

1987

Changes in Cooperation Among Selected Schools and Public Libraries in Iowa

Patricia Ann Ipsen
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1987 Patricia Ann Ipsen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>

Recommended Citation

Ipsen, Patricia Ann, "Changes in Cooperation Among Selected Schools and Public Libraries in Iowa" (1987). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2894.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2894>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Changes in Cooperation Among Selected Schools and Public Libraries in Iowa

Find Additional Related Research in UNI ScholarWorks

To find related research in UNI ScholarWorks, go to the collection of [School Library Studies Graduate Research Papers](#) written by students in the [Division of School Library Studies](#), Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, at the University of Northern Iowa.

Abstract

The results of this study may indicate that while library professionals in Iowa view cooperation as a desirable goal, there is little formal activity between and among school and public libraries. The attendance at state sponsored workshops may have little effect on actual practice in the 18 communities which participated in the ICEMS program. There may be increased cooperative activity in those communities which made some attempts prior to the workshops. However, these activities tend to be fairly traditional and conservative. In communities new to the idea, the participants may be open to change, but psychological and physical barriers may hinder implementing their plans to the fullest potential. The library professionals may not have the time and resources needed to bring their plans to fruition and other community members may not have the commitment to assist them.

Changes in Cooperation Among Selected Schools
and Public Libraries in Iowa

A Research Paper

Presented to the

Faculty of the Library Science Department

Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Patricia Ann Ipsen

November 12, 1987

Read and approved by
Leah Hiland

Elizabeth Martin

Accepted by Department
Elizabeth Martin

November 24, 1987

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Literature Review	9
3. Background of ICEMS and Methodology	21
4. Analysis of Data	26
5. Conclusions, Recommendations, Summary.	38
Bibliography	46
Appendixes	
A. Iowa Interlibrary Cooperation Resolution	51
B. Taxonomy of Library Cooperation	52
C. ICEMS Team Members	56
D. Cover Letter	63
E. ICEMS Questionnaire	64

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In Library Work with Children, Dorothy M. Broderick (1977)

quoted from one of her previous works:

Sometimes it seems as if there have been hundreds of words, thousands of words, millions and billions and trillions of words written about the relationships of school and public libraries in America. It also seems that most of the words were designed to further misunderstanding and confusion in the minds of the reader. (p. 112)

Indeed, multitype library cooperation is the topic of dozens of books and journal articles. Also, it is often discussed in books of a more general nature, such as those about library services for children and young adults. Why, then, should this researcher produce yet another study of cooperation between school and public libraries?

First, this study's main concern was school and public libraries. Cooperative systems which include academic and/or special libraries were not considered unless they also include both school and public libraries. Ralph Stenstrom (1970) defines public libraries as those "which are free to all residents of the library's district and supported primarily from general public funds or taxes levied for library purposes" and school libraries as those "maintained

by the governing boards of schools, whether they be public, private, or parochial. School libraries at the elementary, junior high school, and senior high school are included" (p. 1).

Secondly, while there are perhaps "trillions" of words written about school and library cooperation, many of those studies concern consolidated or combined school and public libraries. This format combines "a school and public library in one physical facility or under a single governing board in a community or area" (Wisconsin DPI, 1976, p. 2). This researcher wished to investigate cooperation, i. e., "planned activities and efforts mutually carried out by one or more libraries..."(Wisconsin DPI, 1976, p. 2). These cooperative efforts more frequently are attempts at resource sharing. Allen Kent (1974) defines a library resource as "any and all of the materials, functions, and services" of a library system (p. 1). Materials may be books, non-print items, and equipment. Functions are activities required to "process, store, and retrieve materials" and services are those activities "which relate the users to the material" (p. 1). The talents of professional and non-professional staff should also be considered as resources.

Third, and more importantly, there is a need for this research in Iowa. The Iowa Department of Public Instruction (DPI) and the State Library jointly sponsored the Iowa Cooperative Effort in Media Services (ICEMS) workshops in 1980, 1981, and 1982. Staff members are unaware of any follow-up studies, and none appears in the professional literature. The purpose of this study was to answer the question: What changes in cooperative library activities have occurred in the schools and communities whose representatives took part in the Iowa workshops?

The results of this study may indicate that while library professionals in Iowa view cooperation as a desirable goal, there is little formal activity between and among school and public libraries. The attendance at state sponsored workshops may have little effect on actual practice in the 18 communities which participated in the ICEMS program. There may be increased cooperative activity in those communities which made some attempts prior to the workshops. However, these activities tend to be fairly traditional and conservative. In communities new to the idea, the participants may be open to change, but psychological and physical barriers may hinder

implementing their plans to the fullest potential. The library professionals may not have the time and resources needed to bring their plans to fruition and other community members may not have the commitment to assist them.

The specific hypotheses for this study used the taxonomy for cooperation (Appendix B) among types of libraries developed by Betty V. Billman and Patricia Owens (1985/86). They organized cooperative activities into six levels and worked on the premise that cooperative collection development depends upon communication. They defined collection development as activities which "are used to analyze, acquire, and maintain resources that will meet the information needs of a defined group of users" (p. 185). This may occur in one or more libraries. The taxonomy lists the following six categories:

Level I	No involvement or cooperation
Level II	Informal cooperation
Level III	Formal communication
Level IV	Formal cooperation
Level V	Resource sharing

Level VI Formal planning

At the lowest level there is no communication among the institutions, and there may even be competitive or antagonistic behavior among the professional staffs or boards. The taxonomy indicates progress to Level VI where there is frequent and regular planning among the libraries. Short- and long-range library goals and objectives are developed and approved by the individual governing boards (p. 186). Activities may include cooperative collection development, selection policies, and purchasing agreements. The libraries may exchange catalog cards or acquisition lists and maintain a joint catalog at one or more locations. The Billman and Owens taxonomy provides a list of activities useful for the purposes of this study.

Based on the taxonomy and a checklist of cooperative activities from the ICEMS workshop, this study will test the following hypotheses:

H₁ Level II: At least 75 percent of the school and public librarians will engage in a majority of activities representative of informal communications.

H₂ Level III: Twenty-five percent or more of the librarians will have a formal communications committee and engage in a majority of the activities which require regular communications between the staff members.

H₃ Level IV: Ten percent or less of the librarians will engage in the majority of formal cooperative activities such as joint celebrations of National Library Week.

H₄ Level V: Forty percent or more of the librarians will share resources through interlibrary loan and other such programs.

H₅ Level VI: Less than 10 percent of the librarians will cooperate by formally developing mutual goals and policies.

It is assumed that cooperation is a desirable goal. Following the Iowa Governor's Pre-White House Conference on Library and Information Services in March of 1979, the State Library Commission adopted a resolution (Appendix A) which "encourages and endorses the promotion of cooperative efforts between local, regional, state, public, and educational libraries" (Buckingham, 1981, p. 10). The resolution recognizes that there are many agencies which support

education in the state of Iowa. However, the publication, Distinctive Functions of School Media Centers and Public Libraries, prepared by the Iowa DPI and Library Commission emphatically states the basic differences between school and public libraries. The school library, sometimes called the media center, is meant to support the curricular needs of students, teachers, and administrators. The librarian or media specialist has the expanded role of teaching the selection and use of materials appropriate for learning activities. The public library provides informational and recreational reading materials for residents of all ages. The distinctive functions, clientele, and physical facilities of each type of library present real barriers to cooperation.

This study must rely on the records and memories of the personnel who attended the workshops or their successors. The current State Library and Department of Education (formerly DPI) staff members could offer only the most basic information about the participants, organization and goals of the workshops. There are no files at either agency for the workshop held in 1982. The names of 1982 participants were obtained by contacting the public librarians

and asking them to recall the participants. Some of the participants are deceased or have moved to other communities; therefore, the current school media specialists and public librarians were asked to supply the necessary information to the best of their abilities. Some cooperative activities not planned or discussed during the ICEM workshops may appear in the respondents' comments.

CHAPTER 2

The Literature Review

By nature, earlier studies of cooperation have been descriptive or analytical. Much of the literature explains why libraries should cooperate with one another, what factors are necessary for successful cooperation, and what barriers impede cooperation. They are often case studies of existing programs or attitudinal surveys of patrons or personnel. Some focus on one function, usually collection development, while a large portion of the literature examines the aforementioned combined school and public libraries.

As a subset of cooperative programs, the combined school and public library provides a focused view of factors supporting or undermining multilibrary cooperation. Shirley Aaron's (1980) three part study described selected combined school and public libraries in the United States and Canada, investigated more thoroughly existing and extinct programs in Florida, and developed a checklist to determine whether a combined facility would provide the best library service within a community. Her study pinpointed many advantages and disadvantages of combined efforts which frequently

appear in other primary and secondary sources. To paraphrase, the advantages are:

1. a monetary savings resulting from eliminating unnecessary duplication of materials and the sharing of operational costs and professional salaries
2. the convenience of having the library open more hours and on weekends
3. the addition of professional staff in a system unable to afford them
4. the availability of materials in many formats through combining the collections
5. the offering of library services to small communities unable to maintain a public library. (p. 3)

Dr. Aaron found some disadvantages which apply more specifically to combined programs and some administrative factors which hinder cooperation in general. They are:

1. the inability of professional and clerical staff to meet the various needs of students and community
2. a reluctance of the public to visit a school-housed facility during school hours
3. the differences in site requirements, i. e., the public library should be near the main business section of the town and the school library at the center of the school
4. the hinderance of adequately developing programs to meet either school or public clientele needs

5. a reluctance of students to visit another school for library services
6. the disturbance of instructional programs by different clientele attending during school hours
7. the censorship of adult materials deemed unsuitable for students
8. an inability to provide a variety of services to instill life-long use of libraries (pp. 3-4).

Dr. Aaron interviewed library directors, school administrators, teachers and board members associated with the combined library systems. She arrived at two main conclusions. First, a community able to support or now supporting separate types of libraries is unlikely to provide better service by combining the facilities. Secondly, when a community is unable to provide minimum library services and no other option exists, the combined program is an alternative. However, the combined program may prove costly. Increased costs are due to a reduced level of use by some clientele reluctant to go to the chosen location. The facility may need to be larger to provide some private spaces for adults and instructional spaces for students. There must still be some distinctive programs which cannot be shared by students and community patrons (p. 47).

L. J. Amey and R. J. Smith (1976) approached combined systems in a different manner. They sent questionnaires to 100 high school libraries and 73 public or branch libraries in Toronto, Canada. Their attitudinal survey attempted to identify areas of agreement in five problem areas: location, economy, operations, collection, and roles. Using a Likert scale labelled "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree", the librarians responded to 50 questions, in addition to three questions on personal background. Only the responses of librarians who had not worked in combined school and public libraries were used. The school and public librarians tended to disagree about the circulation of materials, sharing of duties, and the perceived role of the library within a school system. They tended to agree about economics, censorship, and the purpose of libraries in general. Unlike the findings of the Aaron study, the physical location was not a major factor (p.259).

Wilma Woolard (1978) summarized the history of library cooperation since colonial times and identified representative combined programs in the United States. Her questionnaire identified pre-existing conditions which encouraged mergers,

staffing and management patterns, and perceived strength and weaknesses of merged programs. She, too, found many of the same factors as Dr. Aaron. One interesting factor was the frequent mention of governance or management problems. Seventeen of the 55 respondents mentioned management problems to an open-ended question. Variations of the problem were the failure of the school/library board to define responsibilities, failure to include all parties in the planning stages, and misunderstanding of the librarians' role (p. 53). A prevailing problem was the lack of communication among cooperating administrators, staff, and clientele.

In spite of the problems, Woolard concluded that mergers can work if the local leadership gives careful thought to implementation of a combined system and if all segments of the community are involved in the planning stages. She was particularly optimistic for small communities of less than 10,000 persons, where residents may be committed to supporting local institutions, such as their churches and schools. She, too, admonished that a community should not expect substantial monetary savings in a combined program. Some

savings may be realized in maintenance and operational costs, building and land costs, furnishings and equipment. Her recommendations included a building easily accessible to the community and handicapped persons, adequate parking, and areas for quiet research, as well as group instructional activities. The staff should be trained in both school and public librarianship, and lines of communication should be maintained among personnel, governing agencies, and the clientele (1978, p. 438).

Libraries need not be combined in one facility or governed by a single board to realize the benefits of cooperation. Collection management and resource sharing are the most frequently mentioned functions for cooperative efforts.

Two studies focus on overlap and duplication in school and public library collections and the potential for resource sharing among schools and/or public libraries. Carol A. Doll (1984) defines overlap as two libraries owning the same title and duplication as one library owning more than one copy of a title (p. 277). She studied the similarities of the collections by determining the percentage of titles which overlapped or were duplicated.

Doll chose four Illinois communities with populations between 25,000 and 40,000 persons. Larger communities were eliminated because of the tendency to have branch libraries in those cities. The public library and two elementary schools (K-5 or K-6) were surveyed in each city. The communities and schools were chosen to provide the widest range in collection size. The shelflists were measured and the lengths divided by 200 to obtain the intervals at which cards would be pulled. A sample of 200 titles was chosen from each library's shelflist. Those titles were checked for overlap and duplication and eventually the 2,400 titles were checked for their inclusion in several popular selection tools such as Booklist or The Children's Catalog (p. 280). Non-book items were also analyzed from lists of holdings of magazines, science filmstrips, and fiction sound recordings. The librarians completed a questionnaire which requested information on goals, budgets, selection policies, and perceived library purposes. Doll found that overlap increases as the collection sizes increase and the average overlap was 50 per cent when school library titles were compared to public library collections. Each library had unique titles to contribute to a

cooperative effort such as interlibrary loan (p. 288). Doll concluded that cooperative efforts would be more practical than combined facilities. The two types of collections were not similar enough to warrant eliminating one. Pre-school children and adults are generally not served by school media centers. Five libraries had no selection policy and very little cooperation in collection development was evident. Duplication seemed hit or miss, dependent on patron requests for popular titles.

Similar conclusions were reached by Ellen Altman (1972) in her feasibility study of interlibrary loan among secondary schools. Titles about 12 frequently researched subjects were pulled from the shelflists of 31 school libraries and four public libraries in two counties in New Jersey. Misclassified titles were deleted and the remaining 12,829 titles analyzed for overlap and duplication. Altman found overlap statistics similar to Doll. Fifty-two point five per cent of the titles were held in both the school and public libraries. She concluded that while the school collections were not alike, they did contain a central core of titles found in Senior High School Catalog and that about 10 per cent of each library collection

was unique to its facility. Altman encouraged school media specialists to reach out to other schools and public libraries for these unique resources through interlibrary loan.

H. Thomas Walker (1983) wrote a descriptive study of interlibrary loan activity by students in Howard County, Maryland. Data were obtained during the 1981-82 school year from interlibrary request forms, an attitudinal survey of school librarians, and a network use questionnaire for borrowers. A random sample of 100 student requests were checked against the union list from the school media centers in the Maryland Interlibrary Organization (MILO). None of the titles was found in the school media centers. An interesting part of this study was the analysis of costs to the schools. At about \$15.00 per request, it cost the school districts approximately \$18,000 to belong to MILO. Walker concluded that amount of money would not substantially improve the school collections if spent on individual acquisitions (p. 27). The students had access to more resources through the library network.

The study by Esther Blanche Sutton Woolls (1973) was a general investigation into cooperative library services in Indiana.

She studied 24 communities with populations of over 5,000 persons. Each city had a public library and elementary schools for grades one through five or one through six. Fifty-three librarians and 473 fifth graders responded to her questionnaire. The data revealed that little communication existed between the school librarians and public librarians. Cooperation that did exist tended to be more traditional, such as interlibrary loan. Woolls found that access to a school library did not prohibit public library usage among fifth-graders. Approximately one-fourth of the students surveyed visited the public library at least once a week and over one-third visited at least once a month. While not so interested in evening hours for school libraries; students did express an interest in summer hours at the school facility (p.1304-A).

A study by Mary Ellen Kennedy (1985/86), with the assistance of Blanche Woolls, indicates that schools are not participating in cooperative collection development. Schools and public libraries were chosen from Woolls' earlier study of school and public library cooperation. Kennedy reported that only one of 22 school librarians indicated that joint materials selection meetings were held in their

communities (p. 201). All but one responded no to the question "Do you centrally purchase library materials with public libraries?" and a lone respondent answered "Don't know". Public librarians seemed to have a more positive perception of cooperative activities. Two public librarians said they sent copies of book orders to the schools and five claimed to supply exhibits of materials for selection purposes. However, none participated in a central purchasing agreement. Kennedy and Woolls found little formal planning in the communities surveyed in Indiana. While there seemed to be a perceived need for cooperation, inertia and fear of loss of autonomy hindered any real progress toward cooperation (p. 202).

The final study reviewed for this project was conducted by Esther Dyer (1978). Dyer used the Delphi method to establish predictions for future library service to children. Using a panel of diverse experts and predetermined criteria, she outlined patterns of organization, finance, administration, staffing, and facilities. Oddly enough, Dyer found that money was both a stimulus and a barrier to cooperation. Reduced funds may force schools and public libraries to coordinate programs or to contract for services from another agency.

This was particularly true if state and federal funding changes or if the community exerts pressure to cooperate. Conversely, some schools and libraries may decide to spend their limited funds on known existing programs rather than take the risk on the implementation of a new program. In addition, the institutions may not be able to afford the additional salaries necessary for administrative and planning activities (pp. 91-2).

Dyer's summation is pessimistic. She sees cooperation as an abstract ideal, but an implausible program. It will not be a priority in schools and public libraries. Probability and desirability are in conflict. She sees self-preservation as a stronger goal. Cooperation is a threat to autonomy. Her recommendations offer two choices. "For one, it (the profession) can honestly admit that cooperation belongs in the same romantic spotlight as other worthwhile but elusive goals like peace, love, and harmony. Or the problems inherent in the school/library relationship can be faced boldly and realistically, beginning with systematic research and proceeding with ruthless implementation" (p.95). Perhaps this study will show how Iowa professionals stand up to Dyer's challenge.

CHAPTER 3

Background of ICEMS and Methodology

In March, 1978, the University of Iowa School of Library Science hosted a conference on public library and school library cooperation. The 240 librarians heard keynote speaker, William G. Asp of the Minnesota Department of Education, outline the history, the advantages, and disadvantages of multilibrary cooperation. Drawing on earlier work by Charles Nelson, Asp explained the roles and responsibilities of libraries in a cooperative system. He emphasized mutual benefits, voluntary participation, and each library's responsibility in deciding what it can gain or contribute to the system ("Public Library/School Library...." 1978, p. 923). Asp, who is the director of the Office of Public Libraries and Interlibrary Cooperation in Minnesota, discouraged the formation of combined school and public libraries, calling them ineffective in serving their clientele. The Iowa Department of Education (formerly the DPI) has taken a similar stance in recent years. For instance, in 1985, the Pocahontas City Council approached the local school board with the idea of a proposed combined facility. Subsequent publicity and

editorials in the Des Moines Register helped to cut short the plan (Horstmeyer, 1985, p. 1).

While opposed to joint facilities, the Department of Education has been active in promoting library cooperation in Iowa. As mentioned in the introduction, it has adopted a resolution to work toward cooperative efforts in the state of Iowa. The Iowa Cooperative Efforts in Media Services workshops were further attempts to bring schools and public libraries together.

In 1979, a team of Iowa professionals attended the National Library Media Training Institute on Sharing Media Resources in Pennsylvania. Team members included representatives from the State Library, the Department of Public Instruction, Area Education Agencies, and local school libraries. The group returned to Iowa with the core plan for conducting similar workshops in the state. They developed a plan for a workshop of approximately 16 hours at which similar teams could plan cooperative activities for their home communities. The plan required the involvement of local participants who registered as a team. Each community was required to send a public librarian, a school librarian/media specialist, a

public library trustee, a school administrator, a public library user, and a school teacher.

Each team was assigned a facilitator who had attended the Pennsylvania conference or a similar cooperation workshop. The team leader's outline prepared by Marie Lindquist (1981) set forth the following procedures:

1. establish statement of purpose and goals
2. identification and explanation of each "type" of library
3. identify current services of each "type"
4. identify needs of each "type"
5. discuss barriers to cooperation
6. develop resolution of cooperation
7. compare service list and needs list
8. determine priorities for cooperation
9. selection of one or more areas for cooperation
10. develop detailed plan for cooperation (p. 1).

In both 1980 and 1981, seven communities sent representatives to the workshops held at Spring Brook State Park. In 1982, only four incomplete teams attended. (See Appendix C for a list of communities and their representatives.)

For this study an attempt was made to contact each librarian and school media specialist to determine what changes in cooperation have occurred in their respective communities and schools. Because they have primary responsibility for the planning

and implementation of library services in their schools or public libraries, the media specialists and librarians should have the required statistics and reports to provide the information sought in this study.

Included with a cover letter (Appendix D), was a combined checklist and questionnaire (Appendix E) which asked for the following data:

1. What is position of the respondent?
2. Did he or she participate in the ICEMS workshop?
3. What cooperative activities/attitudes existed in the previous three years before the community's participation in the workshop?
4. What one or more areas of cooperation was selected by the team for closer consideration?
5. What cooperative activities have occurred in at least three of the years following the workshop?

Some open-ended questions for the respondent's comments on what benefits and/ or problems have been observed in the cooperative efforts in his/her school and community were included.

Note: Page 25 was missing from the original print copy

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Data

The questionnaire was sent to a school library media specialist and a public librarian in each of the 18 ICEMS communities. The public librarians' names on the ICEMS lists were checked against the personnel listed in the Iowa Library Directory, and the school media specialists' names were checked against those listed in the 1985/86 Iowa Basic Educational Data List. If an original team member was not in the current lists, an attempt was made to contact his/her immediate successor. Twenty-seven of the 36 persons were original team members. One public librarian and one school media specialist had attended the workshops as representatives of another school or community. The remaining seven had been employed in their schools or libraries since the workshops.

Twenty-five questionnaires were returned. Data on one were not used because the respondent indicated he/she had only been employed in the public library for three months and could not supply any pertinent information. The 24 remaining surveys represented 66

percent of those mailed. Eleven public librarians and 13 school library media specialists answered the survey. Twenty of the 24 had attended the workshops as representatives of schools or public libraries. Of those, two were in new positions of responsibility.

The major section of the survey was Section B which was a checklist of cooperative activity characteristics from the Billman and Owens Taxonomy. One item in Level II and one item in Level V on the activity characteristics list (Appendix B) were not included in the survey instrument because similar activities were included at higher levels on the taxonomy. The respondents were asked to indicate if the activities were in practice before the workshop, had been identified as a goal during the workshop, and if they had been practiced during any three years since the workshop. It was assumed that a community's participation in a ICEMS workshop placed it beyond Level I of the taxonomy. At Level I, there is no cooperation, and there may be some antagonism between school and public library personnel. The five hypotheses, therefore, concern Levels II through VI of the taxonomy and are based on activities in practice since the workshops. Response data for all hypotheses are displayed in Table 1

on page 29.

Hypothesis 1 states that 75 percent of the librarians will engage in the majority of those activities requiring informal communication. The hypothesis is accepted because 50 percent of the responses indicated assignment alerts are given to public librarians. Ninety-six percent indicated that reference phone calls are exchanged between the two agencies.

Hypothesis 2 states that at least 25 percent of the librarians will engage in activities requiring regular communication between staff members. Because all but two of the activities surpassed that figure, this hypothesis is accepted also. Class visits to the public library are common in 79 percent of the libraries. Two activities which provide contrast are those involving summer programming. While 71 percent of the respondents indicated mutual promotion of summer programs; only 12.5 percent spend time cooperatively planning summer programs. Thirty-seven and one-half percent and 45 percent, respectively, car pool to professional events and share professional development opportunities.

TABLE 1

ICEMS CHECKLIST RESPONSES

	No. of Librarians (N=24)			% After
	Before	During	After	
LEVEL II				
Assignment alerts to PL by SLMS	6	11	12	50.0
Occasional phone calls for reference purposes	19	19	23	96.0
LEVEL III				
School class visits to public library	19	14	19	79.0
PL visits to SMC or classrooms	8	9	13	54.0
Mutual planning of summer programs	2	2	3	12.5
Mutual promotion of summer programs	10	9	17	71.0
Carpooling to professional events	5	8	9	37.5
Sharing of professional development opportunities	4	8	11	45.0
Regular meetings between school and PL staff	0	1	2	8.0
LEVEL IV				
Joint celebrations of events such as NLW	3	3	7	29.0
Union lists of periodicals or other materials	3	7	7	29.0
Exchange of bibliographies	3	7	8	33.3
Cooperative data collection such as library statistics or community needs assessment	0	2	4	17.0
LEVEL V				
Shared story-telling, booktalks, discussion groups, etc.	2	3	3	12.5
Loan of school material to public library in the summer	2	3	5	21.0
Compatibility of hardware (video, computers, etc.)	1	3	2	8.0
Shared display of special materials	0	0	1	4.0
Interlibrary loan	9	10	12	50.0
Intradistrict delivery of materials	5	6	9	37.5
Articles in publications about services and programs	5	5	9	37.5
Shared films or film rentals	1	2	4	17.0
LEVEL VI				
Some cooperative collection development	1	3	3	12.5
Cooperative policy development (selection, etc.)	2	2	2	8.0
Joint cataloging/Technical processing	0	1	0	0.0
Cooperative equipment repair service or purchasing program	0	2	4	17.0
Shared goal setting	0	2	1	4.0
Shared evaluation process to assess programs and services	0	3	3	12.5
Exchange of current acquisition lists	1	4	3	12.5
Common card catalog in one or more facility	1	2	1	4.0
Facilities sharing	1	1	1	4.0
Extended hours at school media center for public use	0	1	1	4.0
Development of library skills instructional materials	0	1	1	4.0

Eight percent indicated regular meetings among media specialists and public librarians.

Hypothesis 3 states that 10 percent or less of the librarians will engage in formal cooperative activities. This hypothesis is rejected because no activity fell below that figure. Twenty-nine percent cooperate on special library events such as National Library Week or Children's Book Week. The same number indicated that there are union lists of holdings in their libraries. Thirty-three percent exchange bibliographies. Seventeen percent mutually gather data such as a community needs assessment or library statistics.

Hypothesis 4 is rejected because only one resource sharing activity was in practice in at least 40 percent of the libraries or media centers. Half of the respondents stated that they are engaged in interlibrary loan. Intradistrict delivery of materials is common in 37.5 percent of the agencies, as is publicity for programs and services in school and community publications. Twenty-one percent of the respondents indicated that the schools lend materials to the public library during the summer. Seventeen percent shared films or film rentals. Twelve and one-half percent share story hours, book

talks, and discussion groups. Eight percent have compatible hardware and four percent share displays of special materials.

Hypothesis 5 states that fewer than 10 percent of the respondents will engage in the majority of activities requiring formal cooperation through mutual goal planning and policy making. The hypothesis is accepted as the majority of the activities fell below 10 percent. Seventeen percent of the respondents stated that their media centers and libraries had a cooperative arrangement for the purchase or repair of equipment. Twelve and one-half percent indicated that they share an evaluation process to assess programs and services. The same percentage exchange current acquisitions lists and practice some cooperative collection development. Cooperative policy development appeared in eight percent of the responses. Four percent of the respondents indicated they have a common card catalog, share a facility, share goal setting, and have extended hours at the school library for public use. No librarian indicated a program for joint technical processing or cataloging. One school (four percent) works with the public library to develop instructional materials to teach the use of public library resources.

Section C of the questionnaire consisted of three open-ended questions. The first asked if the community had revised the goals set in the ICEMS workshops and , if so, what new goals had been identified. Sixteen of the librarians responded "No" or left the question blank. Two said, although they were members of the teams, they could not remember what goals had been set and did not have the lists of goals in their files. In the words of one, "It's been a long time." One librarian indicated that all the goals established during the workshop had been accomplished and might need revitalizing. Three librarians indicated that cooperation was no longer a priority in their communities. One said the committee had met twice, and the issue was dropped. Another said momentum fell quickly and that there has been no coordinated effort to continue the goals. To another, it was simply a "dead issue".

Conversely, two communities have implemented new programs as possible outgrowths of ICEMS. One involves a joint recreational reading program which has encouraged communication between the school and public library and has increased the circulation at both institutions. Another community has begun a reciprocal use

cooperative among all types of libraries in its area.

Question 2 asked the librarians to comment about what they have perceived as benefits of cooperation since the ICEMS workshops. Twenty-one responded in some manner. The benefit most frequently mentioned was closer personal contact among staff members. This lead to better communication, an increased willingness to cooperate, and a "feeling of working together". One respondent mentioned that knowing other librarians helped to ease the isolation one feels in a small professional group.

The librarians mentioned the benefits that the students received, as well. Students learned to use more than one library. The exchange of bibliographies, assignment alerts, and the use of public library computer data bases provided more resources for student research.

Only one librarian mentioned a financial aspect of cooperation. He/she stated that sharing materials saved money in some subject areas because certain reference materials were not duplicated by the school media center and public library. Another librarian stated that taxpayers could see that the public library was being used by more

persons as students used the library more often. One interesting benefit of cooperation solved the question of "turf". As one community became involved in the process, the public librarian acquired a better understanding of the two roles played by the school media center and public library. According to the respondent, this helped alleviate some feelings of jealousy on the part of the public library staff.

Fifteen librarians answered Question 3 which asked the respondents to identify any obstacles to cooperation observed since the workshops. The most common characteristic of the obstacles to cooperation was attitude. The personal attitudes of library staff, school administrators, and board members are important to the process of cooperation. For instance, one librarian stated that a board member's perception of the teen-ager's "rightful place" in a public library has hindered efforts to cooperate. Two other librarians mentioned lack of commitment on the part of the school administration as an obstacle. One community has a public library board "run by" school teachers who "demand" service. In the opinion of the respondent, this discourages frank discussion of any problems

which may exist between the two agencies. In some cases, the media specialists or librarians may, themselves, have attitudes that impede progress. One librarian stated that the media specialist doesn't feel the need to keep the public library informed about her center. Another librarian said that since the schools have excellent media centers, the staff does not believe the school can benefit from cooperation with the public library. One professional accuses her colleagues of indifference or, perhaps laziness. In any case, at least three of the respondents said that a change in personnel was more responsible for the changes which had taken place in cooperative efforts in their schools or public libraries. In one instance, the effect was negative as the respondent felt in some way insulted by the new public librarian's lack of courtesy toward him/her.

Six respondents mentioned time as an important factor. Both schools and public libraries are understaffed due to budget cuts. In one community, the school library is now being staffed by a classroom teacher. Heavy workloads in both types of agencies hinder cooperation. One librarian stated that she and others are so busy "doing their own thing" that they have little time to communicate

with one another. One responded that there is little time to schedule meetings to plan cooperative activities.

Three librarians stated that inherent differences in the two agencies impede cooperation. Two mentioned the different goals and missions of the school media center and public library. One mentioned legal barriers such as the limitations on the lending of certain materials purchased with federal funds. One respondent asked, "Who would pay to keep the school library open in the evenings for public use?" For the most part, financial considerations were only mentioned in reference to the effect on staffing.

The original intent of this study was to assess changes in cooperative activities in ICEMS communities. Little has been said of activities in practice before the workshops or activities identified as goals by community teams. Table 1 shows a complete listing of responses to the Billman and Owens Taxonomy. Taking the data at face value, one sees an increase in cooperative activity after the ICEMS workshops. Twenty-seven of the 32 activities showed an increase from the "Before" column to the "After" column. Five activities remained the same.

When one compares the "During" column which identifies goals set by team members at the workshops with the "After" column, there are some interesting results. Twenty activities showed an increase. Some communities have apparently implemented some previously unidentified activities as they make cooperative efforts grow. Eight activities remained the same. Hopefully, those communities which identified those goals have succeeded in implementing them. Four activities (at the higher levels of the taxonomy) showed a decrease from the "During" column to the "After" column. There are some team goals which have not yet been met.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Summary

Just as time is an obstacle to cooperation; time was an obstacle to this study--too much time. Too many years have passed since the workshops. The first indication of this was the limited, although helpful, information available about the workshops themselves. Betty Jo Buckingham of the Department of Education was able to supply a list of 1980 and 1981 participants and some copies of workshop materials. Apparently no such materials exist for the 1982 workshop at either the State Library or Department of Education. Files have been lost or discarded as time passed, new projects undertaken, or new personnel assumed responsibility. Staff changes at all levels probably added to the record keeping problem. Several librarians stated that they could not remember past practices, did not have records, or had only been employed since the ICEMS workshops. The library community seems to be quite mobile.

The benefits of and barriers to cooperation found in this study echo the information found in the literature search. There were few surprises. However, one community had a unique problem--too much

help to the students by the staff at the public library. The school personnel felt that the public librarians and library assistants were doing the homework for the students. Meetings between the school and library staff members have alleviated this problem to some extent.

The study shows that the Iowa library professionals have many of the same experiences as those surveyed in other studies. The data support information available in the literature search. The most common cooperative activities, such as reference calls, assignment alerts, and class visits, tend to be at the lower end of the Billings and Owens Taxonomy. They are traditional activities frequently mentioned in other studies and are common responses in this survey. Those activities requiring greater commitment of time and resources tend to be at the upper end of the taxonomy and appear less frequently in the responses.

Because the survey was anonymous, there is no reliable way to compare the responses of librarians and media specialists in the same communities. Some respondents signed the questionnaire. A cursory examination of signed surveys shows there may be some

discrepancies in the responses. Perhaps the two professionals within a community define the activities in a different manner or based their responses on their own limited experiences.

If the Iowa library community continues to promote school and public library cooperation, this study may be replicated at some future date. However, there are some changes which may facilitate the data-gathering process and may also give a more accurate picture of what is actually happening in the ICEMS communities. The researcher should try to conduct the study within three years of the dates of any formal workshops, seminars, or conferences. This may help solve problems such as lost files, personnel changes, and memory failures. If the State Library and Department of Education sponsor future ICEMS workshops, they should require better documentation at both the state and local levels. If the participants are asked to submit periodic reports, copies of those reports should be kept in local and state agency files for at least three years.

Another researcher may wish to compare communities which participate in ICEMS workshops with those which have not attended formal planning sessions. One may try to match ICEMS communities

with those of similar size. The Iowa Library Directory designates population categories for public libraries. One could design a control group with similar characteristics by randomly selecting from the appropriate population category a community to match each ICEMS participant.

The survey instrument was quite straightforward. The Billman and Owens taxonomy covers a wide range of cooperative activities and most responses fell into one of their categories. The development of instructional materials was the only activity added to the list by a respondent. If future workshop participants work with a designated list of cooperative activities, then that terminology should be substituted for the Billman and Owens taxonomy. The researcher, however, should place the Iowa list within the taxonomy levels to define the complexity of the activities. He/she might also ask ICEMS participants to evaluate the workshop and its effect on cooperative efforts.

If time permits and anonymity can be insured in the final report, the researcher may wish to follow the survey with personal interviews. Those librarians who have unusual success or setbacks

in their cooperative attempts may provide insightful information which could not be explained on the survey instrument. The information may be used to plan future cooperative workshops. State agencies may determine what is already being done locally, what obstacles may be unique to Iowa, and what factors are favorable to cooperation in Iowa. They may change some of the procedures of previous workshops in accordance with respondents' evaluations.

The purpose of this survey was to identify changes in library cooperation in communities which sent teams to the Iowa Cooperative Effort in Media Services workshops. Between 1980 and 1982, 18 communities sent teams composed of school and public librarians, administrators, trustees, teachers, and patrons. The survey was sent to a school media specialist and public librarian in each of the towns. An attempt was made to contact original team members or their immediate successors. Twenty-five of the 36 questionnaires were returned. Of those, 24 were analyzed for this study.

The survey instrument consisted of three parts. Section A identified the respondent's status as a school media specialist or

public librarian. It also determined whether or not the respondent had attended an ICEMS workshop. Section B consisted of a checklist of cooperative activity characteristics developed by Betty V. Billman and Patricia Owens. Their taxonomy arranged several activities at six levels of complexity. More traditional activities are at the lower levels, and those activities requiring more time and effort are at the higher levels. The respondent was asked to indicate on the checklist whether each activity was prevalent BEFORE the workshop, had been identified as a goal DURING the workshop, and/or had been in practice in any three years AFTER the workshop. Section C consisted of three open-ended questions. The first asked the respondent to identify any revisions in the goals set during the workshop. The second and third asked the participant to identify any benefits of and obstacles to cooperation which he/she had perceived since the workshop.

Three of the five hypotheses were accepted on analysis of the data. Hypothesis 1 stated that 75 percent of the librarians would engage in the majority of those activities requiring informal communication. This hypothesis was accepted because 90 percent of the respondents exchange telephone reference calls. Hypothesis 2

stated that at least 25 percent of the librarians would engage in activities requiring regular communication between staff members. This was accepted because five of the seven activities had been done by more than 25 percent of the librarians. Hypothesis 3 stated that 10 percent or less of the librarians would engage in formal cooperative activities. This hypothesis was rejected because more than 10 percent of the librarians participated in all of the activities. Hypothesis 4, which stated that at least 40 percent of the librarians would engage in resource sharing activities, was rejected because only one resource sharing activity, interlibrary loan, was performed by more than 40 percent of the librarians. Hypothesis 5 stated that fewer than 10 percent of the librarians would engage in the majority of activities requiring formal cooperation through mutual goal planning and policy making. Fewer than 10 percent of the librarians engaged in a majority of activities; thus it was accepted.

The study found that Iowa schools and public libraries engage in many of the traditional cooperative activities that are prevalent in other states. Activities which require little advanced planning or a large commitment of time and resources are common. Those which

require more formal planning are rare. As in other studies, the attitudes of library staffs, administrators, and teachers are factors in successful cooperative efforts. Limited time for planning such activities and the inherent differences in the two institutions also affect the extent that schools and public libraries coordinate their services and programs.

Library service is a strong tradition in Iowa. The state leads the nation in number of libraries and per capita circulation of library materials. With ICEMS the State Library and the Department of Education began an important process to coordinate the services and programs offered to patrons on all levels. The study seems to indicate that it is easy to lose momentum when traditional barriers are too overwhelming. However, there are efforts being made at the "grass roots" level. Recently, the Northeast Iowa Regional Library and the Area Education Agency Media Centers for Regions 1 and 7 began an intra-regional van delivery service. These efforts are commendable but perhaps not aggressive enough to match Dyer's challenge that if cooperation is to be more than a "elusive" and "romantic" goal, library professionals must "ruthlessly" pursue it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaron, Shirley L. "A Review of Selected Research Studies about School Library Media Program, Resources, and Personnel: January 1972-June 1981." In School Library Media Annual, 1983. Eds. Shirley L. Aaron and Pat R. Scales. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1983.
- , Combined School-Public Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1980.
- Altman, Ellen. "Implications of Title Diversity and Collection Overlap for Interlibrary Loan Among Secondary Schools." Library Quarterly 42 (April 1972): 177-94.
- Amey, L. J. and R. J. Smith. "Combination School and Public Libraries, an Attitudinal Study." Canadian Library Journal 33 (June 1976): 251-61.
- Billman, Betty V. and Patricia Owens. "School and Public Library Cooperation: A Prerequisite for Cooperative Collection Development." Collection Management 7 (Fall 1985/Winter 1986): 183-95.
- Broderick, Dorothy M. Library Work with Children. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1977.
- Brown, Gerald. "Schools, a Link in the Community Resources Network." Canadian Library Journal 35 (October 1978): 365-9.
- Buckingham, Betty Jo and Barry L. Porter. Distinctive Functions of School Media Centers and Public Libraries, 2nd ed. Des Moines, IA: State of Iowa Department of Public Instruction and the State Library Commission of Iowa, 1981.

- Burke, J. Gordon and Gerald Shields, eds. Children's Library Service, School or Public. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974.
- Chait, William. "The Role of the Public Library in Networking." In Networks for Networkers. Eds. Barbara Evans Markuson and Blanche Woolls. New York: Neal Schuman, 1980.
- Coopridge, David. "Library Cooperation: School Libraries in Illinois." Illinois Libraries 54 (May 1972): 334-41.
- Doan, Janice K. "School Library Media Centers in Networks." School Library Media Quarterly 13 (Summer 1985): 191-99.
- Doll, Carol A. "School and Public Library Collection Overlap and the Implications for Networking." School Library Media Quarterly 7 (Spring 1983): 193-9.
- , "A Study of Overlap and Duplication Among Children's Collections in Selected Public and Elementary School Libraries." Library Quarterly 54 (July 1984): 277-89.
- Dyer, Esther R. Cooperation in Library Services to Children. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1978.
- Falsone, Anne Marie. "Participation of School Libraries." In Multitype Library Cooperation. Eds. Beth A. Hamilton and William B. Ernst, Jr. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1977.
- Fenwick, Sara Innis. "Library Services to Children and Young People." Library Trends 25 (July 1976): 329-60.
- Fitzgibbons, Shirley. "Research on Library Services for Children and Young Adults: Implications for Practice." In Library Lit. 13, the Best of 1982. Ed. Bill Katz. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1983.
- Fleming, Lois D. "Public and School Libraries-Partners in the Big Picture." School Media Quarterly 7 (Fall 1978): 25-30.

Goldman, Maurice. "It Didn't Work in Willingboro." In Library Journal Special Report No. 9. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1979.

Horstmeyer, Mark. "Pocahontas Boards to Consider Shared Library." Des Moines Register 18 July, 1985, p. 1.

Immroth, Barbara. "Networking and the School Library Media Program." In School Library Media Annual, 1983. Eds. Shirley L. Aarons and Pat R. Scales. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1983.

Iowa Basic Educational Data List 1985/86. Des Moines: Department of Education, 1986.

Iowa Library Directory. Des Moines: State Library of Iowa, 1985.

"Iowa Takes Team Approach to School/Library Cooperation." Library Journal 107 (15 March 1982): 593.

Jaffe, Lawrence Lewis. "Collection Development and Resource Sharing in the Combined School/Public Library." Collection Management 7 (Fall 1985/Winter 1986): 205-15.

Kelver, Ann. Public School-Public Library Cooperation in Sheridan, Colorado. Bethesda, MD: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 111 342, 1975.

Kennedy, Mary Ellen. "Cooperative Materials Purchasing Among School and Public Libraries: Focus on Indiana." Collection Management 7 (Fall 1985/Winter 1986): 197-203.

Kent, Allen, ed. Resource Sharing in Libraries. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974.

Kent, Allen and Thomas J. Galvin. Library Resource Sharing. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1977.

Kitchens, James A. and Joni Bodart. "Some Libraries Do Everything Well: An Example of School/Public Library Cooperation." Top

of the News 36 (Summer 1980): 357-62.

Lindquist, Marie. "Team Leaders' Outline." ICEMS Workshop. July 28-31, 1981.

Miller, Marilyn. "Children's Access to Library Systems." Library Quarterly 51 (January 1981): 38-53.

Mosher, Paul H. and Marcia Pankake. "A Guide to Coordinated and Cooperative Collection Development." Library Resources and Technical Services (October/November 1983): 417-31.

Pettem, Doug. "Problems in School and Public Library Resource Sharing." Canadian Library Journal 35 (October 1978): 361-3.

Porter, Barry L. Letter to Dr. Robert Benton. 28 July 1982. State Library of Iowa. Des Moines, Iowa.

"Public Library/School Library Cooperation Eyed in Iowa." Library Journal 103 (1 May 1978): 923.

Sayers, Frances Clarke. "The American Origins of Public Library Work with Children." Library Trends 12 (July 1963): 6-13.

Shontz, Marilyn L. "Selected Research Related to Children's and Young Adult Services in Public Libraries." Top of the News 38 (Winter 1982): 125-42.

Sones, Mary C. "School-Public Library Cooperation Adds Strength and Resources." Canadian Library Journal 38 (April 1981): 85-90.

Sorensen, Richard. "The Role of School Media Programs in Library Networks." In Networks for Networkers. Eds. Barbara Evans Markuson and Blanche Woolls. New York: Neal Schuman, 1980.

Stenstrom, Ralph H. Cooperation Between Types of Libraries 1940-1968, An Annotated Bibliography. Chicago: American

Library Association, 1970.

Walker, H. Thomas. "Networking and School Library Media Centers: A Report of a Pilot Project of the Howard County (Maryland) Public School System and the Maryland Interlibrary Loan Organization." School Library Media Quarterly 12 (Fall 1983): 20-8.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. School-Public Library Services Within a Community--Problems and Questions on Consolidation. A Policy Statement. Madison, WI: Wisconsin DPI Bureau of Public and Cooperative Library Services, 1976.

Woolard, Wilma Lee Broughton. Combined School/Public Libraries: A Survey with Conclusions and Recommendations. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1980.

----- . "The Combined School and Public Library: Can It Work?" Library Journal 103 (15 January 1978): 435-8.

Woolis, Esther Blanche Sutton. "Cooperative Library Services to Children in Public Libraries and Public School Systems in Selected Communities in Indiana." Dissertation Abstracts International. 34 (1973): 19750-1304A.

----- . "The Use of School Libraries and Public Libraries and the Relationship to Collection Development." Collection Management 7 (Fall 1985/Winter 1986): 173-81.

APPENDIX A

IOWA INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION RESOLUTION

As an outgrowth of the Iowa Governor's Pre-White House Conference on Library and Information Services, March 27-29, 1979, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services November 15-18, 1979 and a national workshop on cooperation between school media centers and public libraries September 18-21, considerable attention has been given to strengthening cooperation in the state. The State Library Commission and the State Department of Public Instruction sponsored a state version of the cooperation workshop August 6-8, 1980 and hope for a second such workshop in 1981. Participants in both national and state workshops have been encouraged to seek adoption by boards and agencies of resolutions representing their commitment to the concept of cooperation. The State Library Commission has adopted the following:

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION RESOLUTION

Whereas, there now exists in the State, agencies which provide services that support instruction, such as the local systems, the Regional Library System, the Area Education Agencies, the State Department of Public Instruction, the State Library, and the Iowa Public Broadcasting Network; and

Whereas, these agencies function on a local, regional, multi-regional, or state-wide basis; and

Whereas, there may exist duplication of effort by these agencies in providing services with an apparent potential for the compounding of that duplication of effort; and

Whereas, the level of the state's commitment of funds to support these agencies may not necessarily be related to the cost effectiveness of each agency in providing instructional support; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Library Commission of Iowa encourages and endorses the promotion of cooperative efforts between local, regional, state, public and educational libraries for the purpose of providing expanded and improved services to their patrons.

Be it further resolved, that the State Library Commission establish a task force, to include representatives of the above agencies, for the purpose of thoroughly studying and attempting to define roles and functions of these various agencies in the present and in the State's long range plan; and, to make recommendations for the logistic and financial support for the most cost effective and efficient coordination of such services to the Commission.

Marie H. Wallinga
Signed Chairperson
State Library Commission

September 25, 1979
Date

APPENDIX B

TAXONOMY OF LIBRARY COOPERATION

General Description (Billman & Owens, pp. 186-7)

LEVEL I No involvement or cooperation

At this level, libraries exist as separate and independent institutions, either by choice or by lack of any precedent for cooperation. Many times staffs have never met.

LEVEL II Informal cooperation

At this level libraries are still quite independent entities, but experience some sporadic communication. Some libraries may communicate more than others but all still rely primarily on their own resources to meet user needs.

LEVEL III Formal communication

At this level, communication becomes more purposeful and on-going in nature, focusing on a specific event or issue. Staffs may meet together on an irregular basis.

LEVEL IV Formal cooperation

At this level, mutual goals or objectives guide the cooperative activities. Though actual materials may not be exchanged, there is an increased awareness of the town's total resources. Much of this activity can still be conducted by interested individuals. Library staffs and administrators have an understanding of the services and mission of the other libraries involved in the cooperative group.

LEVEL V Resource sharing

At this level, cooperation becomes more planned, systematic, and ongoing as the commitment to the whole of library services grows. Involvement of school administrators, town fiscal agents, trustees, etc. increases as many resource sharing activities involve policies or finances. Short and long term goals and plan may be developed.

LEVEL VI Formal planning

At this level, cooperation exists on a frequent and regular basis and involve more people. Short and long term goals and objectives for library service are developed and approved by the appropriate governing boards.

Characteristics of Activities

- LEVEL I** There has been no history of cooperation.
Formal contacts have not been made between the two institutions.
There is no public library in town.
There are no library media personnel in the school or school system.
There is a competitive or antagonistic behavior on the part of the professionals or boards.
There are no phones in the school library media center.
- LEVEL II** Assignment alerts are given to public librarians by the school media specialist.
Occasional phone calls for reference by either the school or public librarians.
Joint publicity of special library events.
- LEVEL III** Plan scheduled class visits to the public library.
Public librarians visit school library media centers or school classrooms.
Mutual planning and promotion of summer programs for children.
Social contact through professional associations or workshops.
Carpooling to professional events or workshops.
Sharing of professional development opportunities.
- LEVEL IV** Joint celebration of library events such as National Library Week.
Union lists of periodicals or other materials.
Exchange of bibliographies.
Cooperative data collection.
- LEVEL V** Shared storytelling, book talks, discussion groups, etc.
Loan of school materials to the public library during the summer.
School library media materials are available to public library patrons.

Compatibility of hardware(video, microcomputer, etc.) throughout the town or region.

Shared display of special materials or projects.

Mutual exchange of materials of any kind.

Intradistrict delivery of materials to all libraries and library media centers in town.

Regular articles in school or local newspapers, library bulletins, etc.

Shared films or film rentals.

- LEVEL VI** Some cooperative collection development.
- Cooperative policy development(selection, weeding, equipment, etc.
 - Joint cataloging/technical processing.
 - Cooperative equipment repair, service, or purchase program.
 - Shared goal setting for library service within the town.
 - Shared program evaluation procedures.
 - Exchange of catalog cards or current acquisitions.
 - Common card catalog in one or more location.
 - Facilities sharing for district patron services.
 - Extended hours at the school library media center to increase patron access.

APPENDIX C

ICEMS TEAM MEMBERS

1980 ICEMS Teams

Des Moines

Edwin W. Richardson
Des Moines Public School
Curriculum Service Center
Des Moines, Iowa 50313

Joyce Fant
1218 Hutton Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50316

Merritta Florence
King School
1849 Forest
Des Moines, Iowa 50314

James Bertin
2015 E. 9th
Des Moines, Iowa 50316

Charlene Lakin
Roosevelt School
4419 Center St.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312

Elaine G. Estes
Public Library of Des Moines
100 Locust St.
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Eldridge

Jan Morteson*
R. R. 1
Eldridge, Iowa 52748

Quentin Coffman
Box 311
Eldridge, Iowa 52748

Dennis Albertson
R. R. 1
Princeton, Iowa 52768

Ray Baetke
R. R.
Longrove, Iowa 52756

Frances Paustian
R. R. 2
Wilton, Iowa 52778

Kay Runge *
Scott County Library
215 N. 2nd Street
Eldridge, Iowa 52748

*No longer with the system.

Iowa City

Carolyn Cavitt
215 Teeters Court
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Judy Kelly
Public Library
College and Linn Sts.
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Sharon Lust (Mrs. Gary)
R. R. 2
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Guerin Thompson
1040 William Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Nan Mercier
1040 William Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Jean Donham **
509 South Dubuque
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Marion

Stephen J. Kepros
2155 McGowan Blvd.
Marion, Iowa 52302

Bobbie Duss *
Marion Carnegie Library
Marion, Iowa 52302

Irene Kincheloe
2320 12th Ave.
Marion, Iowa 52302

Marge Jesen
R. R. 3
Marion, Iowa 52302

Dr. C. Robert Bennett
10th and 29th Street
Marion, Iowa 52302

Mrs. Phyllis Purtell
1600 25th Ave.
Marion, Iowa 52302

Gail P. Landy **
Marion Carnegie Library
Marion, Iowa 52302

**Current staff member not a part of original team.

Mt. Pleasant

Marlys Cresap
600 1/2 E. Washington
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641

Micheal E. Keefe
1509 Linden Place
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641

Dennis Moore
R. R. 3 Westwood
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641

Sandy Hopson
306 Rose
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641

Mary Kopsieker
104 1/2 N. Harrison
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641

Waunita Hobbie
405 W. Monroe
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641

Gayle Trede **
Public Library
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641

Shenandoah

Dr. Ken Gee
Public Library
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Ron Lottridge
Community High School
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Mary Beth Vaughn
Community High School
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Joyce McClarch
Rural Route
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Gerry Rowland *
Public Library
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Rebecca Bernthal *
Community High School
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Norma Paulson **
1000 Mustang Drive
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Mary Lou Holdridge **
Public Library
Shenandoah, Iowa 51601

Sioux Center

Charles Irwin
Sioux Center Community School
Sioux Center, Iowa 51250

Katie Haan
475 7th St. N. E.
Sioux Center, Iowa 51250

Char Butler
1004 S. Marshall
Rock Rapids, Iowa 51246

Mary Lynn Bogaard
664 11th St. N. E.
Sioux Center, Iowa 51250

Lois Siebersma
327 1st Ave. N. E.
Sioux Center, Iowa 51250

John Hofland
606 2nd St. S. E.
Sioux Center, Iowa 51250

1981 ICEMS Teams

Bagley

Dennis Ireland
School Administrator

Florence Chalaupka
School Librarian

Julie Robinson
Teacher

Geraldine Wilt
Librarian, Public Library

Lureen Irwin
Trustee, Public Library

Mary Brobst
Public Library User

Cedar Falls

John Baker
School Administrator

Marilyn Young
Media Specialist/Librarian

Jackie Venenga
Teacher

Neil Johnson
Librarian, Public Library

Susan Runkle
Trustee, Public Library

Mrs. Robert Short
Public Library User

Dubuque

Chester Schmitt
School Administrator

Elizabeth Morgan
Media Specialist/Librarian

Elisha Darlin
Teacher

Elizabeth Donnan Minter
Librarian, Public Library

Eileen Coursey
Trustee, Public Library

Janet Melby
Public Library User

Muscatine

Tom Hanifan
School Administrator

Mary Wildermuth
Media Specialist/Librarian

Beth Hetzler
Teacher

Paula V. Smith *
Librarian, Public Library

Margaret Beals
Trustee, Public Library

Evelyn LaBode
Public Library User

Marsha Tate **
Librarian, Public Library

Sibley

Robert A. Robinson
School Administrator

Caroline Robinson
Media Specialist/Librarian

Betty Kingston
Teacher

Connie Mataloni
Librarian, Public Library

Sioux City

Jim Gaul
School Administrator

Marie Haley
Media Specialist/Librarian

Mary Casavant
Teacher

Fred Neighbors *
Librarian, Public Library

Candice Huisenga
Trustee, Public Library

Joann Grueskin
Trustee, Public Library

Lowell Sjogren
Public Library User

Paul Marshall
Public Library User

George Scheetz **
Librarian, Public Library

West Des Moines

Jim Mayse
School Administrator

Jannis Hoobin
Media Specialist/Librarian

Janet Linn
Teacher

Miriam Hansen
Librarian, Public Library

Marlys Lenhart
Trustee, Public Library

Paul B. Linn
Public Library User

1982 ICEMS Teams

Davenport

Kay Runge **
Public Library
Davenport, Iowa 52801

Sue Wiele
25 11 West 60th St.
Davenport, Iowa 52801

Eileen Rewerts McLain
1002 W. Kimberly Road
Davenport, Iowa 52801

Ida Grove

Mary Ann Schultz
609 Circle Drive
Ida Grove, Iowa 51445

Bev Backhaus
Rural Route
Ida Grove, Iowa 51445

Millie Schluter
Ida Grove Community Schools
Ida Grove, Iowa 51445

Rhonda Lee
Ida Grove Public Library
Ida Grove, Iowa 51445

Le Mars

Tom Simpson
Public Library
Le Mars, Iowa 51031

Beth Kehrberg
220 8th Ave. S. E.
Le Mars, Iowa 51031

Rob Hermson
High School Library
Le Mars Community Schools
Le Mars, Iowa 51031

Angie Kobberman (deceased)

Maquoketa

Karen Manning
Public Library
Maquoketa, Iowa 52060

Doug Schermer
Briggs Elementary School
Maquoketa, Iowa 52060

Mary Kahn
Briggs Elementary School
Maquoketa, Iowa 52060

Rebecca Benedix
Briggs Elementary School
Maquoketa, Iowa 52060

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER

R. R. 1 Box 48
New Hampton, Iowa 50659
September 14, 1987

Dear Librarian/Media Specialist,

Your community participated in one of the workshops sponsored by the Iowa's Cooperative Efforts for Media Services between 1980 and 1982. At that time a team of school and public library personnel studied the informational needs and services within your school and community. The team set priorities and developed a plan for future cooperation.

As partial fulfillment for the requirements for a master's degree from the University of Northern Iowa Library Science Department, I am investigating changes in cooperative activities which have occurred in those participating communities. The purpose of the study is to see whether participation in formal workshops has an effect on cooperative activities in local communities. The names of respondents and libraries will be kept confidential. As the library professional in your center, you may have the necessary statistics and/or observations of cooperation between the school and public libraries.

I would appreciate your response to the enclosed survey by October 2nd. Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

Patricia Ipsen

APPENDIX E

ICEMS QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A

1. Position: *Circle one* Public Librarian/School Media Specialist
2. Did you attend one of the ICEMS workshops as a representative from your present library or school? Yes No

If no, respond to the best of your ability for the school or library you represent at this time.

Section B CHECKLIST

Following is a list of characteristics of cooperative activities among school and public libraries.

In the appropriate box *check* (\checkmark) the activities, situations, or attitudes which were in existence in your community (1) during the three years before the ICEMS workshops, (2) those identified as goals during the workshop, and/or (3) those which have been/were in effect for at least three years after your participation in the workshop. For instance, if a cooperative activity was both identified as a goal during the workshop and existed for any three years after the workshop, check both the during and after columns.

CHARACTERISTICS CHECKLIST

	Before	During	After
Assignment alerts to public library by school media specialist	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Occasional phone calls for reference purposes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School class visits to public library	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public librarian visits to school media center or classrooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mutual planning of summer programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mutual promotion of summer programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carpooling to professional events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sharing of professional development opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint celebrations of events such as National Library Week or Children's Book Week	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Union lists of periodicals or other materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exchange of bibliographies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cooperative data collection such as library statistics or community needs assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shared story-telling, booktalks, discussion groups, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loan of school material to public library in the summer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Compatibility of hardware (video, computers, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shared display of special materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interlibrary loan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Intradistrict delivery of materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Articles in school or community publications about one another's services and programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shared films or film rentals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some cooperative collection development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cooperative policy development (selection, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint cataloging/Technical processing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cooperative equipment repair service or purchasing program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shared goal setting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shared evaluation process to assess programs and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exchange of current acquisition lists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Common card catalog in one or more facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilities sharing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extended hours at school media center for public use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OTHER (Please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ABSTRACT

Changes in Cooperation Among Selected Schools and Public Libraries in Iowa

Patricia Ann Ipsen

The purpose of this survey was to identify changes in library cooperation in the 18 communities which sent teams to the ICEMS between 1980 and 1982. The survey was sent to a school media specialist and public librarian in each of the towns.

Section A identified the respondent as a school or public librarian and determined whether or not he/she had attended a workshop. Section B consisted of a checklist of cooperative activities developed by Betty V. Billman and Patricia Owens. The checklist asked whether each activity was prevalent BEFORE the workshop, had been identified as a goal DURING the workshop, and/or had been in practice in any three years AFTER the workshop. Section C consisted of three open-ended questions. The first identified any revisions of workshop goals. The second and third asked the participant to identify any benefits of and obstacles to cooperation which he/she has perceived since the workshop.

H₁ stated that 75 percent of the librarians would engage in the majority of those activities requiring informal communication. H₂ stated that at least 25 percent of the librarians would engage in activities requiring regular communication between staff members. H₃ stated that ten percent or less of the librarians will engage in formal cooperative activities. H₄ stated that at least 40 percent of the libraries would engage in resource sharing activities. H₅ stated that fewer than ten percent of the respondents would engage in the majority of activities requiring formal cooperation through mutual goal planning and policy making. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5 were accepted.

The study found that Iowa schools and public libraries engage in traditional cooperative activities. Those which require more formal planning are rare. As in other studies, staff and community attitudes, lack of time, and the inherent differences of the two agencies affect the success of cooperative programming.