of 84.1 percent.

Education Week, in its Quality Counts 2002 report, awarded Iowa a letter grade of B for its state average spending of $7,603 per student, $524 above the national average. (Education Week Resources: Adequacy, Electronic version). That is despite the fact that Iowa's average annual pay of $26,939 ranks only 38th nationally, according to U.S. Census Bureau (2001).

Iowa had 535,335 students enrolled in kindergarten through 12th grade during the 2000-2001 school year, with nearly 46,000 certified public-and private-school teachers (Iowa Department of Education, 2001, Electronic version). Nearly 56 percent of the students in Iowa's public schools live in rural areas compared to the national average of 27.4 percent (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999). Although the percentage of Iowa minority students rose 112 percent since 1986, the total minority enrollment (8.6 percent) in Iowa public schools was

much lower than the national average (37.1 percent) in 1998 (Iowa Department of Education, 2001, Electronic version, p.35-36).

In 2000, Iowa had the second highest percentage of residents under age 25 and the highest percentage of people 65 years or older in the Midwest (Iowa Department of Education, 2001 Electronic version). Only 7.3 percent of Iowans – fourth lowest nationally -- were living in poverty in 2000, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2000, Electronic version).

In response to a reduction in the state budget, layoffs of teachers, counselors and media specialists were announced for the 2002-2003 school year (Face up to the choice, 2002, April 22, p.A8). The editorial staff at *The Des Moines Register*, the state's largest newspaper, made the following assertion: "Education is Iowa's No. 1 priority, but the state may be on the verge of losing its enviable reputation and biggest selling point."

School library media programs in Iowa were dealt a blow in 1995, when the Iowa Code was changed so that local school districts were no longer required to have guidance or media service programs (Iowa Code, 2001, Electronic version). At the same time, the state-level position of educational media consultant was eliminated. Since there is no longer a code requirement for a media program, schools are not required to have a licensed media specialist administer the library (S. Fischer, personal communication, June 28, 2002). Fischer, of the Iowa Bureau of Practitioners, Preparation and Licensure, emphasized, however, that only licensed media specialists can teach classes on library media skills. Classroom teachers or associates, under Iowa law, may not.

Statistics and research that show ways to improve student achievement are important to school administrators and community policy-makers. In fact, beginning during the fiscal year 2002, the State Library of Iowa worked with school librarians and Area Education Agencies to

gather survey information for all school libraries in Iowa (State Library of Iowa, Electronic version). While all research shows the importance of having adequate staffing and a large varied collection, conditions in parts of Iowa do not support this. Many school districts in Iowa do recognize the importance of library media programs, but all districts need guidelines for supporting a quality program.

Description of Problem

A lack of current state guidelines for personnel, budget, facilities, and collections inhibits the development and maintenance of quality school library media programs in Iowa.

Research Questions

1. What factors influence the needs for school library staffing, budget, collection and facilities?
    - **a.** In particular, what impact have electronic resources (including databases and the World Wide Web) had on the need for print materials? Personnel? Budget? Facilities?
    - **b.** What are the minimum and desirable staffing ratios (including certified media professionals and support personnel) for a school library media program at an elementary school? Middle school? High school? Factor in enrollment figures.
    - **c.** What specifications are minimum and desirable for library facilities? Can this be put in terms of square footage? Seating needs? Number of computer workstations? Can environment or atmosphere be incorporated into this study?

   d. How many print volumes; periodicals, print and full-text online; computers and related technologies such as printers and scanners; and non-print items do libraries need?

2. What role do state and national standards play in the development of strong library media programs?
3. What value do standards have in education?
4. What other states have current quantitative guidelines and have steps been taken to measure the impact of these guidelines and standards on the academic achievement of students in that state?
5. What does research show about the impact of school library media programs on student achievement?

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this project is to develop quantitative state guidelines for minimum and desirable staffing patterns, collections, budgets, technology and equipment needs, and facilities for school libraries in Iowa.

Definitions

Elementary school – For the purposes of this study, an elementary school is an educational facility that serves a combination of students that range from kindergarten through sixth grade.

Middle school -- For the purposes of this study, a middle school is an educational facility that serves a combination of students that range from fourth through ninth grade.

High school -- For the purposes of this study, a high school is an educational facility that serves a combination of students that range from ninth through 12th grade.

Collection – Materials, print and non-print, and equipment contained in the library (AASL & AECT, 1988, p. 69).

Print material – Print material or books may be interchanged. This refers to the format. (Harrod's, 1995, p.514).

Non-print material – Library materials that don't fit the description of a book, periodical or pamphlet are considered non-print material. Examples include audio-visual materials, computer software, videocassettes, DVDs, talking books and musical recordings (p.452).

Text – Text refers to words, signs and symbols used to express a person's ideas, thoughts or feelings. Text may be published in printed (paper) or electronic format (Reitz, 2002, Electronic version).

Illustration – An illustration is a picture, plate, diagram, plan, chart, map, design or other graphic image that appears by itself or in conjunction with text (Reitz).

Periodical – A periodical is printed material that is published at scheduled intervals and carries a distinct title. This publication contains stories, articles, letters, and other submissions by numerous writers. A magazine is the most common type (Harrod's, 1995, p.490).

Media specialist – A person with a professional license to manage a school library and its contents is called a media specialist or librarian (p.377). In Iowa, media specialist is an endorsement term.

Support staff – Support staff are people who perform non-professional library tasks such as clerical tasks, shelving, checking out materials, and distributing materials to teachers (Young, 1983, p.222).

Online database – An online database is an electronic collection of information that is accessed through the World Wide Web (INT Media Group). Examples include traditional print reference materials now available in an electronic format and digital magazine indexes that allow students to search for topics and retrieve articles from hundreds of magazine titles.

Academic achievement – Academic achievement is a way of measuring knowledge acquired through formal education. Common measures include grade point averages, test scores and degrees (Shafritz, 1988). For the purpose of this study, academic achievement, which can be interchanged with the term "student achievement," refers to how students perform on standardized tests or state-developed, standards-based tests, particularly reading scores.

Guidelines – Guidelines are suggestions made for improving the quality of a program. For the purposes of this study, the researcher will provide guidelines rather than required standards.

Standards – Criteria used to measure or assess services and programs (Young, p.215). Standards are generally thought of as requirements rather than suggestions. For the purposes of this study, the researcher will provide guidelines or suggestions.

Quantitative – Quantitative is a variable that is stated in numerical terms (Shafritz, p.287).

Qualitative – Qualitative refers to a measurement of achievement in terms of performing or demonstrating a skill through an activity or exercise (McBrien, 1997, p.74).

Assumptions

The researcher assumes the following:

- Statistical data about libraries matters.
- Valuable and accurate national and state data will be available.
- This data can be interpreted and applied to Iowa school libraries.

Limitations

- This study will make recommendations that may apply only to public schools in the state of Iowa.
- Iowa is the only state without state-prescribed academic standards. Local school boards set the standards for each district.

Statement of Significance

Strong school library media programs have been shown to have a direct impact on student achievement in Iowa and at least five other states. Researchers have found that libraries with more books, more qualified staff, bigger budgets and better facilities do make a difference.

Strong technology-rich programs connect more learners to more information at school and at home. The amount and forms of information have changed dramatically

over the past 10 years. Computers, other technology advances and inflation have rendered the 1992 state guidelines outdated and less than adequate. Updated state guidelines will not only help school library media specialists better plan their spending, but will also serve as an important advocacy tool to present to lawmakers and school administrators at the building, district and state levels.

In a day and age in which student performance is a top priority, the 1998 *Information Power* clearly provides much-needed information literacy standards for media specialists. Nonetheless, in order to contribute to improved test scores, librarians need some guidelines for budget, staffing, facilities and collection needs. Quality Iowa school library media programs cannot exist without adequate personnel, facilities, budget and material collections. Media specialists need up-to-date quantitative guidelines in order to develop and maintain quality school library media programs.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Strong library media programs have been shown to have a direct effect on student achievement. Standards and guidelines drive media specialists in creating and maintaining these strong programs. Media programs in Iowa are relying on 1992 guidelines. Media specialists need more up-to-date guidelines that address the impact that computers, the World Wide Web, and other technology-rich resources are having on the types of information and instruction needed in today's schools.

The areas included in the literature review for this study are state/national quantitative guidelines and surveys; information technology; the role of national and state guidelines in school libraries; and the impact of school library programs on student achievement.

State/National Quantitative Guidelines and Surveys

AASL and AECT (1988) released national standards based on a United States Department of Education survey of school library media centers. A survey was sent out to 4,500 public schools in the fall of 1985 and 1700 private schools in January 1986 (p.113). Questions focused primarily on staff, expenditures, facilities, collections, technology and services provided. The AASL-AECT standards writing committee analyzed this data and developed quantitative guidelines based on 571 schools identified as high-service programs (p.114). These schools were selected from the sample of 3,527 schools (after non-typical schools were excluded) on the basis of how many of 22 specified services they provided on a regular basis. Only data from public schools was used in forming the national guidelines. Only high levels of service (75^{th}, 90^{th} and 95^{th}

percentile) are presented in 1988 *Information Power* as the national guidelines were intended to drive schools that were striving for excellence (p.115).

Several states, including Iowa, adapted these national guidelines and set their own. The Iowa Department of Education (1992) followed up with a new set of state guidelines. *Plan for Progress in the Media Center* was the fifth and last Iowa document by the same title released since 1973. The handbook was developed by a statewide committee, which was led by state educational media consultant B.J. Buckingham. References to *Information Power* are made throughout the document, which makes recommendations about the minimum and desirable levels of staffing, collection size and budget spent on replacing materials. In addition, recommendations are given in regards to budget, facilities, networking with other agencies, and the roles and responsibilities of the media specialist. The document stresses the importance of a quality library media programs in shaping information literate students. In order for students to reach desired outcomes, the library media center must provide students and staff access to information and the instruction they need to use it, according to the state handbook.

Iowa's public school library spending was the subject of a related study by Clark (1990). The researcher, who wanted to see how Iowa ranked compared to the national average, sent a questionnaire to a random sample of 100 full-time media specialists in Iowa (p.19). Eighty media specialists returned usable surveys, which addressed spending on books, periodicals, professional materials, audio-visuals and computer software during the 1988-89 school year. Clark found that Iowa spent less than the national average. Iowa media specialists spent an average of $3351 per school on books to the national average of $4287 (p.24). The majority of the respondents spent more than 55 percent of their material budget on books, 25 percent or more on software, 20 percent or more on

periodicals, and less than 5 percent on professional materials. The researcher suggested further study of spending trends.

A few years later, Donham van Deusen (1996) collected information about budgets and staffing as part of the Iowa Educational Media Funding Task Force. The researcher analyzed data from the 1994-1995 school year provided by 718 schools. Donham van Deusen found that the average (median) school had a professional staff of 1.0 FTE, with a median of .5 FTE at the elementary level. At that time, funding averaged $8.99 for books and $1.40 for software overall, with elementary having the largest median book budget ($9.11 per student) including all sources of funding.

The State Library of Iowa (2002) surveyed all 1,528 public schools in Iowa regarding library media programs. In all, 1,221 of 1,528 public schools, or 80 percent, responded to questions about funding, collection, staffing, and other program data for the 2001-2002 school year. The average (50^{th} percentile) school is staffed by a professional 22.5 hours per week, and with a total staffing of 47 hours per week. The average media center had 7,974 books with an average copyright date of 1985, with an additional 312 reference books averaging a 1988 copyright date. The State Library of Iowa found that the average operating budget was $4,008, with the average population served being 285 students.

Miller and Shontz (2003) investigated national trends in school library spending. The researchers had a 41 percent return rate (593) on their survey, which was sent to 1496 media specialists from a random sampling of School Library Journal subscribers. Nearly equal numbers of elementary, middle school and high school media specialists, including nine percent from private schools, addressed questions about spending, resources and services (p. 59). The researchers found a decline in 2001-2002 media

spending for non-personnel library resources – to $13,341 from $14,047 in their study from two years earlier (p. 52). Median spending for books and CD-Rom/software products was up, while spending declined for audiovisual and world wide web products (p. 54). The median staffing for all levels was one media specialist and one support staff member per school (p. 59). The researchers concluded that school libraries and library media specialists, despite an economic downturn, are providing valuable services, particularly in the areas of information and computer skills instruction, cooperative planning, and communication with teachers about new resources on the market.

In one of their previous studies of school library spending, Miller and Shontz (2001) randomly selected and surveyed 1530 library media specialists from among School Library journal's subscribers. All 50 states were represented. In all, 609, or 39.8 percent (including 51 private schools) responded to questions that addressed funding sources, expenditures broken down by category, collection size, technology, use of online databases, and staffing (p.59). Miller and Shontz found there was a slight increase in spending between 1995-1996 and 1999-2000, and found there was a marked increased in spending on Web-based and other technology-related products. Median spending for all library resources except salaries was up to $14,047 per school, with each school spending an average of $8.09 per student on books -- less than the average cost of a trade paperback (p.50). The researchers concluded that librarians are becoming "increasingly preoccupied" with technology, and that funds for books are still inadequate (p.60). In addition, there is a national shortage of librarians, particularly those with adequate training; and yet school librarians still are finding time to serve their main functions as teacher, information specialist, and a resource to students and teachers.

In another national survey, Truett (1991) investigated what librarians liked, disliked and wanted to change about their library facilities. The researcher conducted a random survey and received 146 usable surveys – which represented 48 percent of the school media specialists and children's librarians at public libraries who were surveyed. Openness and spaciousness were features both groups liked the most about their facilities; central location and windows were the next two most common responses. milarly, the most complaints from school media specialists were about insufficient space and poor design (p.92). Not surprisingly, more media specialists and public librarians said they wanted to increase the physical size of their library than any other change, with adding technology and remodeling other popular choices among school librarians (p.94). Other features ranked highly by media specialists were "an inviting, attractive atmosphere'' and "a good floor plan or layout design" (p.95). Also outstanding features specifically mentioned were new furniture and technology (p. 95).

Information Technology

Grover and Barron (1995) summarized the papers presented at the Treasure Mountain retreat November 8, 1994, near Indianapolis, Indiana. The topic of the retreat was "Future Scenarios for School Library Media Programs." Researchers and media practitioners met to discuss what schooling will be like in the future and what role library media programs and specialists will play. Grover and Barron pointed out that the conference attendees brought up several challenges that educators, particularly library media professionals, will face. In order to thrive, educators will need to become "change junkies" (p.13). A key point was how technology is and will affect all aspects of life. Grover and Barron noted the following adjustments media professionals need to make:

expand our view of sources; collaborate; facilitate rather than instruct; be willing to serve as community learning facilitator; and use research to make decisions (p.15).

Another researcher, Jankowska (1998), also stressed the need for media professionals to be willing to change rapidly. In her meta-analysis of related data, the researcher notes the influence information technology has had on reference librarians' responsibilities, which include "collaboration, resource-sharing, and the ability to bring libraries to their users" (p.124). Janowska found that although electronic databases may provide better access to more people, these versions generally were more costly than their printed counterpart. The researcher suggested that human librarians will be needed in the future to help people analyze, sort and access the vast amount of knowledge that will be available through the Internet and other electronic networks and databases.

Simpson (2002) found there were not many guidelines to assist media specialists in determining the number of computers needed in a library. Too often, this factor is driven by space rather than student needs (p. 23). The researcher identified four types of computers needed (administrative, class productive, personal productive, OPAC) and developed a formula schools can use to arrive at the appropriate number of computers for their library media centers (p. 24).

The Role of National and State Guidelines

Gann (1998) reviewed the national media standards and guidelines through 1988, and discussed their significance and impact on the profession and education. She concluded that the national standards and guidelines have served as a way to better define the role of a library media program and a library media specialist in a school (p.193). Gann noted how the guidelines evolved from merely lists to extensive descriptions of roles and responsibilities. The national standards, despite their reflection of education

trends at times, have contributed to increased role of library media programs in schools (p.194).

In her meta-analysis of literature related to standards, Stahlschmidt (1989) found two doctoral dissertations that addressed the issue of school library standards (p.120). Both found that few schools were able to meet the national ALA standards. The researcher concluded that the national standards definitely had an impact on the profession, particularly in the model they set for the development of state-level standards. Stahlschmidt found in her study of citations in *Library Literature* from 1876 to 1989 that standards were a common topic of study (p.121). She found at least five citations per year, with the greatest amount coming between 1958 and 1969, during which three different sets of standards were released (p.121). Stahlschmidt recommended further study, including a look at research that was done to support standards over the years, as well as a study of the response of school board members, school administrators and other members of the education community to the standards and their attainability.

In one of the dissertations cited by Stahlschmidt, Basel (1982) compared a random sampling of 425 Texas public school libraries to state, regional and national standards (p.43). The researcher was attempting to see how close Texas schools were to being in compliance with state standards that were going into effect in 1985 (p.3). Areas the researcher covered in a 35-question survey included materials and resources, equipment, and facilities. Basel found that only five percent of the schools surveyed met all of the state standards, less than one percent met regional standards and none met national standards (p.93). The greatest compliance was in the area of personnel (p.91) and the weakest area was in the area of budget (p.92).

Interested in seeing how Iowa schools measured up against state standards, McGrew and Buckingham (1982) sent a survey to 1762 public schools in Iowa in 1980 (p.3). Comparisons were made to a similar survey they had conducted for the Iowa Department of Public Instruction in 1976. The major areas researched were: the number of school library media centers meeting state guidelines and the number of guidelines met by each school library media center. The researchers found that little progress had been made over a four-year period (1976 to 1980) in moving Iowa library programs closer to state guidelines. Of 32 possible guidelines, 50 percent of the schools met 12 or fewer and 90 percent met 18 or fewer (p.5). McGrew and Buckingham also found a trend of schools reducing the number of hours libraries were staffed by professional media personnel (p.14).

The Impact of School Library Media Programs on Academic Achievement

Greve (1974) studied the relationship between student access to library services and the performance of 12th grade students in Iowa high schools on standardized tests. Greve's sample was 96,009 Iowa high school seniors from 232 public schools who completed the ITED during the 1965-66 school year, attended a three- or four-year public high school, and attended a school in an area served by a public library that collected the needed data (p.30). Greve used a library service index that was based on the expenditures per pupil and number of volumes per pupil. The researcher also looked at the role school size played, and noted that students attending larger high schools had higher levels of service available to them. The researcher found that the "most valuable" indicator in predicting a student's performance on the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) was the number of books in the school library (p.83). Greve proposed that other

researchers attempt to identify cause-and-effect relationships between academic achievement and accessibility of library services (p.87).

Several similar studies have been done since then. Loertscher, Ho and Bowe (1987) examined the characteristics of the 270 exemplary public and private elementary schools identified in an earlier mentioned U.S. Department of Education study. They researchers received usable data from 70 percent, or 147 of the 209 public schools from that list (p.148). Loertscher, Ho and Bowe attempted to identify common elements of exemplary programs. The researchers found the staffing of "a full-time professional and a full-time clerical person" was "the single most important" variable in an outstanding media program (p.152). The quality and frequency of library services were linked to the level of professional and overall staffing (p.152). The researchers charged schools first to make a financial investment in bringing the staffing level up, and also recommended increased spending on materials, particularly related to the school's curricular goals (p.153).

Krashen (1993), in a meta-analysis of research related to access to books, found evidence that children read more when they have access to books at home, school and public libraries (p. 33). The researcher also found a link between the amount of reading students did and how well they performed on various literary tests, including reading comprehension, vocabulary, and spelling (p. 12). Krashen analyzed several studies that showed that children who had access to books at school libraries and public libraries did more reading. He concluded that libraries are therefore a major source of books for free reading (p. 37) and libraries with print-rich collections can be associated with better reading (p. 38).

In the first of a series of studies in different states, Lance, Welborn and Hamilton-Pennell (1993) investigated the impact of school library media centers on academic achievement in Colorado's public schools. Lance, Welborn and Hamilton-Pennell sent questionnaires to 1331 Colorado public schools that served grades 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and/or 10 and received 221 valid surveys (1993, p.11, p.25). The researchers compared selected scores from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) or Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP) to library media program, other school and community variables, such as graduation rates and socio-economic factors such as percentage of students eligible for the national free lunch program. The researchers found that the library staff and collection size are the best predictors of academic achievement (p.92). They identified at-risk conditions and library media size as "direct" predictors of test scores for all the grades that were studied (p.80). Indirect predictors included the instructional role of the media specialist, library expenditures and teacher-pupil ratios (p.89). The researchers recommended that similar studies be conducted in other states.

Lance, in turn, collaborated with three other researchers to find similar results in Alaska, Pennsylvania, Oregon and Iowa. Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell (2000a) completed a second and more extensive study of Colorado library media programs. All five of these follow-up studies were done in part to see if the results of the first Colorado study would hold up over time and if the findings applied to other states. Standardized tests were used to measure academic achievement in Alaska (CAT) and Iowa (ITBS and ITED). Pennsylvania, Colorado and Oregon's studies were based on results of state-designed tests based on state standards. This researcher will discuss the Iowa study separately later in this section.

The second Colorado study was based on a population of 200 public schools that served students in grades 4 and 7. Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell (2000b) based their Pennsylvania study on 435 of the state's 1691 public schools serving fifth, eighth and/or 11th graders (Lance & Loertscher, 2001, p.[73]). The Alaska study (Lance, Hamilton-Pennell and Rodney, 2000) was based on 211 of the state's 461 public schools serving students in grades 4, 8 and/or 11 (Lance & Loertscher, 2001, p.[72]). Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell (2001) based their Oregon study on 513 of the state's 1215 public schools serving fifth, eighth and/or 10th graders (Lance, 2001, Electronic version).

Common achievement findings of the Oregon, Alaska, Pennsylvania and the second Colorado studies (Lance, 2001, Electronic version) included:

- The skill level of the media specialist impacts student achievement.
- Principal and teacher support are necessary for success.
- Support staff is vital so that the professional media specialists can perform their jobs effectively.
- Success relates to the time a media specialist spends teaching information literacy skills to students, and serving as in-service trainer for teachers.

The level of the media program's development and staffing levels were predictors of academic achievement in the Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Alaska, and second Colorado study (Lance, 2001, Electronic version; Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, 2002, p.73). Other library data found to be a predictor of achievement in more than one state include: access to online databases and the World Wide Web, library staff activities related to collaboration, leadership and technology, individual student visits to the library, and the level of media program usage (Lance, 2001, Electronic version; Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, 2002, p.74).

Rodney, Lance and Hamilton-Pennell (2002) assessed the impact of Iowa public library media programs on academic achievement at the request of the state's area education agencies. The role of information technology and the impact of collaboration on library media programs were two other areas of focus (p.1). The researchers sent a questionnaire to all Iowa public schools that serve fourth, eighth and/or 11th graders. The survey focused on potential predictors of academic achievement, including library media center hours, library media staff and activities, library media center usage, library media resource collections and finances (pp.114-119). The sample was 506 schools (169 with fourth grade, 162 with eighth graders, 175 with 11th graders) for a 34 percent response rate (p.29). The researchers also collected the following information from the Iowa Department of Education: total enrollment; percentage of students on free or reduced lunch; enrollment based on race and ethnicity; and key teacher characteristics (pp.32-33).

The Iowa study found that Iowa reading scores improve in relation to the strength of a school's library media program. Rodney, Lance and Hamilton-Pennell found that the impact was greatest at the fourth grade level, where it could not be explained away by other school or community conditions. Reading scores also went up at all levels as staffing levels and collection size increased (p.73).

Recommendations in Iowa, similar to those in other states, that relate to the need for standards were as follows:

- Provide additional funding for school library media programs.
- Principals need to support and expect collaboration between the media specialist and teachers.
- Media specialists need to provide high-quality databases for staff and students, and provide training on their usage (p.91).

Lance and the other Colorado researchers weren't the only ones examining the link between libraries and academic achievement during the past few years. Baughman (2000, Electronic version) presented results of a study of Massachusetts's school libraries at a symposium at Simmons College in Boston, Massachusetts. Baughman mailed out 1818 questionnaires and received 519. The researcher found there was a "vital link" between libraries and student achievement. Specific library factors that correlated to academic achievement at the elementary, middle school and high school level were per pupil book count, student use of the library and the number of hours the library was open. Other key library factors that link to achievement at two different grade levels were library instruction program, per pupil expenditures, the presence of a full-time librarian, and the level of non-professional staffing. Baughman's recommendations were for the state to provide categorical funding for libraries and appoint a state-level media program director.

Baxter and Smalley (2003) examined the status of Minnesota's school library programs in comparison to the state's performance-based standards. Eighty-two percent, or 1,172 media specialists, completed an online survey that included questions about staffing, collections, computers and other equipment, budget, and Internet access (p. 33-34). As a follow-up, site visits were made to 131 schools (p. 58). The researchers found a statistically significant relationship between student reading scores and two factors – school media center spending and the hours media specialists work (p. 36). More than two-thirds of the schools with above average reading scores had librarians who worked 36 or more hours a week. Researchers also found a statistically significant correlation between the size of a media center's budget and higher reading schools at the elementary level (p. 36). Recommendations included the following:

- School districts need to provide adequate staffing, including at least one full-time professional media specialist per building.
- The state needs to provide funding to help make library print collections more current.
- The state needs to hire state-level staff to help school districts develop effective library media programs (p. 136).

Similar research has been done in Florida (2003), North Carolina (2003) and Michigan (2003). These studies have also demonstrated the importance of library staffing and collections to student achievement.

Summary

AASL and AECT (1988) provided high standards for school library programs, based on the best of the nation's schools providing high levels of service. The Iowa Department of Public Instruction (1992) followed up with its own version of guidelines for minimum and desirable levels of staffing, budget, collection and facilities a school library media program should have. Donham van Deusen (1996) provided Iowa media specialists with comparative staffing and funding data. The State Library of Iowa (2002) assimilated the most recent data in the most comprehensive study of Iowa school library Miller and Shontz (2003) found spending down for all library resources with book spending up and audiovisual spending down. That was reversal of their previous study (2001) in which spending was up with more money being channeled into technology. Clark (1990) observed that Iowa library programs tended to spend less than the national average on resources. Truett (1991) found that children's librarians and media specialists place a high value on open and spacious facilities. Grover and Barron (1995) pointed out the need for media professionals to be willing to respond to change, particularly in the

area of new technologies. Jankowska (1998) emphasized that while technology will change the way media professionals operate, there will still be a need for human librarians to help people find and analyze the enormous amount of information that will be available. Stahlschmidt (1989) observed a definite impact of national standards on the field, despite the inability of most schools to reach them. Simpson (2002) developed a formula to determine the number of computers needed in school libraries. Gann (1998) emphasized the evolution of the media program during the 20th century, and how the standards have helped the media center become a more integral part of the school. Basel (1982) found that few Texas schools met state, regional or national library standards. McGrew and Buckingham (1982) found few Iowa public schools were measuring up well against state guidelines put in place in 1976.

Greve (1974) observed that the number of books in a school library was the best indicator of student performance on the ITED instrument. Loertscher, Ho and Bowie (1987) identified library staffing as the most critical variable in an excellent media program. Krashen (1993) emphasized that students who had access to more books, particularly at libraries, are likely to do more reading. Lance, Welborn and Hamilton-Pennell (1993) found evidence of a definite link between school library media centers and academic achievement in Colorado's public schools. Lance collaborated with three other researchers to find similar results in four other states (Iowa, Oregon, Pennsylvania and Alaska) and again in Colorado (Lance, Rodney & Hamilton, 2000a; Lance, Rodney & Hamilton, 2000b; Lance, Hamilton-Pennell & Rodney, 2000; Lance, Hamilton-Pennell & Rodney, 2001; Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, 2002). These researchers found that the level of the media program's development and staffing levels were predictors of academic achievement in all five states. Baughman (2000) pointed out the need for

financial support for libraries in Massachusetts, since a statewide study showed a vital relationship between libraries and student achievement. Baxter and Smalley (2003) identified two factors – the more hours media specialists work and larger school media center budgets – that correlate with higher student reading scores. Studies done in Florida (2003), North Carolina (2003) and Michigan (2003) have shown a link between student achievement and library staffing and collections.

All studies suggest that effective school library media programs must have adequate professional and support staff, more books and technology-rich resources, and excellent facilities. Yet decision-makers and library media specialists are left to determine on their own how many of anything is adequate for student achievement. In order to better develop and maintain quality school library programs in the state of Iowa, media professionals need recommendations for minimum and desirable levels of staffing, collection size, budget, and facilities.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The Information Age has put added pressure on school library media specialists to learn, adapt and teach new technologies and change their programs accordingly. At the same time, they are being expected to contribute to student achievement with reading research suggesting more books are necessary. Media specialists, including those in Iowa, often are faced with tough decisions, such as whether to buy print or electronic versions of resources, while dealing with dwindling budgets and staff. The most current state guidelines, issued in 1992, are outdated, containing references to formats such as filmstrips and 16 mm films that are declining in use and excluding commonly used resources such as online databases. Iowa media specialists can make better decisions, make more effective use of their time and better contribute to student achievement if they have current state guidelines for personnel, budget, facilities and collections.

Procedures

This researcher used print and electronic resources to find current state standards or guidelines for school library media programs, expressed in terms of numbers (quantitative). The researcher used online library catalogs, including those at the University of Northern Iowa and the University of Iowa, online databases, and search engines such as Google. The search involved using "state" and/or the name of each of the 50 states in a keyword search combined with other terms as standards, guidelines, school library, and media.

During the collection process, an emphasis was placed on acquiring copies of standards or guidelines that have been enacted since 1997. A special focus was on states that surround Iowa or share similar social or economic characteristics. To determine

states that share these characteristics with Iowa, the researcher used U.S. Census Bureau information and other comparable data.

The researcher looked for quantitative guidelines that contain factors that have been shown to have an effect on student achievement. These included: library staffing, collection size, library budget, and access to online databases and the World Wide Web. Recommendations are being made about facility and equipment needs, in an effort to address the impact of new technologies and equipment on school library programs.

This researcher attempted to identify the 10 most valuable standards and guidelines, taking into consideration currency of the standards, the percentage of categories covered in that state's guidelines compared to the researcher's targeted areas, the standards' link to actual research, standardized test scores in those states, and Census data.

Data from selected states were put into a database for comparison purposes. Commonalities and patterns were identified. This researcher's recommendations are being made on two levels of quality: minimum and desirable.

The new guidelines are modeled after the 1992 *Plan for Progress*, which was also used as a source along with the quantitative guidelines included in the 1988 *Information Power*. Quantitative guidelines this researcher addressed include: staff size, including media specialists and support staff; budget; collection size, including books, periodicals, newspapers, videotapes, musical recordings, talking books, computer programs, software, online databases; and equipment needs.

This researcher evaluated her standards for format using suggestions from Doug Johnson, who helped write state standards as part of the Minnesota Educational Media Organization Task Force (Johnson, 2000, p.19-20). Another tool the researcher used in

formulating state guidelines was *A Planning Guide for Information Power: Building Partnership for Learning* (1999), which includes a program assessment rubric based on the 1998 *Information Power*.

A preliminary set of guidelines was put together and given to Barbara R. Safford and Mary Jo Langhorne for review.

Revisions were made and the document was resubmitted to Safford and Langhorne before the final draft was completed. The researcher wrote background and other explanatory information to be included with the guidelines. This researcher is publishing a print version and is investigating the online publication of this document.

Once these guidelines are published, the researcher plans to make a presentation at the Iowa Association of School Librarians state conference. She will share the guidelines with the state Department of Education, and seek to spread awareness of them in whatever ways possible, including speaking at conferences. She will seek the support or endorsement of other educational institutions and organizations in Iowa as well.

Results of this data will produce a much-needed product that will assist school library programs in having a positive effect on the academic achievement of the students in their buildings.

Chapter 4

The Project

The researcher presents her findings through a revised edition of *Plan for Progress in the Library Media Center*, which begins on the following page. The title of this document has been changed to *Plans for Progress into the 21st Century*.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

This research project, designed for Iowa school library media specialists, principals, and state education and legislative decision-makers, provides quantitative guidelines for library media program budgets, collections, staffing and facilities in Iowa schools. Research repeatedly has shown a link between these elements of a quality school library program and higher student achievement scores. Historically, standards and guidelines have been used to improve school library media programs. Modeled after previous guidelines developed in Iowa, this project is entitled *Plans for Progress into the 21st Century.*

This researcher was driven by the fact that *Plan for Progress* was last updated in 1992. Some resource types and equipment listed in that document are becoming obsolete and many other new ones, particularly in the area of technology, are being added. New technologies increase the need for state guidelines to be updated, ideally regularly.

The problem was addressed through an examination of national and state library standards and guidelines, and research on libraries and student achievement. Using print and electronic resources, this researcher identified states that had quantitative guidelines for school library media programs. An emphasis was placed on state guidelines that were more current and included program characteristics that research has shown to have an impact on student achievement. School libraries of every size need at least one full-time certified media specialist, and a support staff that includes staff that provides in-building computer and network support. The school library media budget for resources must be at least one percent of the school's non-salary instructional budget and include plans for replacing old materials and equipment. The

school library collection must include a wide range and variety of resources to meet the educational needs and interests of the students and staff. The addition of technology has increased rather than decreased the amount of space needed in school library media centers.

Conclusions

Iowa schools cannot afford to let their school library media programs decline. Without some direction, that can easily happen. With more education budget cuts by the state in store for next year, school librarians need more than ever to demonstrate their needs to their teachers, their students and their community. With student-achievement research in one hand and state guidelines in the other, school library media specialists can be better prepared to advocate.

School library media specialists need quantitative guidelines for a variety of reasons. First of all, they need them as program administrators, when they approach their principals with budget requests. Secondly, they can use the guidelines to analyze their programs. In addition, the guidelines outlined in this updated *Plan for Progress* will serve as advocacy tools with the principal as they compare their school to the state guidelines. School librarians also need to use these recommendations to advocate for their needs to their community, lawmakers and state education officials.

Unfortunately, for some school library media specialists, the realities seem to overshadow the possibility of ever meeting the minimum guidelines. Staff hours are being cut. Media secretaries or paraprofessionals are replacing professional media staff. Budgets for books, equipment, and other resources are being cut or eliminated. The guidelines are intended to serve a goal to which school library media professionals aim. Those schools below the minimum need to shoot for those. Those who are at or above the minimum should aim at the desirable levels.

School librarians need to find creative ways to provide resources for their students and staff. The Area Education Agencies have excellent print, non-print and professional resources as do many public and nearby college and university libraries. School media professionals need more than ever to collaborate, both within their district or region, and through statewide borrowing.

Maintaining a quality library web page is also a necessity. Internet resources, once identified and evaluated by school librarians, can provide accurate and current information to students in communities where schools cannot afford to update their print resources fast enough. These Web sites can be posted on school library web pages along with class assignments, teacher resources and much more. This researcher firmly believes that a school library web page has perhaps more potential than any other resource to make the school library media program the educational center of the school. It is imperative that school librarians learn and teach their staff and students how to use any online databases provided free of cost or at a low rate by the Area Education Agencies. Media specialists need to try new things, including online book discussions.

The fact that these recommendations are not endorsed by the Iowa Department of Education does not make them invalid. They are based on this researcher's analysis of dozens of states' library media recommendations. (See Works Consulted for Plan for Progress, Revised Edition.) Many of these state documents provide excellent information on planning and evaluating a school library media program.

While this study was underway, several states completed studies that continued to link quality library programs to student achievement scores. The most prevalent factors were staffing, particularly in terms of professionally certified staff, and the size and age of a school library

collection. In summary, there was significant link between the number of staff members and hours they worked, and student achievement scores, particularly in the area of reading. In addition, schools with more resources, including access to the Internet and online databases, reported higher test scores.

This researcher will use every means possible to disseminate this information. The goal is to provide printed copies to every school district in the state, as well as publishing the document online, perhaps through the State Library of Iowa or Iowa Library Association web site.

This researcher challenges national leaders to include in the next installment of *Information Power* national standards and benchmarks in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

Recommendations for further study

The *No Child Left Behind* legislation is driving educational reform at this time. Schools are expected to be accountable to their communities, the state and the nation. This research provides important quantitative guidelines for school administrators and school librarians. This researcher recommends these guidelines be updated again in a minimum of five years. Changing resources, technologies and methods are driving the need for more frequent revision. Further research should focus on developing information literacy standards and a scope and sequence at a state level. Further study into the importance of electronic media, using base data from the state library survey, is recommended.

Other topics to consider for further study would address the following questions:

- How has the changing nature of electronic resources impacted school library media programs?

- How many Iowa schools have more electronic databases other than those provided by the Area Education Agencies?
- How do Iowa schools compare to the guidelines outlined in this research?

Quality school library media programs are having a positive impact on student achievement at schools across the nation. The proposed guidelines can help Iowa schools improve in this area. For that reason, these guidelines should be followed and regularly updated, and further study of related topics should be completed.

References

Alabama State Department of Education (1999). *Alabama's literacy partners: A principal's guide to an effective library media program for the 21st century.* [Electronic version] Retrieved June 28, 2002, from www.alsde.edu/general/ LiteracyPartners.pdf

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology (1988). *Information power: Guidelines for school library media programs.* Chicago: American Library Association and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology (1998). *Information power: Building partnerships for learning.* Chicago: American Library Association and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

American Association of School Librarians (1999). *A planning guide for information power: Building partnerships for learning with school library media program assessment rubric for the 21st century.* Chicago: AASL.

Barker, P. (1997). Electronic libraries of the future. In *Encyclopedia of library and information science.* New York: Marcel Dekker.

Basel, J.H. (1982). *A comparison of selected public school libraries in Texas with state, regional and national standards*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University.

Bass, R.W. (1987). *Information technologies and space planning for libraries and information centers. Boston: G.K. Hall.*

Baughman, J.C. (2000, October). *School libraries and MCAS scores*. Paper presented at a symposium sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at Simmons College in Boston, MA

Baumbach, D.J. (2003). *Making the grade: the status of school library media centers in the Sunshine State and how they contribute to student achievement.* [Electronic version] Retrieved November 17, 2003, from http://www.sunlink.ucf.edu/makingthegrade/ summary.pdf

Baxter, S.J. & Smalley, Ann W. (2003). *Check it out! The results of the school library media program census*. Saint Paul, MN: Metronet.

Burgin, R., P. Brown Bracy & K. Brown (2003). *An essential connection: How quality school library media programs improve student achievement in North Carolina.* [Electronic

version] Retrieved November 17, 2003, from http://www.rburgin.com/NCschools2003/index.html

California Department of Education (2001, October). *California Reading Initiative*. [Electronic version] Retrieved July 18, 2002, from http://www.cde.ca.gov/cilbranch/eltdiv/rdg_init.htm

Clark, L.C. (1990). *Expenditures for collection development in Iowa's public school library media centers*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Donham van Deusen, J. (1996, May). IEMA funding task force 1995. *Iowa Media Message, 23 (4)*. 7-8.

Education Week (2002). Standards. [Electronic version]. Retrieved June 24, 2002, from http://edweek.org

Education Week (2002). Resources: Adequacy. [Electronic version] Retrieved June 24, 2002, from http://edweek.org

Face up to the choice. (2002, April 22). *The Des Moines Register*, A8.

Fraley, R.A. & C.L. Anderson, C.L. (1990). *Library space planning: a how-to-do-it manual for assessing, allocating and reorganizing collections, resources, and facilities*. New York: Neal-Schuman.

Gann, L. (1998). School library media standards and guidelines: A review of their significance and impact. In Latrobe, K.H. (Ed.), *The emerging school library media center: Historical issues and perspectives*. Englewood, CO.: Libraries Unlimited, pp. 153-194.

Glick, A. (2001, December). A friend at the top. *School Library Journal*, 47 (12), p.52-54.

Greve, C.L. (1974). *The relationship of the availability of libraries to the academic achievement of Iowa high school seniors*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Denver. Denver, Colorado.

Grover, R. & Barron, D. (1995). The Treasure Mountain papers: Future scenarios for school library media programs. In *School Library Media Annual, 1995, v. 13*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Harrod's librarian's glossary, 8th ed. (1995). Brookfield, VT: Ashgate.

Hartzell, G. The hole truth: Librarians need to emphasize what they have to offer. *School Library Journal, 48* (7), 31.

INT Media Group. Webopedia: Online dictionary. [Electronic version] Retrieved July 17, 2002, from http://www.webopedia.com

Iowa Code 2001: Section 256.11A.Guidance program – media services program – waiver. [Electronic version] Retrieved July 30, 2002, from http://www.legis. state.ia.us/ IACODE/2001/256/11.html

Iowa Department of Education (1992). *Plan for progress in the library media center PK-12: A guide to planning for school library media programs and for district AEAMC, and other support of those programs*. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Education.

Iowa Department of Education (2001). *The annual condition of education report*. [Electronic version] Retrieved June 29, 2002, from http://www.state.ia.us/educate/ fis/pre/coer/coer01.pdf.

Jankowska, M.A. (1998). Economic and technological aspects of electronic and printed recorded knowledge. In *Encyclopedia of library and information science, V. 61* (24),121-130. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Johnson, D. (1997). *The indispensable librarian: Surviving (and thriving) in school media centers in the information age*. Worthington, OH: Linworth Publishing.

Johnson, D. (2000, December). Building standards that are useful. *Teacher Librarian, 28* (2), 19-20.

Krashen, S.(June 2002). Whole language and the great plummet of 1987-92. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83* (10), 748-753.

Lance, K.C. (1994). *The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement.* [Electronic version] ERIC Digest. ED372759. Syracuse, N.Y.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information and Technology. Retrieved June 26, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed372759.html

Lance, K.C. (2001, October). *Proof of the power: Recent research on the impact of school library media programs on the academic achievement of U.S. public school students.* [Electronic version] ERIC Digest. ED456861. Syracuse, N.Y.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology. Retrieved June 19, 2002, from http://www.ericit.org/digests/EDO-IR-2001-05.shtml

Lance, K.C., Hamilton-Pennell, C. & Rodney, M.J. (2000). *Information empowered: The school librarian as an agent of academic achievement in Alaska schools*. Revised edition. Juneau: Alaska State Library.

Lance, K.C. & Loertscher, D.V. (2001). *Powering achievement: School library media programs make the difference: The evidence*. San Jose, CA: Hi Willo Research and Publishing.

Lance, K.C., Rodney, M.J. & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000a). *How school librarians help kids achieve standards: The second Colorado study*. San Jose, CA: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Lance, K.C., Rodney, M.J. & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000b). *Measuring up to standards: The impact of school library programs and information literacy in Pennsylvania schools*. Greensburg, PA: Pennsylvania Citizens for Better Libraries.

Lance, K.C., Rodney, M.J. & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2001). *Good schools have school librarians: Oregon school librarians collaborate to improve academic achievement.* Portland: Oregon Educational Media Association.

Lance. K.C., Welborn, L. & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (1993). *The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement.* Castle Rock, CO: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Loertscher, D.V., Ho, M.L. & Bowie, M.M. (1987, Spring). "Exemplary elementary schools" and their library media centers: A research report. *School Library Media Quarterly, 15* (3), 147-153.

Lushington, N. & Kusack, J. (1991). *The design and evaluation of public library buildings*. Hamden, CT: Library Professional Publishers.

Mardis, M. (2001). *Uncovering the hidden web, part II: Resources for your classroom.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED456864)

Massachusetts School Library Media Association (1997). *Standards for school library media centers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.* [Electronic version] Retrieved June 29, 2002, from http://www.doe.mass.edu/mailings/1997/ lmstandards.html

McBrien, J.L. (1997). *The language of learning: A guide to education terms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGrew, M.L. & Buckingham B.J. (1982). *Survey of the status of media service in Iowa public schools 2*. Des Moines: Iowa Department of Public Instruction.

McQuillan, J. (1998). *The literacy crisis: False claims, real solutions.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Miller, M.L. & Shontz, M.L. (2001, October). New money, old books. *School Library Journal, 47 (*10), 50-60.

Miller, M.L. & Shontz, M.L. (2003, October). The SLJ spending survey. *School Library Journal, 49* (10), 52-59.

Minnesota Educational Media Association (2001). *Minnesota standards for effective school library media programs*. [Electronic version] Retrieved July 2, 2002, from http://cfl.state.mn.us/library/mnschoolstandards.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics (1999). *Common core of data, local education agency universe survey, 1998-99.* Retrieved electronically July 1, 2002, from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ruraled/data/WhatsRuralSummary.asp

No Child Left Behind Homepage. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from the World Wide Web: http://www.nclb.gov

Reitz, J.M. (2002). *ODLIS: Online dictionary of library and information science.* Retrieved electronically Sept. 20, 2002, from http://vax.wcsu.edu/library/odlis.html

Rodney, M.J., Lance, K.C. & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2003). The impact of Michigan school librarians on academic achievement: Kids who have libraries succeed. [Electronic version] Retrieved electronically November 17, 2003, from www.michigan.gov/documents/hal_lm_schllibstudy03_76626_7.pdf

Rodney, M.J., Lance, K.C. & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2002). *Make the connection: Quality school library media programs impact academic achievement in Iowa.* Bettendorf, IA: Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency.

St. Lifer, E. (2002, Dec.). Investing in our role first. *School Library Journal, 49 (12),* 11.

Schulzetenberg, A.C. (1984). Building and remodeling school media facilities to accommodate the new technologies. In *School library media annual,* 1984, V. 2, 469-480.

Senator Reed talks library funding. (2002, March). *School Library Journal*, *48* (3), 24.

Shafritz, J.M. (1988). *The Facts On File dictionary of education.* New York: Facts on File.

Simons, J.H. (letter, April 1994). In Lynn, M.J. Kramer, P. & Weeks, A., *Public school library media centers in 12 states: Report of the NCLIS/ALA survey.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Commission on Libraries & Information Science.

Simpson, C. (2002, Sept.-Oct.). Information technology planning : Computers in the school library – how many are enough? *Knowledge Quest, 31 (1*), 23-26.

Stahlschmidt, A.G. (1989). Impact of national standards on the profession from the research perspective. In *School library media annual, 1989, V. 7,* 120-123. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

State Library of Iowa. *Library Statistics*. [Electronic version] Retrieved July 29, 2002, from http://www.silo.lib.ia.us/for_ia_libraries/statistics/index.html

State Library of Iowa. *Survey of School Library Media Centers in Iowa, July 2001-May 2002.* [Electronic version] Retrieved March 26, 2003, from http://www.silo.lib. ia.us/for-ia-libraries/statistics/schools/schlib2002tabulate.pdf

Stover, B. (1998, Nov. 22). Put to the test. *The Cedar Rapids Gazette*, A1.

Surprenant, T.T. (1984). Developing technologies and their impact on libraries: Eight trends. In *Library serials standards : Development, implementation, impact: Proceedings of the Third Annual Serials Conference*. Westport, CT: Meckler.

Truett, C. (1994). A survey of school and public children's library facilities: What librarians like, dislike, and most want to change about their libraries. *School Library Media Quarterly, 22* (Winter 1994), 91-97.

U.S. Census Bureau (2001). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2001.* [Electronic version] Retrieved electronically July 18, 2002, from http://www.census.gov/ prod/2002pubs/ 01statab/stat-ab01.html

U.S. Census Bureau (2000). *Table D. Percent of People in Poverty by State: 1998, 1999, and 2000.* [Electronic version] Retrieved electronically July 1, 2002, from http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/tabled.pdf

White House Conference on School Libraries Proceedings (2002, June). Washington, D.C.: Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. *School financial services: Wisconsin's Common School Fund.* Electronic version. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.dpi. state.wi.us/dpi/dfm/sfms/comsch.html

Young, Y. (Ed.) (1983). *The ALA glossary of library and information science.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Appendix A

STATE OF IOWA

THOMAS J. VILSACK, GOVERNOR
SALLY J. PEDERSON, LT. GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TED STILWILL, DIRECTOR

March 31, 2003

Becky Stover Johnson
343 Red Fox Rd SE
Cedar Rapids IA 52403

Re: Plan for Progress in the Library Media Center PreK-12

Dear Ms. Stover Johnson:

The purpose of this letter is to give you permission to reproduce unspecified parts of our agency's 1992 publication, Plan for Progress in the Library Media Center PreK-12. We understand that you intend to reproduce large sections of this publication. As long as you give proper credit in doing so, you have our agency's permission.

If you need further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at either 515/281-8661 or carol.greta@ed.state.ia.us.

Very truly yours,

Carol J. Greta
Legal Consultant

Appendix B

Summary of Results, 2/8/03

Survey of School Library Media Centers in Iowa, July 2001-May 2002

Direct questions to Media Directors at your AEA or Gerry Rowland, State Library of Iowa, 515-281-7573 or growlan@mail.lib.state.ia.us

Due Date: November 15, 2002

- **ALL shaded areas require a response!**

PART A - RESPONDENT INFORMATION

- Please identify your school by Name, Level, and District, and provide **all contact information** for the individual who responded to this survey.
- *Report current information.*
- Complete a separate questionnaire for **each** school.
- **Do not** combine data for multiple schools in one survey.

Number of Public School Buildings with Library Media Centers (LMCs) Reporting, **1,221 of 1,528 (79.9%)**

Population Served per Building

25th percentile	**186**
50th percentile	**285**
75th percentile	**400**
Your LMC	

AEA #	***Number of Buildings with School LMCs Reporting***
1	**83**
2	**63**
3	**47**
4	**39**
5	**94**
6	**38**
7	**80**
9	**102**
10	**135**
11	**206**
12	**86**
13	**86**
14	**43**
15	**83**
16	**36**

School Level (Mark one) o Elementary o Jr. High/Middle o High o Combined

School Level	***Number in School Level***
Elementary	**575**
Jr. High/Middle	**175**
High	**187**
Combined	**284**

Grades in school (circle **all** that apply) Pre-K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

District Name Number of Districts Reporting, **(339 of 374 public school districts)**

The number of Library Media Centers you manage in your **building**:
1,086 reported 1

The number of Library Media Centers you manage in your **district**:

75th percentile	**1**
50th percentile	**2**
25th percentile	**3**
Your LMC	

Number of LMCs Managed in District	***# of Schools Reported***
7	**22**
6	**18**
5	**24**
4	**62**
3	**170**
2	**273**
1	**508**

PART B - SERVICE HOURS PER TYPICAL WEEK (by building)

Please report the typical ***weekly*** number of hours this library media center is open for use. Report hours during school, before and after school hours, and during the summer. Report data from July 2001-June 2002.

Number of hours open per typical school **week** during school hours, Line 1

25th percentile	**31**
50th percentile	**35**
75th percentile	**36**
Your LMC	

Number of hours open per typical school **week** before school hours, Line 2

25th percentile	**0.5**
50th percentile	**2.5**
75th percentile	**2.5**
Your LMC	

Number of hours open per typical school **week** after school hours, Line 3

25th percentile	**0**
50th percentile	**2.5**
75th percentile	**3.3**
Your LMC	

Number of hours closed per typical school **week** during school hours, Line 4

25th percentile	**0**
50th percentile	**0**
75th percentile	**2.5**
Your LMC	

Number of hours open per typical summer **week** , Line 5

25th percentile	**0**
50th percentile	**0**
75th percentile	**0**
Your LMC	

46 LMCs>0-3, 56 LMCs>4 or more

PART C - SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA STAFFING – PAID (by building)

- Please report the levels of **paid** staff for this library media program. Report data from July 2001-June 2002
- Include both the **number** of people at each level (Col. A) and the **total number of staff-hours** per typical **week** for each staff type (Col. B).
- **Do not report more than 40 hours per week per person.**
- Count each individual only once.
- Do **not** include volunteers or student workers or their hours, if any.

Example: If two people are reported as "All other paid staff" on line C 2 (a) and one works 20 hours per week and the other 10, enter 30 on line C 2 (b).

Paid Staff Line

Col. A Number of People (head count, **not** FTE)	**Col. B** Total Staff-Hours per Typical **Week**
Library media specialists, Line 1	Library media specialists, Line 1
25th percentile- 1	**25th percentile- 8**
50th percentile- 1	**50th percentile- 22.5**
75th percentile- 1	**75th percentile- 40**
Your LMC	Your LMC
All other paid staff, Line 2	All other paid staff, Line 2
25th percentile- 1	**25th percentile- 17.5**
50th percentile- 1	**50th percentile- 33**
75th percentile- 1	**75th percentile- 40**
Your LMC	Your LMC
Totals, Line 3	Totals, Line 3
25th percentile- 2	**25th percentile- 37.5**
50th percentile- 2	**50th percentile- 47**
75th percentile- 2	**75th percentile- 72**
Your LMC	Your LMC

Total Library Media Specialists, **1,014**

Total all other paid staff, **1,154**

# of Library Media Specialists per building	***# of Buildings Reporting***
0	**93**
1	**965**
2	**17**
>2	**1**

# of Other Paid Staff per building	***# of Buildings Reporting***
0	**143**
1	**779**
2	**120**
3	**22**

4	**8**
5	**5**
>5	**2**

Education Levels and Endorsement
Highest education level attained by the library media specialists in this building 4
Drop-down menu on web
BA, BA-15, BA-30,MA,MA-15,MA30, MA-45, EDS, Ph.D

Education Level	***Number Reporting***
BA	**39**
BA-15	**103**
BA-30	**189**
MA	**267**
MA-15	**148**
MA-30	**128**
MA-45	**94**
EDS	**7**
Ph.D	**3**

Total: **978**

Does the person responsible for this library have school library endorsement?
Line 5 YES **896**

Does the person responsible for this library have a teaching certificate?
Line 6 YES **975**

Number	Endorsement	Teacher Certification
884	**Y**	**Y**
13	**Y**	**N**
91	**N**	**Y**
107	**N**	**N**

PART D - PAID STAFF ACTIVITIES PER TYPICAL WEEK (by building)

• Report your best estimate of the **number of hours** per typical **week** *all staff* spend on **each** of the following activities. *Report data from July 2001-June 2002*
• Include **all** staff hours, not just professional staff.
• Col. B is **OPTIONAL. *Only*** complete it if you wish to report voluntary unpaid overtime.
Staff-hours/typical **week**

Activities	**Col. A** Regular, Paid hours	**Col. B** Voluntary Unpaid hours
Collaboration		
Hours spent **weekly** identifying materials for and planning instructional units with teachers, Line 1		
25th percentile	**1**	**0**
50th percentile	**2**	**.5**
75th percentile	**4**	**2**
Your LMC		

Hours spent weekly teaching students cooperatively with teachers, Line 2		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**1**	**0**
75th percentile	**5**	**0**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly providing information skills instruction to students—individually or in groups (e.g., locating information, citations, copyright/plagiarism, evaluating Internet sources, note-taking), Line 3		
25th percentile	**2**	**0**
50th percentile	**5**	**0**
75th percentile	**10**	**0**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly providing in-service training to teachers and/or other school staff (includes informal one to one and formal group sessions), Line 4		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**1**	**0**
75th percentile	**2**	**.5**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly implementing reading and literacy incentive activities for students and/or promoting reading guidance (e.g., reader's advisory services, book talks, book clubs, story times, author visits, puppet shows), Line 5		
25th percentile	**1**	**0**
50th percentile	**2.5**	**0**
75th percentile	**6**	**1**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly on collection development (e.g., selecting materials), Line 6		
25th percentile	**1**	**0**
50th percentile	**2**	**1**
75th percentile	**4**	**2**
Your LMC		
Leadership Hours spent weekly meeting with school library staff from building, district, or beyond, Line 7		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**.5**	**0**
75th percentile	**1**	**.5**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly meeting with principal and/or other building or district administrators, Line 8		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**.5**	**0**
75th percentile	**1**	**0**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly attending general faculty and/or staff meetings, Line 9		
25th percentile	**.25**	**0**
50th percentile	**.5**	**0**
75th percentile	**1**	**.2**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly with meeting standards and/or curriculum committees/teams/task forces, Line 10		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**.5**	**0**
75th percentile	**1**	**0**
Your LMC		

Technology Hours spent weekly managing computers/library automation/computer network, Line 11		
25th percentile	**1.7**	**0**
50th percentile	**5**	**.1**
75th percentile	**10**	**2**
Your LMC		
Hours spent weekly on **All other library activities** (e.g., processing, retrieving, checking in and out, re-shelving/re-storing), Line12		
25th percentile	**7.5**	**0**
50th percentile	**15**	**1**
75th percentile	**25**	**4**
Your LMC		
Other **Extra duties unrelated to school library services** (e.g., monitoring restrooms, lunch, etc.), Line13		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**2**	**0**
75th percentile	**5**	**0**
Your LMC		
TOTAL WEEKLY HOURS OF PAID STAFF (Add Lines 1 through 13 →), Line **14**		
25th percentile	**37**	**0**
50th percentile	**45.5**	**0**
75th percentile	**71**	**6**
Your LMC		

PART E - SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA TECHNOLOGY (by building)

• FIRST, determine the number of computers located *in* or *under supervision of* the school library. This might include some computers not located *in* the library.
- (**Note**: For this question, the terms "computer", "terminal", and "workstation" are considered synonymous.)
• Enter this number on Line 1 in Col. A.
• THEN, determine the number of computers that are:
- located elsewhere in the school (like a computer lab, mini-lab, administrative office, etc.), and
- are *not* under supervision of the school library, and
- *are* connected to LMC resources. (Do *not* include any that are *not* connected to LMC resources)
• Enter this number on Line 1 in Col. B.
• On Lines 2 through 6, enter the number *of* the Line 1 Totals, in *each* column, that have the accesses, options, etc. specified on each of Lines 2 through 6.
• A computer in either of the Line 1 Totals may be included on as many of Lines 2 through 6 as necessary.
• For example, a computer in the school library might have Internet access *and* a school home page. This computer would be counted on both Lines 2 *and* 5 under Col. A.
• *Report data from July 2001-June 2002*

Number of computers in school

Computer Connections and Access Line ***(Totals)***	**Col. A** *Located in or under supervision of school library*	**Col. B** *Located elsewhere, not under library control, but connected to LMC resources*
TOTALS: FIRST, enter on this line the *TOTAL* number of computers in *each* of the Col. A and Col. B categories: Line 1	**24,614**	**77,300**
THEN, enter the number of each of the Line 1 TOTALS that have...		
Internet access, Line 2	**22,681**	**61,705**
Access to the school library catalog, Line 3	**14,907**	**34,436**
Access to school library databases (e.g., ProQuest, EBSCO, e-Library, SIRS, Gale Group, etc.), Line 4	**21,607**	**58,900**
Access to digital streaming for curriculum content or professional growth (e.g., AP classes, textbooks, etc.), Line 5	**5,467**	**15,605**
Access to district or school home page to guide users to library resources, Line 6	**18,942**	**49,884**
Menu option or bookmark to a public library catalog, Line 7	**9,541**	**20,942**
Menu option or bookmark to the Area Education Agency Website, Line 8	**16,965**	**43,113**

Number of computers in school

Computer Connections and Access Line **(Percentiles)**	**Col. A** *Located in or under supervision of school library*	**Col. B** *Located elsewhere, not under library control, but connected to LMC resources*
TOTALS: FIRST, enter on this line the *TOTAL* number of computers in *each* of the Col. A and Col. B categories: Line 1		
25th percentile	**5**	**7.25**
50th percentile	**12**	**42**
75th percentile	**30**	**85**
Your LMC		
THEN, enter the number of each of the Line 1 TOTALS that have...		
Internet access, Line 2		
25th percentile	**4**	**15**
50th percentile	**11**	**45**
75th percentile	**29**	**86.7**
Your LMC		
Access to the school library catalog, Line 3		
25th percentile	**1**	**0**
50th percentile	**5**	**0**
75th percentile	**18.25**	**49.75**
Your LMC		
Access to school library databases (e.g., ProQuest, EBSCO, e-Library, SIRS, Gale Group, etc.), Line 4		
25th percentile	**4**	**11**
50th percentile	**11**	**43**
75th percentile	**29**	**84**
Your LMC		

Access to digital streaming for curriculum content or professional growth (e.g., AP classes, textbooks, etc.), Line 5		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**0**	**0**
75th percentile	**1**	**0**
Your LMC		
Access to district or school home page to guide users to library resources, Line 6		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**7**	**30**
75th percentile	**26.2**	**76**
Your LMC		
Menu option or bookmark to a public library catalog, Line 7		
25th percentile	**0**	**0**
50th percentile	**0**	**0**
75th percentile	**5**	**15**
Your LMC		
Menu option or bookmark to the Area Education Agency Website, Line 8		
25th percentile	**1**	**0**
50th percentile	**6**	**24**
75th percentile	**23**	**60.5**
Your LMC		

PART F - SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA USAGE PER TYPICAL WEEK (by building)

- Please report the following types of usage of the library media program **per typical WEEK.**
Report data from July 2001-June 2002.
- *If annual totals are available, divide the annual total by 36.*
- If these figures must be estimated, and it is easier to estimate for a month or a year:
- estimate for a month and divide by four; or
- estimate for a year, and divide by the number of weeks the library media center is open annually.

Line

*Type of Usage **per Typical Week Total***	*Number per **Week***
Total Visits to the school library, scheduled or unscheduled, by: **Individuals** (students, teachers, administrators, parents, student aides, volunteers, others). Do *not* count people who are in the LMC in groups, Line 1a	**323,032 people**
Classes or other **groups** (e.g., the number of **classes** or **groups** of teachers, administrators, parents, or students touring your library) 1b	**23,380 groups**
Information skills instruction contacts, scheduled or unscheduled, for purposes like locating information, citations, copyright/plagiarism, critical thinking, evaluating Internet sources, or note-taking by: **Individuals** (students, teachers, administrators, parents, others) Do *not* count people who are in the LMC in groups, Line 2a	**96,898 people**
Classes or other **groups** (e.g., the number of **groups** of teachers, administrators, parents, or students touring your library), Line 2b	**12,240 groups**
Total circulation of materials, including all formats, in a typical **week,** Line 3	**489,621**

In-library use of materials in a typical **week** (estimate based on re-shelving count), Line 4	**145,237**
Inter-library loans to any other library, outside of your district, in a typical **Week, Line** 5	**269**
Inter-library loans received from any other library, outside of your district, in a typical **week.** Contact your AEA for average circulation to your building, **Line** 6	**43,108**
Inter-library loans to any other library, in your district, in a typical **week,** Line 7	**2,876**
Inter-library loans received from any other library, in your district, in a typical **week, Line** 8	**3,427**

Type of Usage per Typical Week **(Percentiles)** **Total Visits to the school library,** scheduled or unscheduled, by:	*Number per Week*
Individuals (students, teachers, administrators, parents, student aides, volunteers, others). Do *not* count people who are in the LMC in groups, Line 1a	
25th percentile	**85**
50th percentile	**200**
75th percentile	**400**
Your LMC	
Classes or other **groups** (e.g., the number of **classes** or **groups** of teachers, administrators, parents, or students touring your library) 1b	
25th percentile	**8**
50th percentile	**15**
75th percentile	**25**
Your LMC	
Information skills instruction contacts, scheduled or unscheduled, for purposes like locating information, citations, copyright/plagiarism, critical thinking, evaluating Internet sources, or note-taking by: **Individuals** (students, teachers, administrators, parents, others) Do *not* count people who are in the LMC in groups, Line 2a	
25th percentile	**15**
50th percentile	**50**
75th percentile	**100**
Your LMC	
Classes or other **groups** (e.g., the number of **groups** of teachers, administrators, parents, or students touring your library), Line 2b	
25th percentile	**3**
50th percentile	**7**
75th percentile	**15**
Your LMC	
Total circulation of materials, including all formats, in a typical **week,** Line 3	
25th percentile	**154**
50th percentile	**350**
75th percentile	**620**
Your LMC	

In-library use of materials in a typical **week** (estimate based on re-shelving count), Line 4	
25th percentile	**25**
50th percentile	**50**
75th percentile	**125**
Your LMC	
Inter-library loans to any other library, outside of your district, in a typical **Week, Line** 5	
25th percentile	**0**
50th percentile	**0**
75th percentile	**0**
Your LMC	
Inter-library loans received from any other library, outside of your district, in a typical **week.** Contact your AEA for average circulation to your building, **Line** 6	
25th percentile	**4**
50th percentile	**12**
75th percentile	**28**
Your LMC	
Inter-library loans to any other library, in your district, in a typical **week,** Line 7	
25th percentile	**0**
50th percentile	**1**
75th percentile	**3**
Your LMC	
Inter-library loans received from any other library, in your district, in a typical **week, Line** 8	
25th percentile	**0**
50th percentile	**1**
75th percentile	**2**
Your LMC	

PART G - SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA COLLECTION (by building)

- Report in Col. A and Col. B on *all* holdings (except N/A on Line 4).
- Include all circulating and non-circulating items, *but*
- *Exclude* any materials that are *not* available for use by teachers or students, such as materials reserved for library media staff, the principal, counselors, etc.
- Report average copyright dates in Col. B. If these dates cannot be obtained from an electronic catalog, randomly select 25 items in the category (e.g., one per range or section, every third item, an item from every fifth shelf), and *average* their copyright dates.
- *Report items in the collection as of the end of the 2001-2002 school year.*

Item Line

Item (Total)	***Col. A*** *Number*	***Col. B*** *Average Copyright Year*
Books of all types ***except*** reference books, Line 1	**9,721,626**	
Reference books ***only, Line*** 2	**510,304**	
Encyclopedias & reference titles on CD-ROM or laser disk, Line 3	**19,562**	
Current print subscriptions to magazines & newspapers, Line 4	**32,298**	
Audio materials (cassettes, CDs, LPs), Line 5	**281,666**	
Video materials (cassettes and discs), Line 6	**137,922**	
Computer software packages for use in school library by Students, Line 7	**46,439**	

Does the school library have access to any online or CDROM services (e.g., EBSCO, ProQuest, InfoTrac, UMI, SIRS, Newsbank), Line 8 YES/NO	**Yes, 1000**	

Item (Percentile)	***Col. A*** *Number*	***Col. B*** *Average Copyright Year*
Books of all types ***except*** reference books, Line 1		
25th percentile	**5,368**	**1980**
50th percentile	**7,974**	**1985**
75th percentile	**11,050**	**1989**
Your LMC		
Reference books ***only, Line*** 2		
25th percentile	**153**	**1982**
50th percentile	**312**	**1988**
75th percentile	**575**	**1992**
Your LMC		
Encyclopedias & reference titles on CD-ROM or laser disk, Line 3		
25th percentile	**0**	**1995**
50th percentile	**4**	**1997**
75th percentile	**14**	**1998**
Your LMC		
Current print subscriptions to magazines & newspapers, Line 4		
25th percentile	**8**	**Na**
50th percentile	**17**	**Na**
75th percentile	**33**	**Na**
Your LMC		
Audio materials (cassettes, CDs, LPs), Line 5		
25th percentile	**0**	**1985**
50th percentile	**10**	**1990**
75th percentile	**50**	**1995**
Your LMC		
Video materials (cassettes and discs), Line 6		
25th percentile	**20**	**1990**
50th percentile	**64**	**1993**
75th percentile	**153**	**1995**
Your LMC		
Computer software packages for use in school library by Students, Line 7		
25th percentile	**0**	**1995**
50th percentile	**7**	**1997**
75th percentile	**30**	**1999**
Your LMC		

PART H - ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES (by building)

- Report the annual operating expenditures for this library media program from school or district funds *for the 2001-2002 school year.*
- Exclude major one-time capital outlays for computers, furniture, and other equipment.
- Exclude labor costs and fees and salaries of personnel assigned to media responsibilities.
- Exclude spending from income from book fairs, bake sales, donations, and other volunteer efforts.

Item Line ***(Total)***	*Whole dollars only*
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES, Line 1	**6,384,337**
Amount of annual operating expenditures from Title 6B (Contact building principal for information), Line 2	**1,306,570**

Item Line ***(Percentiles)***	*Whole dollars only*
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES, Line 1	
25th percentile	**2,000**
50th percentile	**4,008**
75th percentile	**7,200**
Your LMC	
Amount of annual operating expenditures from Title 6B (Contact building principal for information), Line 2	
25th percentile	**0**
50th percentile	**0**
75th percentile	**1,554**
Your LMC	

PART I - SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA MANAGEMENT (by building) (1103 surveys)

- Please mark YES or NO for each of the following questions.
- If there is no library media professional, mark N/A on line 4.
- Report information as of the date the survey is completed.
- *Report data from July 2001-June 2002*

Does the library media staff submit an annual budget request,
Line 1 **YES, 328**

Does the library media program have an advisory committee,
Line 2 **YES, 139**

Does the library media professional or staff submit an annual Report,
Line 3 **YES, 462**

Does the library media professional direct, supervise, or coordinate support staff,
Line 4 **YES, 829**

Does the library have a selection policy and reconsideration policy to prepare itself for challenges,
Line 5 **YES, 976**

PART J - PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL LIBRARY AND PUBLIC LIBRARY (by building) (1103 surveys)

- In this Part and in Part K following, please mark YES or NO for each question.
- *Report data from July 2001-June 2002*

Do you have a local public library,
Line 1 **YES, 1,040**

Does your library media program have a working relationship with the local public library,
Line 2 **YES, 852**

In which of the following ways do your school library media center and the local public library work together?

Are there electronic access links (such as shared catalog access) between your library and the local public library,
Line 3 **YES, 213**

Does the public library staff present booktalks at the school library,
Line 4 **YES, 160**

Does the school library provide homework alerts to the public library,
Line 5 **YES, 283**

Does the school library direct reference questions to the public library,
Line 6 **YES, 659**

Does the school library receive bulk loans from the public library,
Line 7 **YES, 174**

Is there a summer reading program at the public library,
Line 8 **YES, 1,008**

PART K - PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAM AND AEA INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA SERVICES (by building) (1103 surveys)

Do you take advantage of staff development activities at your AEA,
Line 1 **YES, 1,010**

Does your library media program acquire databases through the support of your AEA,
Line 2 **YES, 1,019**

Does your library media program use reference information and services from the AEA media program,
Line 3 **YES, 998**

Does your library media program utilize instructional resource materials from the AEA media program,
Line 4 **YES, 993**

Do you request consulting services from the AEA media program? (by phone, e-mail, face-to-face),
Line 5 **YES, 911**

Does your library media program participate in the cooperative purchasing opportunities offered through the AEA media program? (e.g.; ACEM - AEA Collaborative for Educational Media),
Line 6 **YES, 998**

Does the library media professional regularly receive communication from the AEA Instructional Media staff,
Line 7 **YES, 1,053**

Does your library media program use production services offered by the AEA media program? (e.g.; slides, video duplication, lamination, printing),

Line 8 **YES, 850**

Does your library media program request technical assistance from AEA media services? (e.g.; professional development of instructional media services, how to request materials online, navigation of online resources, or utilization a particular piece of software or hardware operation),
Line 9 **YES, 883**