

2002

Evaluating School Media Specialists

Pamela J. Wible
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2002 Pamela J. Wible

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

Recommended Citation

Wible, Pamela J., "Evaluating School Media Specialists" (2002). *Graduate Research Papers*. 4106.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/4106>

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.

Evaluating School Media Specialists

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

Guidelines for successful media specialists are available from a variety of reputable sources, but specific criteria and measurement tools for evaluation by school administrators either are not in place or are not implemented. The purpose of this videotape was to portray the variety of criteria which can be incorporated by administrators for the evaluation of school media specialists.

The program opened with the title Evaluation of School Library Media Specialists. The videotape presented criteria administrators can use in evaluating school media specialists. The criteria were presented in a direct, clear-cut approach using graphics and staged scenarios. Dr. Connie Erpelding, Ed.D., provided the introduction and explained the importance of a school media center and the media specialist responsible for its success. A narrator explained the various criteria as graphics appeared. The graphics were of the different roles of the media specialist and the nine standards presented in Information Power. The scenarios were staged in three different school media centers, and the characters acted out the various stages of the evaluation process as the voice-over explains the video. Characters included administrators, media specialists, teachers, and students. Rolling credits with music closed the production. As intended by the videotape, a school library media specialist is vital to student achievement, therefore the evaluation of the media specialist is crucial. Evaluation of the media specialist by the school administrator who is familiar with the national standards will help insure the professional growth of the library media specialist which will result in increased student learning

Evaluating School Media Specialists

The Graduate Research Project

Submitted to the

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Division of School Library Media Studies

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Northern Iowa

by

Pamela J. Wible

August 2, 2002

This Research Project by: Pamela J. Wible

Titled: Evaluating School Media Specialists

Has been approved as meeting the research paper requirements
For the degree of Master of Arts.

Barbara Safford

August 5, 2002
Date Approved

Barbara Safford
Graduate Faculty Reader

Connie J. Erpelding

8.5.02
Date Approved

Connie J. Erpelding
Graduate Faculty Reader

Rick Traw

August 13, 2002
Date Approved

Rick Traw
Head, Department of
Curriculum and Instruction

Abstract

Guidelines for successful media specialists are available from a variety of reputable sources, but specific criteria and measurement tools for evaluation by school administrators either are not in place or are not implemented. The purpose of this videotape was to portray the variety of criteria which can be incorporated by administrators for the evaluation of school media specialists.

The program opened with the title *Evaluation of School Library Media Specialists*. The videotape presented criteria administrators can use in evaluating school media specialists. The criteria were presented in a direct, clear-cut approach using graphics and staged scenarios. Dr. Connie Erpelding, Ed.D., provided the introduction and explained the importance of a school media center and the media specialist responsible for its success. A narrator explained the various criteria as graphics appeared. The graphics were of the different roles of the media specialist and the nine standards presented in *Information Power*. The scenarios were staged in three different school media centers, and the characters acted out the various stages of the evaluation process as the voice-over explains the video. Characters included administrators, media specialists, teachers, and students. Rolling credits with music closed the production. As intended by the videotape, a school library media specialist is vital to student achievement, therefore the evaluation of the media specialist is crucial. Evaluation of the media specialist by the school administrator who is familiar with the national standards will help insure the professional growth of the library media specialist which will result in increased student learning.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	8
Research Questions.....	8
Purpose Statement.....	8
Definitions.....	8
Assumptions.....	9
Significance.....	9
2. Methodology.....	10
Related Literature.....	10
Procedures.....	14
3. Accompanying Videotape.....	17
4. Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations for Further Study.....	18
Reference List.....	21
Appendix	
A. Informed Consent.....	23

Chapter 1

Introduction

“What you have to do is cut those people who have the least impact on students; you cut positions like custodians, bus drivers, librarians.” Iowa school superintendent, Roger Godfrey. (Bolten, 2000, p.1).

Background

School librarians have often noted that the typical evaluation tools used by principals in supervisory procedures are the same as those used by principals in supervising classroom teachers. Principals will ask, “when are you teaching something,” come and observe one or two whole-class teaching sessions, and write the evaluation. Librarians ask, but what about the majority of my teaching in small groups and to individuals, not to mention my collaborative efforts, information tasks, and administrative tasks? These seem never to be evaluated. This research project is intended to suggest to school administrators a more appropriate way to evaluate their school library media specialists.

The Evaluation Process

Accountability has become a major focus of school districts’ state-mandated guidelines. Accountability extends beyond student performance into the professional realm of classroom teachers and administrators. The means for measuring classroom teachers’ accountability is found in comprehensive master contracts between school boards and education associations. The evaluation of a teacher’s classroom performance reflects the accountability of that individual to the teaching profession. The teacher’s contract evaluation procedure states when a teacher is to be evaluated, how the evaluation is to be conducted, and follow-up procedures. The evaluation section of the contract refers to the school

district's staff development model which, in turn, elaborates on the evaluation procedure (Forest City, 1991).

Teacher evaluations are usually conducted by the building principal according to school board-approved guidelines and procedures. The principals are held accountable by the district superintendent. The superintendent is ultimately held accountable by the Board and the state departments of education and the taxpayers; his/her ultimate expectations are defined by state codes and mandates. The legal responsibilities of school administrators vary state by state. "In most states, the superintendent of a local school district is considered an employee of the district, and state codes authorize the school board to employ a chief school administrator. However, most state school codes do not delineate the specific duties of the school superintendent. Specific duties are outlined by board policy and/or contract" (Norton, Webb, Dlugosh, & Sybouts, 1996, p.177). The superintendent's legal responsibilities to the school district include ensuring "that all employees are evaluated in accordance with the schedule established by the board and in statutory compliance with state laws" (Norton, Webb, Dlugosh, & Sybouts, 1996, p.178).

Staff development models created and accepted by school boards include one or more sections designed for teacher assessment procedures. Guidelines for the teacher and the principal are provided for pre-observation, for observing the lesson, and for post observance. The intent is for staff members to improve their teaching effectiveness in the classroom through observation and guidance from their administrator. Classroom teacher observation directions and forms are provided, but tools and guidelines for the school specialists (the media specialist, the guidance specialist, the students services people) are missing. Principals are often provided no tools for evaluation of these vital but overlooked areas of expertise (Forest City, 1991).

Effectiveness of Evaluation Procedures

It is required that school principals have been classroom teachers prior to the administrator training. In a survey conducted by Brickell and Paul (1988), however, teachers revealed that though principals conduct the supervision of instruction, they are often not perceived to be qualified supervisors, "Principals didn't know enough to teach the classes in their schools." (p.144) "You cannot supervise what you cannot do" (Brickell & Paul 1988, p. 144) "...we think that is reasonable. A school principal should know as much as the students in the school. Otherwise, how can he or she lead the teachers?" (p.145).

Principals tend to have had no prior experience as school media specialists, and yet they are expected to evaluate that professional position on their staff. "My principal doesn't have a clue as to what goes on in a school library." That comment surfaced more frequently than any other in the 1993 Wilson, Blake & Lyders' study of principals and library media specialists. Librarians are often evaluated in the same manner as classroom teachers. Evaluation forms and checklists for teacher observation/evaluation are provided in professional staff development models, but specific evaluation tools for librarians are often not included (Forest City, 1991). One of the major roles of the library media specialist is that of teacher, but there are also the roles of instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator to be considered (AASL and AECT, 1998).

Legislation.

Examining what the Code of Iowa addresses by using the search terms of: school administrators AND evaluation, librarians, librarians AND evaluation revealed very little with any clarity. Chapters dealing with libraries and evaluation in public school are as follows:

279.14 Evaluation criteria and procedures.

1. The board shall establish evaluation criteria and shall implement evaluation procedures.

If an exclusive bargaining representative has been certified, the board shall negotiate in good faith with respect to evaluation procedures pursuant to chapter 20.

2. The determination of standards of performance expected of school district personnel shall be reserved as an exclusive management right of the school board and shall not be subject to mandatory negotiations under chapter 20.

Practitioner performance improvement program.

1. The department of education shall establish and implement a voluntary practitioner performance improvement program that shall provide technical assistance to teachers and administrators from each public school district and area education agency. Individuals under contract with a school district may receive technical assistance in accordance with this subsection. The department shall consult with the Iowa State Education Association, the Iowa Association of School Boards, the School Administrators of Iowa, the Professional Educators of Iowa, and, as practicable, other entities providing similar programs, in developing the program. At a minimum, the program shall provide administrators with training, including but not limited to, seminars and written materials, relating to the areas of employment policies, and procedures, employment documentation, *performance evaluation*, corrective performance techniques correlative performance techniques, discipline, termination, and support by qualified individuals for implementation of the program.

256.51 Division of libraries and information services -- duties and responsibilities

1. The division of libraries and information services is established within the department of education. The division shall do all of the following:

a. Determine policy for providing information service to the three branches of state government and to the legal and medical communities in this state.

b. Coordinate a statewide inter-regional/inter library loan and information network

among libraries in this state and support activities which increase cooperation among all types of libraries.

The American Association of School Libraries (AASL) has published a list of competencies for prospective teachers and administrators. This list for beginning administrators includes competencies that directly rely on their understanding of information literacy skills (the ability to find and use information). The first competency states "The Administrator understands and supports information literacy as an integral part of curriculum" (1995). Among the skills and behaviors by which the administrator will demonstrate understanding and support is "hires professional and paraprofessional staff for the library media center" (1995, n.p.). When administrators expect teachers to incorporate information literacy skills in the curriculum, they need to understand the role of the school library media specialist and the importance of the school library media center in student achievement.

Suggestions for Improving Evaluation Procedures

The Wilson, Blake & Lyders (1993) survey resulted in a recommended three-step plan including a curriculum for future principals, a plan for practicing principals, and a plan for library media specialists. Heightening understanding of management and function of the school media center is important and may form the beginning of a set of evaluation criteria for the media program. If the partnership idea emphasized in Information Power is to be attained, universities that train principals must take a leadership position in providing future administrators with that knowledge. Meanwhile teacher-librarians must breach the communication barriers between teacher-librarians and administrators, and partially assume the training responsibilities (Wilson, Blake & Lyders, p.24).

The *Library Media Specialist Evaluation Form* prepared by the Kentucky Media Association is an actual instrument which can be used in evaluating school media

specialists. The form is organized into five standards. Each standard has a list of *demonstrators* (indicators) and a rating scale is provided. Standard One: Demonstrates proficiency in the management and administration of the library media center. Standard Two: Provides exemplary resources through collection development. Standard Three: Provides effective library media services. Standard Four: Enables students to become effective information users. Standard Five: Assumes responsibility for professional growth practices. Ratings for each standard are designated as O - outstanding, S - satisfactory, NI - needs improvement, and U - unsatisfactory (Kentucky School Media Association. [2000 February]. Library media specialist evaluation form [On-line]. available: <http://www.state.ky.us/oet/customer/lmsvillage/html/lms.eval.asp>).

The goal of the National Library Power Program, sponsored by the DeWitt Wallace - Reader's Digest Fund, was "to show how a library media program can contribute to learning when it's integrated fully into the curriculum (Hopkins & Zweizig, 1999 p. 26). According to Renee Olson (1999), "the official evaluating, while valuable, was surprisingly barren of statistics." What it did recognize was "the more fully adapted school library media programs - those that received more acceptance from teachers - had seven characteristics: shared vision, professional development programs, ample planning opportunities, leadership from school principal, support staff, complementary school reforms, and community and district advocates" (Hopkins and Zweizig, 1999 p. 26).

A successful school media center depends on the partnership of the classroom teacher, the library media specialist, and the principal. According to Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning (AASL and AECT, 1998), the library media specialist is poised to work collaboratively with teachers, administrators, and others to facilitate students' entry into the communication age as an essential partner who both contributes to and draws from the expertise of the entire learning community (p.3).

Information Power (1998) is built upon a set of nine information literacy standards designed to guide and support the library media specialist's roles as teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator. The mission and goals, information literacy standards, and indicators for success are presented in the publication. The publication has clearly stated goals the school library media specialist can adapt to meet the needs of her/her media program.

Information Power (1998), states "A well-run, student-centered school library media program that is carefully planned, appropriately staffed, and imaginatively and efficiently managed is essential for meeting contemporary learning needs. Such a program, with administrative support, makes a significant contribution to student learning. It also serves as the hub of a schoolwide culture of learning that is strong, stimulating and vital to student achievement. Creative and effective program administration supports authentic student learning and is indispensable to the development of lifelong learners" (p. 101). The principles and goals for the ideal media program follow this passage, yet there are no criteria (or "how-to") for measuring the degree of success of the school media center, nor is there any methodology for reaching this idyllic state. However, Information Power may be the logical source on which to base evaluation criteria.

Initial investigation has revealed guidelines and expectations of today's school library media specialists. These guidelines reflect the increasing importance of the library media specialist in a school district's curriculum and student achievement. Separating the roles of the media specialist from the media program itself, may be difficult if not impossible. Is it necessary to see the media specialist and the program as two separate entities? Is the success of the program the result of the efforts of the media specialist? Or, is the success of the media specialist the result of the structure and purpose of the media center? How might principals come to a better understanding of media specialists?

Recognizing that television is an effective teaching tool, a video could be utilized in administration-preparation courses that would provide administrators with guidelines in the evaluation of school library media specialists.

Problem Statement

Guidelines for successful media specialists are available from a variety of reputable sources, but specific criteria and measurement tools for evaluation by school administrators either are not in place or are not implemented.

Research Questions

Is it possible to produce a 6-10 minute videotape that clarifies the responsibilities of the school library media specialist to administrators so the administrator will have a clear understanding of the roles of the media specialist and can use these criteria in the evaluation procedure?

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this videotape will be to portray the variety of criteria which can be incorporated by administrators for the evaluation of school media specialists.

Definitions

evaluation - to determine the significance of worth of, usually by careful appraisal and study (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1997, p.395).

teacher-librarian - the duly qualified professional working full-time or part-time in the school resource center; library media specialist emphasizing cooperative planning with classroom teachers and team teaching (Emergency Librarian, p. 23, September/October 1993).

school library = media center = IMC - all terms used interchangeably.

media specialist roles - teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator (Information power: building partnerships for learning, 1998, p. 18).

Assumptions

School principals are involved in the evaluation process of all school professionals.

Evaluation of school library media specialists by school principals is incomplete because administrators are inadequately prepared to understand the role the school library media specialist plays in the school media program.

Limitations

The daily schedules of volunteer participants need to be coordinated and production time planned for after school hours.

Videotape production equipment will be provided by the featured school's television production studio.

Post-production time will be scheduled primarily during the weekends.

Significance

By presenting the evaluation procedure in a basic organized format with suggestions for evaluative criteria that can be modified to fit individual school districts design, the video will make evaluation of school media specialists more efficient for school principals. It is essential to have strong administrative understanding and support for an effective school library media center. The video will incorporate not only the professional criteria found in Information Power, AASL Competencies, and the Library Media Specialist Evaluation Form, but will also allow for input applicable to the unique aspects of the responsibilities of the individual school media specialist.

Chapter 2

Methodology

Related Literature

According to Keegan and Westerberg (1991), the transformation of this country to an Information Age has required schools to equip students to “deal effectively with the information flood that threatens to overwhelm them. Today’s students must develop the knowledge, skills, and habits that enable them to locate, evaluate, and use information to solve problems (p.9). Library information is more akin to that which our graduates will encounter in the real world. Libraries are storehouses for civilization, professionally organized with specialized tools for access (p.10). “The vision is to make the school library the focal point of the school for producing the informationally literate, lifelong learner. This vision requires resource-based instruction. We can make this happen by making a dedicated effort to make the use of library resources an integral part of school curriculums (p.12).

School administrators have no widely-recognized set standard of criteria on which to base evaluation of school media specialists. The concept of professional evaluation lends itself to endless controversy, commentary and research. The research can be organized into three categories: administrator training in the area of school library media specialists, legislation and state mandates on evaluation requirements, and the guidelines widely-accepted by professional library organizations.

Administrator training.

A 1991 survey of the heads of departments of education administration and professors of courses on principalship, supervision, or curriculum was designed to uncover the attitudes of professors of educational administration and the characteristics of those who have these attitudes (Veltze, 1991). Two respondents were selected from each of the 144

universities surveyed. Results were gathered which included the attitudes as a function of the respondents' age, gender, date of last school administrative experience, and agreement with recent library guidelines as described in Information Power, background in school library media programs, and actual course content (p.131). The results "appeared to indicate that the principals' instructional leadership was not maximized and that this was due to their lack of understanding of the issues involved in effective school library media programs, and to the lack of a knowledge base from which to make decisions about them" (130). The study "found that there was a significant independent relationship between attitudes of professors of educational administration about school library media program information in the principalship preparation program and the respondents' agreement with recent library guidelines. Further analyses revealed that there was a lack of understanding of Information Power's message as it related to principals" (132).

A random, national survey designed by Patricia J. Wilson and Martha Blake consisted of a 30-item questionnaire and two questions which explored the idea that principals lack knowledge and training concerning school library media centers. A total of 1000 school library media specialists and 1000 principals from a variety of elementary, middle school, and high school levels were selected. Responses were received from 57.2% (572) library media specialists, and 42.3% (423) principals. This included 363 matched pairs of principals and library media specialists from the same schools (Wilson and Blake, 1993, p.65).

Of the 572 library media specialists responding, 90% agreed that principals are not adequately trained regarding the management and function of school libraries; over 68% of the responding principals also agreed that they were not adequately trained in the management and function of school library media centers (Wilson and Blake, 1993, p.66). Regarding whether the management and function of the school library media center should

be a part of the principal's training, 90% of the responding school library media specialists agreed, and 78% of the principals did, too (Wilson and Blake, 1993, p.66). Although reference to Information Power, the role of the school library media center in the school programs, the role of school library media specialists, and technology was included in this study, there was no example of concrete measurements included (no list of standards, expectations, or rubrics).

The Wilson and MacNeil survey (1996) resulted in a model designed for principal-preparation programs. It presented the courses offered in the program with the components that relate to school libraries. The course offerings include introduction to educational Leadership, Principalship, Instructional Leadership, Special Programs, Curriculum, School Personnel, School Law, School Finance, School Evaluation, Supervision, and Internship. The components included defining the roles and expectations necessary to school media programs (principal and librarian) and the credentials thereof, expectations, law, logistics and operations of school media programs, evaluation, and budget (p.20).

MacNeil and Wilson (1999-2000) recognized that no research had been conducted concerning the preparation of principals during their university course work for supervising library media centers . Their research was collected via a one-page survey distributed to the Deans of the Departments of Education of 519 institutions accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The Deans in turn, were to give the survey to the program chair or to a professor in their principal-preparation program. A repeat request was sent to those universities not responding. Each survey answer was given a numerical value and entered on to a spreadsheet. Included was the opportunity to volunteer for a telephone interview consisting of seven prepared questions. Of the 37 volunteers, 14 interviews were conducted and responses recorded on special forms (MacNeil and Wilson, 1999, 23).

The purposes of their survey included: 1. To determine whether principal preparation programs include information about school libraries in their course work; 2. To determine how the principal-preparation programs that do include information about school libraries in their courses have integrated the information in their course work; 3. To identify what school library information they include (or recommend what should be included) in specific courses; 4. To identify model principal-preparation programs that have been successful in infusing school library components in their course work; 5. To identify suggestions for a model principal-preparation program that infuses school library information into their courses (MacNeil and Wilson, 1999, 22-23).

A total of 519 surveys were sent; 426 or 82% of the surveys were returned. Principal-preparation programs were in 58.7% (or 250) of the NCATE accredited Departments of Education (MacNeil and Wilson, 1999, p. 23). Response to the question, “Does your program have a course for principals on administration of leadership for the school library?” was 96.4% answering “no,” and 3.6% answering “yes” (MacNeil and Wilson, 1999, 23). The questions “Does your program integrate administration or leadership for the school library into the courses for principal-preparation?” A total of 77.6% answered “no”, and 18.8% responded that school library information was incorporated into the courses (MacNeil and Wilson, 1999, 23). The survey provided opportunity to indicate the options of instruction that were integrated as well as requesting suggestions for implementing library instruction in principal-preparation programs. The responses helped develop the model curriculum used at University of Houston-Clear Lake. The study concluded with seven recommendations for principal-preparation programs (MacNeil and Wilson, 1999, 23). The first six recommendations seem to be logical suggestions for curriculum development. It’s the seventh recommendation on the list, to “Work to add a school library requirement in principal-preparation programs to the National

Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards” which seems to demonstrate the potential for nationally recognized standards of media specialist evaluation (MacNeil and Wilson, 1999, 26).

Guidelines.

James H. Stronge, Virginia M. Helm, Pamela D. Tucker realized that valid, constructive, practical , and systematic evaluation policies and practices on a large-scale basis for professional support personnel are rare. Their national survey conducted in 1993, resulted in the PSP model (professional support personnel).

The model was designed for professional support personnel (pupil services, instructional support service, academic/curriculum development, and special education), state education agencies, and local administrator-evaluators. The model is designed around three features: individual/institutional balance (need for accountability), emphasis on communication (cooperative development of an evaluation plan, individual skill enhancement and improved performance, enhanced self-expectations, increased change in behaviors, achieve higher standards, and a checks and balance system), and multi-faceted method of data collection (survey data, performance artifacts, case notes, etc.). The PSP model follows a series of steps: 1. Identify system needs. 2. Identify duties. 3. Select performance indicators. 4. Set performance standards. 5. Document job performance. 6. Evaluate performance. 7. Improve and maintain professional service.

Although there is a semblance of structure presented in this plan’s steps, there is no measurement instrument. No value assignments are provided. However, this plan is flexible in its design to allow for differences in individual school library media programs.

Procedures

The purpose of this investigation was to produce a 6-10 minute videotape for school administrators to use as a guideline in the evaluation of school media specialists.

An exact-word script was written accordingly. The individual scenes and shots were given number references which were necessary for the post-production edit process. An edit decision list (edl) was derived from this script and was used as a tool in post-production editing.

Participants in the video were contacted and the Human Subjects Review form was completed. All participants involved were chosen on a volunteer basis, and were fully informed of the purpose and expectations of the project.

Pre-production meetings were held according for the different segments of the videotape as presented in the script. The pre-production meeting for the segment featuring the introduction segment administrator (Dr. Connie Erpelding) included dialogue focusing on the administrator's knowledge of evaluation procedures and how those procedures are adapted to the school library media specialist, his/her philosophy of the importance of the media center in the school experience, and then lead-in to the subsequent videotape. This pre-production meeting was conducted via email. The pre-production meeting with the teacher included explanation of the purpose of this videotape, and the types of interactive shots possible. The pre-production meeting with the students included explaining the purpose of the tape, the possible camera shots, and on-camera behavior.

A shot list was designed based on the edl. Revision of the script and edl was not necessary at this point. The shot list was organized according to shot location, not according to chronological appearance in the final tape. Shot locations included the school's television studio (or alternative locale for background), classrooms (media specialist/teacher, media specialist/student interactions), the school media center action shots (students working, teacher/student, teacher/media specialist, media specialist/student). Each listed shot was numbered in coordination with the edit decision list

The individual camera shots were explained prior to the actual videotaping of that

shot. The shot list was used as a guideline to ensure all necessary shots were videotaped. Segments were videotaped. Each shot was preceded by an off-camera voice-over explaining the intended use on the final tape and take number. Footage was reviewed after shooting so any necessary retakes were accomplished with little further delay. The final program was edited according to the edit decision list. An edit worksheet was used throughout the edit process in case revision was required. All rough footage was kept.

A working copy was shown to a non-involved administrator and a retired media specialist for review and suggestions for improvements. They were asked to consider content, organization, pacing, and overall effectiveness.

Following the test-audience review, suggestions were taken into consideration, and a few revisions were made. After all the reviews and revisions were completed in editing, titles, credits, and music were added. The tape was then ready for release.

Video production began after the school year was completed, and the students and teachers had finished up their year-end commitments. The program script was completed by this time as well as the Human Subjects Review form. The pre-production meeting with the on-camera administrator and the actual videotaping of this segment was completed in less than a week. The only minor obstacle in working with administrators was finding an open time in their schedule. Pre-production meetings with teachers were accomplished informally during their prep periods. Pre-production meetings with students took place through phone conversations and prior to the actual taping. Videotaping of the media specialist and students in the media center did not take more than one or two sessions. The pre-production and videotaping of the shots involving the media specialist collaborating with the teacher and with the students in both the classroom and the media center was completed within two weeks. Editing the final copy took approximately fifty hours to complete. Total production time took approximately three weeks.

Chapter 3

Acompanying videotape, "Evaluating Library Media Specialists."

Chapter 4

Summary, Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

Guidelines for successful media specialists are available from a variety of reputable sources, but specific criteria and measurement tools for evaluation by school administrators either are not in place or are not implemented. The purpose of this videotape was to portray the variety of criteria which can be incorporated by administrators for the evaluation of school media specialists.

Summary

Following approval of the script, *Evaluating School Media Specialists* was ready to begin field production. The element of time seemed to be the most difficult component to the production process. Arranging a taping schedule is rarely convenient for the people involved, and this project was no exception. Year-end duties at school made it impossible for any taping sessions to be scheduled until teacher and staff year-end exits were completed. This caused difficulty because the people who left school for the summer would have been excellent participants in the videotape.

A variety of scenes involving media specialists demonstrating the nine standards in Information Power were videotaped at various school media centers. The project began to take preliminary shape as a montage. Dr. Connie Erpelding from UNI's Department of Curriculum and Instruction and a former elementary school principal graciously agreed to present the introduction to the videotape.

Martha Chancellor, the media specialist at St. Ansgar, and Donna Ellingson, the media specialist from Lake Mills willingly volunteered to participate in the video. They each arranged for a few students at each of their respective sites to participate. Ellingson was able to arrange for adult participants as well. Students from the home production site of Forest City were also scheduled for taping.

The videotaping on location went very well. The students, as well as the adults, were very

cooperative and seemed to enjoy the experience. While on location, another slight problem presented itself. Because school was not in session during the taping of these segments, the three media centers involved were not active with patrons. Quite to the contrary, all three were used to a limited extent as storage for audio visual equipment. Extra computers, VCRs, and projectors were often in the way and needed to be moved to record the scene. An advantage was that adequate time had been scheduled at each site to accommodate any unforeseen complications.

Once the field recording was complete, post production began with editing in the control room. Graphics were created and recorded out on a separate tape. Bob Miller, the Forest City High School Principal provided the voice-over narration. This recording was laid on the final tape following the introduction by Dr. Erpelding.

The next step was to “match” the video with the audio. Students were called in a second time to create scenes for the section of videotape that focuses on the nine standards. The three scenes of the principal involved in the evaluation process with the classroom teacher were the last shots taken and were done so on the final morning of editing. Music was selected from a “legal” music library and thought to be appropriate in melody and tempo for the production.

Searching the field recording tapes to find shots that reasonably represented the audio was the most time consuming part of the process. As always, time was distorted when editing the videotape. Although the final tape is approximately nine minutes in length, there are over 75 hours of taping and editing involved.

The program opened with the title *Evaluation of School Library Media Specialists*. The videotape presented criteria administrators can use in evaluating school media specialists. The criteria were presented in a direct, clear-cut approach using graphics and staged scenarios. Dr. Connie Erpelding, Ed.D., provided the introduction and explained the importance of a school media center and the media specialist responsible for its success. A narrator explained the various criteria as graphics appeared. The graphics were of the different roles of the media specialist and the nine

standards presented in *Information Power*. The scenarios were staged in three different school media centers, and the characters acted out the various stages of the evaluation process as the voice-over explains the video. Characters included administrators, media specialists, teachers, and students. Rolling credits with music closed the production.

It is hoped this video can be used by school administrators to effectively evaluate their schools' Library Media Specialist. The video is purposely designed to be straight-forward and uncomplicated, so it will be more user-friendly for the administrator's purpose. The special effects are unobtrusive and clean so as not to detract from the content of the script. Administrators may have some idea as to the existence and purpose of Information Power, but may it not be readily accessible to them. A school administrator may not have the time to review the contents of an entire book, but may have 10 minutes to view a videotape as a precursor to an evaluation.

As intended by the videotape, a school library media specialist is vital to student achievement, therefore the evaluation of the media specialist is crucial. Evaluation of the media specialist by the school administrator who is familiar with the national standards will help insure the professional growth of the library media specialist which will result in increased student learning.

Recommendations for Further Study

School administrator are the specific audience for which *Evaluating School Media Specialists* was produced. Understanding administrators are but one of the many human components in a successful media program. School board members, new teachers, veteran teachers, parents, and patrons of the school district are other influential participants in student achievement. Videotapes should be produced with each of the aforementioned as an intended audience. Once the entire scope of those who play crucial roles in a student's world is addressed true advocacy of a media program will be achieved.

Reference List

American Association of School Librarians, & Association for Educational Communications and Technology (1998). Information power: building partnerships for learning. Chicago: American Library Association.

Code of Iowa

Bolten, K. (2000, May 13). Schools cut student use of libraries, some librarian positions axed. The Des Moines Register, p. B1.

Brickell H. M. & Paul, H. P. (1988). Time for curriculum: How school board members should think about curriculum, what school board members should do about curriculum. Alexandria: National School Boards Association.

Forest City Program and Staff Development Model, 1991.

Hopkins, D., & Zweizig, D. (1999, May). Power to the media center and the people, too. School Library Journal 45: 5, 24-27.

Keegan, B. & Westerberg, T. (May 1991). Restructuring and the school library: partners in an information age. NASSP Bulletin, 75, 9 - 14.

Kentucky School Media Association. (2000, February). Library media specialist evaluation form [on-line]. Available:

<http://www.state.ky.us/oet/customer/lmsvillage/html/lms.eval.asp>

MacNeil, A.J. & Wilson, P. P. (1999-2000). Preparing principals for the leadership role in library media centers. National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal 12: 2, 21-27.

Norton, M.S., Webb, L.D., Dlugosh, L.L. & Sybouts, W. (1996). School Superintendency; New Responsibilities, New Leadership. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Olson, R. (1999, May). The data desert. School Library Journal 45:5 5-7.

Veltze, L. (1992). School library media program information in the principalship preparation program. School Library Media Annual, 10: 1992, 129-134.

Wilson, P., & Blake, M. (1993, Spring/Summer) The missing piece: A school library media center component in principal-preparation programs. Record, 13: 2, 65-68.

Wilson, P., Blake, M., & Lyders, J. (1993, September-October). Principals and teacher-librarians: A study and a plan for partnership. Emergency Librarian, 21:1, 18-24.

Wilson, P.P. & MacNeil, A.J. (1999-2000) What do principals really learn about school library media centers in university principal preparation programs? A national study and plan for reform. National Forum of Teacher Education Journal 9:2 18-23.

Appendix A

University of Northern Iowa -- Adult Participation Informed Consent

Project Title: Evaluating School Library Media Specialists

Investigator: Pamela J. Wible

You are invited to participate in a research project conducted through the University of Northern Iowa. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project. The following information is provided to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate.

The purpose of this project is to produce a short videotape to be used by school administrators to evaluate school library media specialists. It is intended through more effective evaluation, media specialists will improve in the roles of service to students and teachers.

The project videotape "Evaluating School Media Specialists" involves no, or at most, minimal risk to the subjects involved in the production. Middle school and high school students, and teachers will be demonstrating the various procedures used in a school media center setting. These procedures involve students selecting books from shelves, teachers interacting with students and their reading selections, students using computers, students writing information selected from sources, and media specialists instructing students individually and in groups. Students will be standing and sitting. Nothing of sensitive nature will be expected of participating students and teachers.

Participants in this project will receive no monetary compensation. The appreciation of your participation by the Investigator will be sincere.

Information obtained during this project which could identify you will be kept strictly confidential. The final project may be viewed by school administrators as a tool for their evaluation processes.

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary. I have been advised that I am free to withdraw from my participation at any time or to choose not to participate at all, and that by doing so I will not be penalized or lose benefits.

I understand that Pamela Wible will answer any questions I have about my participation. I also understand that if I desire information in the future regarding my participation or the study generally, I can contact Pamela Wible at (641) 585-2583. I can also contact the office of the Human Participants Coordinator, University of Northern Iowa, at (319) 273-2748, for answers to questions about rights of research participants and the participant review process.

I fully understand the nature and extent of my participation in this project as stated above and the possible risks arising from it. I hereby agree to participate in this project. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent statement. I am 18 years of age or older.

Signature of participant *date*

printed name of participant

Signature of investigator *date*

Signature of advisor *date*

University of Northern Iowa -- Subject's Parents Informed Consent

Dear Parent or Guardian,

Your child has been invited to participate in a research project conducted through the University of Northern Iowa. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to allow you child to participate in this project. The following information is provided to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate.

The purpose of this project is to produce a short videotape to be used by school administrators to evaluate school library media specialists. It is intended through more effective evaluation, media specialists will improve in the roles of service to students and teachers.

The project videotape "Evaluating School Media Specialists" involves no, or at most, minimal risk to the subjects involved in the production. Your student along with other students and teachers will be demonstrating the various procedures used in a school media center setting. These procedures involve students selecting books from shelves, teachers interacting with students and their reading selections, students using computers, students writing information selected from sources, and media specialists instructing students individually and in groups. Students will be standing and sitting. Nothing of sensitive nature will be expected of participating students and teachers.

The videotaping process should take no longer than one or two hours.

Your student's participation and cooperation is appreciated. Any behavior not within the expectations of this project will end your student's participation without his/her consent.

Participants in this project will receive no monetary compensation. The appreciation of your participation by the Investigator will be sincere.

Information obtained during this project which could identify your child will be kept strictly confidential. The final project may be viewed by school administrators as a tool for their evaluation processes.

I understand that my child's participation is completely voluntary. He/She is free to withdraw from participation at any time or to choose not to participate at all and that by doing so he/she will not be penalized.

I understand that Pamela Wible will answer any questions I have about my child's participation. I also understand that if I desire information in the future regarding my child's participation or the study generally, I can contact Pamela Wible at (641) 585-2583. I can also contact the office of the Human Participants Coordinator, University of Northern Iowa, at (319) 273-2748, for answers to questions about rights of research participants and the participant review process.

I fully understand the nature and extent of my child's participation in this project as stated above and the possible risks arising from it. I hereby agree to allow my child to participate in this project.

Signature of parent/guardian *date*

Printed name of parent/guardian

Printed name of child participant

University of Northern Iowa -- Minor Participant Informed Consent

Project Title: Evaluating School Library Media Specialists

Investigator: Pamela J. Wible

I, _____, understand that one of my parents/guardians has given his/her permission for me to participate in a project about school library media centers.

I understand that my participation is voluntary. I have been told that I can stop participating in this project at any time. If I choose to stop or decide that I don't want to participate in this project at all, nothing bad will happen to me. My grade/treatment will not be affected in any way.

Name date