University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

School-Public Library Cooperation

Suzanne R. Larson

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

School-Public Library Cooperation

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.

School-Public Library Cooperation

A Research Paper

Presented to the

Faculty of the Library Science Department

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

_____

Suzanne R. Larson

July 1, 1988

_____

Read and approved by

Elizabeth Martin

_____

Leah Hiland

_____

Accepted by Department

Elizabeth Martin

_____

Date _July 13, 1988_

Abstract

The researcher undertook this study to discover the current status
of activities, the role of communication, and the benefits that were
associated with cooperation between school and public libraries. The
sample for this study was those elementary library media specialists and
children's librarians employed in the institutions in the 80 cities
served by the Northeast Iowa Regional Library System in Waterloo. A
questionnaire with a cover letter was sent directly to each of the
prospective respondents. The yes-no items in the questionnaire dealt
with the respondents' opinions concerning their participation in
cooperative activities, and the level of communication, as well as
opinions about the benefits associated with school-public library
cooperation when applied to their community. The results indicated that
only a few librarians had taken the initial steps in cooperation, and
were moving toward more effective library service.

DEDICATION

This paper is dedicated to the memory
of my father, Raymond R. Larson.
Finishing this degree was so important
to him.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the love and support of my family and friends, especially Mom and Papa, during the past year . . . they kept me going while I was working on fulfilling this goal.

Table of Contents

Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

A variety of factors contributed to the current interest in school-public library cooperation. Increased demands for materials and services generated from the information explosion as well as from the use of more discovery-oriented, individualized teaching methods in the school placed an intolerable burden on individual school and public libraries. At the same time added fiscal constraints have been imposed on libraries faced with mounting costs of resources and services and with increased pressures to make better use of tax monies.

Other trends such as community education also had an impact on school-public library cooperation. As schools opened their doors to all community members who desired a variety of educational, recreational, social, and cultural experiences, school library media programs are often being asked to serve as community libraries during and after school hours.

Legislation, especially at the federal level through the Library Services and Construction Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the National Defense Education Act, has also had a decided effect on cooperative programs in school and public libraries. Technological developments further stimulated school-public library cooperation. The introduction of computer and communications technology into the field provided a means of rapid access to information that was not possible in the past (Aaron, 1981).

Although school and public libraries have distinct and primary responsibilities for providing service appropriate to particular

clienteles, they share the common goal of providing individuals and groups with access to that part of the total information resource which satisfy their educational, working, cultural, and leisure-time needs and interests.

Because of their common goal, school and public libraries stand to gain from a relationship that is conducive to cooperation. Essential to such a relationship is an awareness, understanding, and knowledge of one another's functions, objectives, and service programs. Continuous joint planning and evaluation of library services is also essential (Public Library, 1976).

This study caused both public librarians and school library media specialists to reexamine their professional understandings of each other's functions, and the resulting cooperation which could lead to greater benefits for the child, the teacher, and the community.

The Problem

The researcher undertook this study to discover the current status of activities, the role of communication, and the benefits that are associated with cooperation between school and public libraries.

Questions that were considered in this study included the following:

1. What is the current participation rate of school-public library cooperative activities?

The majority of librarians believe that (a) most cooperative activities consist of school classes visiting the public library on a yearly basis, and (b) most school and public librarians have not

participated in any extensive planning of programs or services on a regular basis.

2. What level of communication exists in school-public library cooperation?

The majority of librarians believe that the (a) quality, (b) regularity, and (c) opportunity for communication is a major determining factor in the activities that could normally be achieved by school and public libraries. In most instances (d) an informal, occasional level of communication exists between the two libraries, though (e) the established level of communication has to be fairly high in order to pursue substantial cooperative activities.

3. What do professionals think are the benefits of school-public library cooperation?

The majority of librarians believe that:

a. The potential benefits of cooperation to children and the libraries that served them are great.

b. Sharing ideas and materials serve young people in a wider variety of ways than could be accomplished by an individual institution.

c. Sharing publicity for activities carries information to a wider audience, and reinforces and supports those activities.

d. Sharing the planning for activities saves time and effort, and encourages new approaches and ideas.

e. Sharing expensive resources saves money.

f. Creating a positive image of librarians working together increases community awareness of libraries and their services.

g. Improving awareness can translate into greater support at budget time.

The researcher assumed that cooperation is indeed beneficial to both school and public libraries, and that it should be inherent to both of their respective programs. Another assumption was that communication between the two librarians and their respective institutions is limited and, in some situations, non-existent.

A limitation in this study is that the respondents are elementary school library media specialists and children's librarians currently employed in institutions in the cities served by the Northeast Iowa Regional Library System in Waterloo. Another limitation is a lack of professional librarians who are currently employed in the public libraries and the elementary schools among the respondents. It must also be noted that the researcher did not include the area of combined school-public libraries in this study.

For the purposes of this study, library cooperation refers to "planned activities and efforts mutually carried out by one or more libraries in a community or area" (Public Library, 1976, p. 2). A public library is a library "designed to serve the reading and information needs of people of all ages in its service area including the handicapped. Its collections and services provided access to the working, educational, recreational, and leisure time information needs of the entire community" (Buckingham & Porter, 1981, p. 2). A school library media center

> . . . supports the curriculum and meets educational needs by
> providing a rich variety of materials, equipment, and services
> for both students and teachers. It is where students can
> learn library or media center skills, and also read, view,
> and listen for knowledge and enjoyment, choosing from a
> variety of media (Buckingham & Porter, 1981, p. 1).

Chapter 2

Literature Review

School-public library cooperation has engendered much discussion in the library field since the late 1800's. One has only to look at Resources in Education, Current Index to Journals in Education, and Library Literature to see that hundreds of articles have been written on this topic and that librarians have generally hailed the idea of school-public library cooperation as a major vehicle for providing more effective library services for their users.

In the late 1800's people began questioning whether the material resources available in the school could furnish students with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they needed to become educated individuals. Francis Adams, Jr., a trustee of the Quincy, Massachusetts, Public Libraries, in a paper that was read before a National Educational Association meeting in 1880, spoke of the importance of the public library to the education of students in Quincy schools. He said,

> We try now to treat the child throughout as a moral, reasoning being, and not as an automaton, and so we begin with Froebel's method and end with the public library. They are both in our Quincy common schools now, only the library is by far the more important factor of the two (Aaron, 1980, p. 7).

Adam's efforts had a major influence on shaping the educational role of the public library in the schools.

Another event which had a great impact on future directions for librarians was the publication of Public Libraries in the United States of America (Aaron, 1980, p. 7). This report was an effort to determine the status of public libraries, to indicate basic questions and

practices, and to help librarians and others to see their educational role in the proper perspective. The most important message from this report for librarians was that public libraries were auxiliaries to education.

As this view became more widely accepted, educators and librarians jointly explored how the public library could serve the schools in better ways. In 1897 John Cotton Dana, president of the American Library Association, urged the National Education Association to appoint a committee to study the interrelationship of the two organizations. The report issued by this committee was one of the major documents in the area (Aaron, 1980, p. 7). It examined every aspect of cooperation between the school and the public library, and it gave practical advice to the teacher and the librarian about how to achieve the best cooperative learning environment for students.

During the late 1800's and the early 1900's school libraries were almost nonexistent and public libraries offered their services to the schools on a continuing basis. However, as educators became aware of the dependence of the school on adequate materials to carry on its educational program, schools assumed the responsibility for their own library services. By the 1920's many high school libraries had been established in urban areas of the country, but rural sections still had few of these programs. School libraries continued to grow in the 1930's and 1940's, though their progress was slowed considerably by the depression and the war. Throughout this period public libraries generally continued to serve schools with bookmobiles and other means of services, and even established public library branches in schools in

many instances. This was especially true in elementary schools where public libraries supplied a major part of the library materials long after high schools had set up their own libraries. Although libraries existed in many schools, their collections were inferior and very little reciprocity existed in the school-public library relationship at that time (Aaron, 1980).

The history of school library media standards is described in the revised standards (AASL & AECT, 1987). In 1945, the second set of national school library standards, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, was published by the American Library Association. Cooperation between school and public libraries was strongly supported to meet the students' educational and cultural needs. The standards identified school librarians with teachers and described their role in supporting the educational program. It also differentiated very clearly between the school librarian's unique functions in serving students and teachers, and the functions shared with the public librarians working with children and young people. Standards for School Library Programs was published in 1960 by the American Association of School Librarians (AASL). It stressed cooperation with other types of libraries and advocated introducing children to community libraries as early as possible, but its major emphasis was on the school librarian's role in serving teachers and students. A major concern was the need for school librarians in the community to develop an excellent overall library program (AASL & AECT, 1987).

In 1969, <u>Standards for School Media Programs</u> was developed by AASL and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association in cooperation with several other national associations. It placed a greater emphasis on serving students' curricular needs, while attention to personal, cultural, and other needs assumed a lower priority. Media specialists were expected to concentrate heavily on helping children to develop competence in listening, viewing, and reading skills. One result of these changes was a deemphasis on cooperating with other types of libraries and an increase in attempts to establish links with educational and other community agencies. The revised standards for school library media centers stated that <u>Media Programs: District and School</u> was developed jointly by the AASL and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) in 1975. The 1975 standards described programs designed to respond to both district and school objectives and reflected the vital inter-relationships between those operations. The influence of systems thinking was obvious in these standards. Networks and networking were briefly dealt with in the 1975 standards, but the primary focus was on cooperation with related community agencies (AASL & AECT, 1987, p. 4).

Work is currently being completed on revised standards for school library media centers. One of the challenges in the proposed standards deals with the school library media center creating partnerships that enhance access to resources located outside of the school. It is apparent that school-public library cooperative programs could further the principle of equal access to materials and could assure the variety

of resources needed to meet the individual learning needs of students (AASL & AECT, 1987).

School library media specialists and public librarians work in a very similar business: the provision of information and learning experiences for their patrons (Fleming, 1978, p. 25). The past two decades have ushered our society out of an industrial age and into one of information and high technology. Information is what libraries are all about today. They select, acquire, manage, and somehow make sense of the deluge of information generated in our society. In addition, elaborate automation networks and sophisticated bibliographic retrieval systems are available to help provide the answers more quickly than ever before. Libraries and librarians of all types are critical to the provision of resources in an age of information (Billman & Owens, 1985, p. 183).

Unfortunately, the potential for providing information to meet the ever changing and often demanding user has not been undergirded with appropriate financial, and/or sometimes philosophical support necessary to carry out the task. The past two decades that brought us to the age of information have been accompanied by inflation, resulting in reduced buying power, frozen local budgets, and decreased or discontinued funding for library services. Some school library media specialists and public librarians have thrown up their hands in despair as the gap between the potential for library service and its reality seems to widen today. Fewer and fewer libraries can realize the goal of meeting patron needs with only their own resources.

The majority of professional librarians are aware of the potential of library services and equally aware of the reality. They are searching for ways to provide better library services, taking steps, no matter how small, toward that goal. Times of austerity have encouraged an openness to attractive options and alternatives for service as it becomes increasingly evident that almost all libraries have abandoned their "stand alone status" in favor of working together to satisfy the information needs of the patrons they serve. In addition to "networks" and "automation," "cooperation" has became a buzz word of the 1980's (Billman & Owens, 1985, p. 184).

Differences in buildings and management affects the possibilities for cooperation between school library media specialists and public librarians. The school library media center is often placed at the center of the building. When the library media center is placed near the classrooms, it is easily accessible to all students in the school during the day when they leave their classrooms to visit the center. Since a library media center serves the students attending that school, its size and furnishings are provided for an identified age and ability level. The public library may also be located "centrally" on the main street of the local community, but it is not always conveniently located or easily accessible to its adult users. It may be some distance from any school or, in other cities, public libraries or their branches may be located very near school buildings. Because the public library serves all ages in the community, rather than a specialized clientele, decor and furnishings are designed for many users, not just for children and young people. When public library buildings are large enough to

separate collections and users, the children's room is an area as far away as possible from the other areas of public use (Woolls, 1985).

Management responsibilities in these two types of libraries have been defined as governance, budget, personnel, and public relations. The governance structure is very different between these two types of libraries. Public librarians usually answer directly to a Board of Trustees who have been appointed by the Mayor, the City Council, or the County Commissioner. This means that they have a direct line to their governing board. This is not true of the school library media specialist. This person addresses all requests to the building principal (and/or to the district school library supervisor, if such a position exists) who may in turn present them to the superintendent who may then seek school board approval if the request has an effect on the entire school district. Since the school board is made up of elected officials, these persons answer more directly to community pressures. This political situation adds to a sense of helplessness on the part of the school library media specialist who has little control over policy decisions which affected the library media center.

In some cases the school library media specialist appears to be more autonomous as the manager of the school library media center. A certain air of academic freedom pervades the decision-making process within that area of the school. On the other hand, the principal may demand hall passes for children to leave the classroom, making it difficult for students to move freely to the library media center, or the central administration personnel may insist upon a fine system for overdue books. Because most libraries have only one professional per

building, school library media specialists feel isolated from other professionals and have no one with whom to discuss matters or to assist in choosing alternatives for solving problems (Woolls, 1985).

One problem common to both librarians is budget. Budgets for schools come from the state allocation for public education and from local tax effort. School boards are usually able to levy taxes while public library boards seek funding from city councils or county commissioners or attempt to pass referendums. While school library media specialists lament being in competition with other departments in the school, the public librarian stands in line with the police department, the fire department, and the garbage collectors. It must be noted at this point that public librarians finance salaries and building maintenance from their budget while school library media specialists purchase materials and supplies from their funding (Woolls, 1985).

Personnel differences exist between these two institutions. The first is related to the educational background of these librarians. While not all states require a master's degree in library science from an American Library Association accredited program to be a school library media specialist, most require an applicant to have a bachelor's degree with a library science minor. Public librarians who manage large public library systems may be required to have a master's degree in library science. However, a university degree may not be required of the person who works with children, and in small public libraries, the library director may be certified by the state library or some means other than achieving a master's degree in librarianship or even any education beyond high school.

A final difference is the salary of these persons. School library media specialists are a part of the teacher bargaining unit and receive the same salary as other teachers. School personnel are required to be at school during the hours school is in session and on days when pupils are in attendance. This means longer holiday vacations for school library media specialists as the school year is nine months long in most regions. Teachers' salaries are often higher than salaries of public librarians who may receive a specified vacation of two to three weeks, a limited number of holidays each year, and who often work evenings and weekends.

The public librarian initiates more public relations activities which encourage use of the library than is necessary for the school library media specialist. The public librarian advertises in the local newspaper that encourages attendance at book fairs, special programming for children and youth, book talks, and other events. For emphasizing special events, the school library media specialist sends a message over the school's loud speaker system or places an announcement in each teacher's school mail box.

The school library media center serves the students in a single attendance center and therefore serves a captive audience. Children may be taken to the library media center by their teachers whether or not they wish to go there. In contrast, the public library reaches out to attract its clientele, and that clientele includes everyone in the area served by the public library. While the public library serves some of the same children as the school, it may not serve all children in the school. One reason is that not all children attending any school may

choose to visit the public library or are allowed to go because the
library may be too distant for them to go alone. The differences in
governmental boundaries may restrict use of the public library to
children within the city limits while the school serves both city
children and rural children who are bused to the school. If several
schools exist in a community, the public library may be serving children
from all schools rather than teachers and students with a single
curriculum (Woolls, 1985).

Both libraries offer book and media collections to their clientele.
However, the collection at the public library is both for recreational
use and for research with the emphasis perhaps more on the recreational
aspect. The collection at the school is designed to meet curriculum
needs with less recreational reading provided. Because of its
curriculum emphasis the school library may have a more specialized
subject-oriented collection.

The public library media collection is seldom as extensive as that
of the school, and the public library collection may contain fewer
subject-oriented educational materials. The variety of formats
is also different. Public librarians concentrate on recordings and
video-tapes while school library media specialists may purchase
recordings, video-tapes, transparencies, kits, and filmstrips. The
advent of the microcomputer and its subsequent adoption by the education
community has seen much more microcomputer software available in the
schools than is found in the public library (Woolls, 1985).

The library media center is open during hours the school is in
session, while the public library is open after school, on weekends, and

during the summer months. This means the public library collection may
seem more accessible to some students because they have little
time during the school day to visit the library media center. A second
major difference in the use of the school library media center is that
most schools have a bell system which rings at the end of a specified
period of time. Students using the library media center leave when the
bell rings, whether or not they have completed their research. Students
who go to the public library may have longer periods of time when they
can work on research. The age orientation of the school collection
limit the span of materials which may be available to the student in the
school, while access to the adult collection for students wishing to
expand their research is available to them at the public library. On
the other hand, materials available in a children's collection may help
introduce a high school student to a more difficult topic. These would
not be available in the typical high school collection (Woolls, 1985).

From the beginning school-public library cooperation has fostered
an atmosphere of mutual trust, a willingness to share, respect for the
expertise and the qualifications of peer library professionals, and most
importantly, an understanding between the librarians that they serve
virtually the same patron from differing perspectives (Roeder, 1983).
An attempt was made to define various levels of school-public library
cooperation by activities or characteristics that typified each level,
and presented cooperation as an ongoing process. In addition to merely
presenting a hierarchy of cooperation, the information may have provided
a starting point for school and public libraries in towns or regions to
evaluate their present level of cooperation and what kinds of activities

would be logical to attempt at that level. It was also a goal that this information be used as a basis for short- and long-term planning for expanding the current scope of cooperative ventures. The range of cooperative activities are divided into six levels, each of which required a greater commitment of time and staff than the previous level (Billman & Owens, 1985).

At Level I, "No Involvement or Cooperation," libraries exist as separate and independent institutions, either by choice or by lack of any precedent for cooperation. Many times, the two staffs have never met together. No history of cooperation, no formal contacts between the two institutions, and a competitive or antagonistic behavior on the part of the professionals or boards are characteristic of this level (Billman & Owens, 1985).

At "Informal Cooperation," Level II, the libraries are still quite independent entities but experience sporadic communication. Some libraries may communicate more than others, but all still rely primarily on their own resources to satisfy user needs. Characteristic of this level are assignment alerts given to the public librarian by the school library media specialist and occasional phone calls for reference by either school library media specialists or public librarians (Billman & Owens, 1985).

At Level III, "Formal Communication," communication becomes more purposeful and ongoing in nature, focusing on a specific event or issue. The two staffs meet together on an irregular basis. Planning scheduled class visits to the public library, public librarians visiting the school library media center or classrooms, and mutual planning and

promotion of summer programs for children are characteristic of this level (Billman & Owens, 1985).

At "Formal Cooperation," Level IV, 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 information resources. Library staffs and administrators have an understanding of the services and mission of the other libraries that are involved in the cooperative group. Characteristic of this level are the joint celebration of library events such as National Library Week, preparation of union lists of periodicals or other materials, and the exchange of bibliographies (Billman & Owens, 1985).

At Level V, "Resource Sharing," cooperation becomes more planned, systematic, and on-going as the commitment to the whole of library service grows in the community. The involvement of school administrators, town fiscal agents, and trustees increases as many resource-sharing activities involve policies or finances. Short- and long-term goals and plans may be developed at this level. The loan of school materials to the public library during the summer, compatibility of hardware throughout the town or region, and shared display of special materials or projects are characteristic of this level (Billman & Owens, 1985).

At "Formal Planning," Level VI, cooperation exists on a frequent and regular basis and involves more people. Short- and long-term goals and objectives for library service are developed and approved by the appropriate governing boards. Characteristic of this level is cooperative collection development, joint cataloging/technical

processing, and shared goal setting for library service within the town (Billman & Owens, 1985).

Increased cooperation between schools and the public library is often a major goal of librarians who serve young people. It means more efficient service and fewer frustrations for both public librarians and school library medial specialists. Cooperation converts observed needs into fulfilled needs and shared ideas into action (Morning & Watkins, 1985). Just what kinds of activities could cooperation foster between school and public libraries? The listing of activities below are examples that could be used to foster the beginnings of school-public library cooperation in a community.

1. Establish a "blue alert" line between libraries for unannounced research projects.

2. Share research standards required by the school's information retrieval skills curriculum.

3. Provide reciprocal access to resources so that the public library patron needing adult literacy materials (or merely materials with a simpler reading level) may benefit from a school's collection.

4. Standardize kinds of audiovisual equipment so that bulk purchases may provide lower unit costs of benefit to both libraries.

5. Host a school workshop on the use of various kinds of AV equipment, slide/tape production, video usage, etc.--skills very familiar to school media personnel.

6. Cooperatively plan continuing education experiences.

7. Coordinate public relations ventures such as shared presentations before civic groups.

8. Use a school facility for a public library sponsored community meeting.

9. Lend school endorsement for a public library's request for resource sharing or local support funds.

10.   Establish a staff internship or exchange program to "walk in someone else's moccasins" (Roeder, 1983).

School-public library cooperation is systematic planning, careful implementation, continual evaluation, and constant communication. It is a commitment of time and professional skills to improving library service for the patrons. It does not just happen; it takes an effort from those involved to make it happen (Krubsack & Whiting, 1985).

Research related to school-public library cooperation has been conducted on a very limited and sporadic basis. It must be noted that the field of librarianship has no design data, no standards, no models, and no operational personnel competence in this area. Instead, librarians have generally proceeded from the conceptual stage directly to the operational stage without allocating the time or money necessary to obtain systematically gathered, evaluative information. This non-research based approach has resulted in little real evidence to support the contention that resource sharing results in certain benefits even though librarians have almost universally accepted school-public library cooperation as the only realistic way of meeting future demands (Aaron, 1981).

The research evidence which does exist about school-public library cooperation has been generated largely by local, state, or federal agencies, and by individuals attempting to complete degree requirements. Researchers directing the studies have investigated at least some of the following areas: the status of presently existing cooperative programs; information about past attempts; opinions relating to various facets of the program; advantages and disadvantages; reasons for success or

failure; and techniques for planning, implementing, and evaluating the program (Aaron, 1981).

In the 1960's a number of studies were initiated which examined the relationship between the public library and the school. These were chiefly surveys which attempted to determine the status and direction of cooperative activities in school and public libraries, or state-wide planning investigations which resulted from the passage of the Library Services and Construction Act. In these studies lack of communication between school and public libraries was frequently cited, as was the minimal number of efforts to develop policies and activities to facilitate cooperation. In 1967 Margaret Brewer surveyed each state to determine outstanding examples of school-public library cooperation. She concluded on the basis of her findings, that, in general, there was "gross lack of initiative" in the area (Aaron, 1981, p. 281).

In the 1970's most of the studies continued to focus on the status of cooperative programs. However, there also appeared to be an increased emphasis on investigating professional attitudes and perceptions, and some attempt to evaluate factors which influenced cooperation between school and public libraries.

Libraries of the Southeast were the subject of Mary E. Anders' regional study conducted from 1972 through 1974 (Aaron, 1981). This investigation confirmed the existence of a number of problems that librarians could effectively approach on a cooperative basis. It also showed that many school and public libraries were informally providing services to other than their primary clientele. Further, the study

indicated that the lack of clerical staff in school library media centers affected their ability to participate in cooperative activities.

Three additional studies performed in the 1970's were national in scope, but they explored different aspects of school-public library cooperation. The first was a study conducted by Applied Management Sciences, Inc. in 1978 which evaluated the impact and effectiveness of the Library Research and Demonstration Program of the Higher Education Act (HEA II-B), and Title III, Interlibrary Cooperation, of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA III) to aid in developing and improving library services (Aaron, 1981). In addition to an evaluation of each project, this study also provided a model describing the transformation of library-related innovations into basic library information services.

The second investigation, essentially a status study, was carried out by members of the Children and Young Adult Section of the Westchester Library Association of New York in 1979 (Aaron, 1981). They queried 70 American and Canadian agencies which determined avenues of potential school-public library cooperation. The responses indicated cooperation was taking place informally and/or formally and that the subject was a concern to many organizations and associations. Cooperative activities reported by participants ranged from simple information exchange to elaborate combined libraries.

The last study, by Esther R. Dyer in 1976, explored professional attitudes toward school-public library cooperation of a group of leading public library administrators, public school superintendents, coordinators of children's services, media supervisors, library

educators, and state and federal officials (Aaron, 1981). She used the

Delphi technique to obtain panelists' projections about the probable

and desirable occurrence of selected events with regard to public school

and public library services to children (K-6) in the next fifteen years.

Dyer concluded that the results of her study

> . . . constituted a refresher course in institutional
> rigidity. The highest priorities for both institutions
> are self-preservation and protection of territory.
> Cooperation is viewed as an implicit threat to autonomy
> and as such stands little chance of implementation . . .
> it will not be overtly resisted, but neither will
> cooperation be actively pursued unless external forces
> such as the community or other funding agencies foist
> such requirements upon these traditional institutions.
> (Aaron, 1981, p. 282)

Careful analysis of the findings and conclusions of the research

studies discussed above suggest that attitudes of many professional

library personnel toward cooperation must be changed significantly if

strides are to be made in the area of school-public library cooperation.

In addition, research studies which progress beyond surveying the

current status of cooperative programs have revealed the specific levels

and types of cooperative library activities that could serve children

more effectively and how these activities could best be implemented in

library programs. Without this information cooperative activities are

likely to gain little real acceptance or support in many library

programs (Aaron, 1981).

School-public library cooperation is not an end in itself, of

course, but rather a road which could lead to greater benefits for the

child, the teacher, and the community. Successful cooperation requires

mutual planning, the involvement of the administration, the enthusiasm

of those involved, and the genuine respect for the contribution of those with whom one is working. Individual successes could lead to a more permanent basis of continual cooperation (Shockey, 1978).

The improvement of library service is of primary concern to all professionals. Cooperation in itself is no panacea, but it does have a vital contribution to make in fulfilling the goals and objectives of both the public library and the school library media center (Shockey, 1978).

Chapter 3

Methodology

This researcher used the survey method to gather information about cooperation between school library media centers and public libraries. The population was school library media specialists in Iowa elementary schools and children's librarians in Iowa public libraries. The sample for this study was those elementary library media specialists and children's librarians employed in the public libraries in the 80 cities that are served by the Northeast Iowa Regional Library System in Waterloo (See Appendix A). The Regional Library System "was developed to provide supportive services to the public libraries. Reference services, interlibrary loan, consultant visits, workshops, and professional collections are some of the services identified and provided by the regional system" (Buckingham & Porter, 1981, p. 3).

A questionnaire with a cover letter which asked for cooperation and explained the purposes of this study was sent in May, 1988, directly to each of the prospective respondents instead of routing them through their respective superiors at the institutions (see Appendix B). Two separate cover letters and two questionnaires were developed for the prospective respondents. The questionnaire included preliminary questions addressing each of the three special employment situations that could have existed among the prospective respondents. The first was the elementary school library media specialist situation which addressed the amount of time that was spent at the elementary level. The second situation was the small public library run by one person who had both director and children's librarian responsibilities. The third

situation was the person employed as the children's librarian on a part-time basis in the small public library. The second preliminary question requested information about the amount of time spent as the children's librarian. If the response was less than 50% of their time to these preliminary questions, the respondent's questionnaire was not used in tabulating the findings for this study.

The yes-no items in the questionnaire dealt with the respondents' opinions concerning their participation in cooperative activities, and the level of communication, as well as opinions about the benefits that are associated with school-public library cooperation when applied to their community.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis

A total of 187 questionnaires were mailed to the prospective

respondents in the 80 cities that are within the area served by the

Northeast Iowa Regional Library System in Waterloo. During a two-week

response period, 150 questionnaires, or 80.21%, were returned to the

researcher. After determining which of the respondents spent at least

50% of their time as either a children's librarian or an elementary

library media specialist, 70.11% of 87 questionnaires, or 61, were used

to tabulate the findings for the schools and 32 of 63 questionnaires, or

50.79%, were used to tabulate the findings for the public libraries.

Table 1

Participation Rate of School-Public Library Cooperative Activities by

Number and Percent

| | Elementary Library Media Specialists | | | | |
| | Yes | | No | | No Response |
Question	No.	%	No.	%	No.
4 (1A)*	41	67.21	19	31.15	1
2 (1B)	18	29.51	41	67.21	2
	Children's Librarians				
	Yes		No		No Response
Question	No.	%	No.	%	No.
4 (1A)*	17	53.21	13	40.63	2
2 (1B)	9	28.12	22	68.75	1

* Number and letter in parentheses refer to the hypothesis.

The elementary library media specialists replied positively that classes had visited the public library (see question 4 responses on Table 1). There was a range of grade levels that visited the library, ranging from the primary grades to all of the grades. The frequency of the visits ranged from monthly to once or twice during the school year. Comments indicated that class visits to the local public library were being planned for the next school year. The children's librarians also responded positively that they had visited the elementary library media center or classrooms. Again, there was a range of grade level visits reported with the emphasis on the primary level. The frequency of the visits ranged from weekly to yearly. Comments included that elementary classes only came to the library for visits, or that drop-in visits and flyers were used at the school. The researcher accepted this hypothesis as a majority of librarians did participate in visits to the other local library in the community on a regular basis.

A minority of elementary library media specialists and children's librarians responded positively that they had informed each other of large class assignments so that materials could be put on reserve for the students (see question 2 responses on Table 1). Elementary library media specialists' comments ranged from "teachers do this" to "we check out collections" to "N.A.--no assignments given in elementary." Comments from children's librarians ranged from "we send out units on request" to "never" to "I have also bought more about subjects that were of need." This hypothesis was accepted because the majority of librarians did not participate in any extensive planning of programs or services on a regular basis.

Table 2

Level of Communication In School-Public Library Cooperation by Number and Percent

	Elementary Library Media Specialists				
Question	Yes		No		No Response
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
1 (2A)*	49	80.33	12	19.67	
7 (2B)	1	3.30	59	96.70	
8 (2C)	0	14.75	52	85.25	
3 (2D)	40	65.57	20	32.79	1
9 (2E)	7	11.47	53	86.89	1
	Children's Librarians				
Question	Yes		No		No Response
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
1 (2A)*	22	68.75	10	31.25	
7 (2B)	3	9.37	28	87.50	1
8 (2C)	3	9.37	28	87.50	1
3 (2D)	3	9.37	28	87.50	1
9 (2E)	9	28.13	23	71.87	

* Number and letter in parentheses refer to the hypothesis.

Both a majority of children's librarians and elementary library media specialists answered positively that they have had professional contact with the other in their communities (see question 1 responses on Table 2). One children's librarian commented that any communication between the two libraries was initiated only when the respondent approached the elementary library media specialist in the community.

Another respondent did note that the communication between the two librarians was very limited in the community. The researcher accepted this hypothesis as the majority of librarians believed that the quality of communication was indeed a major determining factor in school-public library activities.

A minority of children's librarians and elementary library media specialists replied positively that their libraries had made various materials available for loan to each other during the summer months (see question 7 responses on Table 2). Comments from children's librarians included that the high school had made materials available for loan and that a collection of books from the area education agency was borrowed for the summer. One elementary library media specialist commented that loaning materials to the public library would probably not be permitted by the school. This hypothesis was rejected because the majority of librarians did not maintain regularity in their communication which effected the type of activities between the two libraries.

A minority of both elementary library media specialists and children's librarians responded positively that they had spoken together to local service clubs about library service and its value to the community (see question 8 responses on Table 2). Several comments indicated that the children's librarians had spoken individually to service clubs, but not with the elementary library media specialist. The researcher rejected the hypothesis as the majority of librarians did not use an opportunity for communication with the community which affected the type of school-public library activities.

A minority of the children's librarians answered positively that they had made reference phone calls to the elementary media center if

they needed assistance in answering questions (see question 3 responses on Table 2). One children's librarian commented that the high school library was usually contacted for assistance, and another commented that the Northeast Iowa Regional Library System was used as a resource. A majority of the elementary library media specialists responded positively that they used the public library as a reference resource. Comments included that the local public library was not used as it was small, open only a few hours, and had a very limited reference section, or that a nearby library in a larger city or a college library was used as a resource. This hypothesis was rejected because a majority of the librarians did not maintain an informal, occasional level of communication between the libraries in their community.

A minority of both children's librarians and elementary library media specialists replied positively that they had worked together on setting goals for library service in the community (see question 9 responses on Table 2). Comments included that there was some talk and planning this year, and that there had been work together for collection development. The researcher rejected this hypothesis as the majority of librarians did not maintain a fairly high established level of communication which was necessary in order to pursue substantial cooperative activities.

A majority of both children's librarians and elementary library media specialists responded positively that they saw cooperation as desirable between schools and public libraries (see question 10 responses on Table 3). Comments included that cooperation was beneficial in the respect that it would simplify matters when special

Table 3

Benefits of School-Public Library Cooperation by Number and Percent

| | Elementary Library Media Specialists | | | | |
| | Yes | | No | | No Response |
Question	No.	%	No.	%	No.
10 (3A)*	60	98.36			1
11 (3B)	59	96.72	1	1.64	1
5 (3C)	28	45.90	2	52.46	1
6 (3D)	15	24.60	46	75.40	
12 (3E)	17	27.86	5	57.38	9
13 (3F)	59	96.72	2	3.28	
14 (3G)	42	68.85	2	19.67	7
	Children's Librarians				
	Yes		No		No Response
Question	No.	%	No.	%	No.
10 (3A)*	31	96.87	1	3.13	
11 (3B)	28	87.50	3	9.37	1
5 (3C)	12	37.50	20	62.50	
6 (3D)	6	18.75	26	81.25	
12 (3E)	18	56.24	7	21.88	7
13 (3F)	28	87.50	2	6.25	2
14 (3G)	27	84.38	4	12.50	1

* Number and letter in parentheses refer to the hypothesis.

assignments would be upcoming, but one respondent could foresee quite a few problems with differences in the libraries' material collections and budgets. Another commented that school-public library cooperation is the "wave" of the future, and another sign of tight budgets and the need

to share resources. One elementary library media specialist commented that school-public library cooperation was possibly desirable. This hypothesis was accepted because the majority of librarians believed that the potential benefits of school-public library cooperation to children and the libraries that serve them were great.

A majority of both children's librarians and elementary library media specialists answered positively that sharing materials and ideas would serve the community's children in a wider variety of ways than could be accomplished alone (see question 11 responses on Table 3). Children's librarians' comments included that this would be worth looking into for the library, and that sharing ideas rather than materials would be more beneficial to the library. Comments from elementary library media specialists included that the public library had so many more facilities, and that each library had its own role--they could cooperate, but not share as partners. The researcher accepted this hypothesis as the majority of librarians believed that sharing ideas and materials served young people in a wider variety of ways than could be accomplished by an individual institution.

A minority of both children's librarians and elementary library media specialists replied positively that they had worked jointly on publicity of special community library events (see question 5 responses on Table 3). Comments from children's librarians included that the local school sent out information on the public library's summer programs at the last parent- teacher conference and that the library works on publicity with only the local teachers. Elementary library media specialists' comments included that the librarians cooperate by passing on information and that they have not "worked together," and

that the Chapter I reading teachers, not the elementary library media
specialist, have worked with the children's librarian on publicity of
community library events. This hypothesis was rejected because the
majority of librarians did not participate in sharing the publicity for
activities, and therefore did not carry or reinforce them to a wider
audience.

A minority of both elementary library media specialists and
children's librarians responded positively that joint celebrations of
library events had been planned in their communities (see question 6
responses on Table 3). The researcher rejected this hypothesis as the
majority of librarians did not share the planning for activities and
therefore did not save any time or effort, or encourage any new
approaches and ideas.

A majority of elementary library media specialists and children's
librarians answered positively that the compatibility and bulk purchases
of audiovisual and computer resources would be economical for both of
the libraries and the community (see question 12 responses on Table 3).
Comments from elementary library media specialists included that
purchasing was done through the area education agency, that joint
purchasing would not be beneficial unless the public library was larger,
and that joint purchasing was impossible as the public library and
elementary library were entirely separate organizations with different
budgeting and purchasing guidelines. Children's librarians' comments
included that joint purchasing might be beneficial but it would involve
a lot of "hassles," the library had never had an opportunity to purchase
such items as there was no room for storage or any extra funding from

the city, and that this might be ideal but that duplicating materials was not done in a small town. This hypothesis was accepted because the greater majority of librarians believed that sharing expensive resources could save money for both of the libraries and the community.

Both a majority of children's librarians and elementary library media specialists replied positively that school-public library cooperation would increase community awareness of all libraries and their services and would create a positive image of librarians working together (see question 13 responses on Table 3). Comments from children's librarians included that people in the community were usually favorably impressed by school-public library cooperation. The researcher accepted this hypothesis as the majority of librarians believed that creating a positive image of librarians working together could increase community awareness of libraries and their services.

A majority of both children's librarians and elementary library media specialists responded positively that improving community awareness of libraries and their services would translate into greater support for both libraries at budget time (see question 14 responses on Table 3). Children's librarians' comments included that improving community awareness was always good and that spreading the word could only help. Comments from elementary library media specialists included doubt being expressed that improving awareness would actually make a difference in the community. This hypothesis was accepted because the majority of librarians believed that improving community awareness could translate into greater support for both libraries at budget time.

Chapter 5

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Summary

Conclusions

After conducting this study, the researcher concluded that
school-public library cooperation is indeed a topic that elicits much
interest in the library field today, and generates much discussion--both
positive and negative--between librarians in school and public
libraries. Even though the majority of librarians believed that
cooperation would indeed be beneficial to the libraries, few were
familiar with the range of opportunities that school-public library
cooperation could afford to them. The researcher also noted some
feelings of antagonism between the two groups of librarians which was
evidenced by comments from respondents indicating that they considered
the libraries in the community as separate institutions and did not see
any common purpose between them. Another interesting result was the
number of school districts that had either no elementary library media
specialist or used a teacher's aide at the elementary level which could
likely affect the understanding of school-public library cooperation,
and impede its progress in the community.

Concerning the question of current participation rate of
activities, the majority of librarians did participate in visits, at
least annually, to the other library in the community, but did not
participate in any extensive planning of programs or services, such as
assignment alerts or reserves for the students. An encouraging note was
the range of grades and the frequency of library visits, but also a
discouraging note that the majority of librarians had not initiated

assignment alerts or reserves. These services would take a minimum of planning time, but could also stimulate additional communication and cooperation between the librarians.

The level of communication in the school-public library cooperation question generated many written comments from the librarians. The majority of librarians did have professional contact with each other, though did not use each other as a resource in the community. The majority of librarians also did not take any opportunities to speak together about the value of library service to local service clubs, work together to set goals for library service, or maintain any regularity in their communication by making materials available for loan to one another's libraries. Without communication, school-public library cooperation would not prove beneficial in any community, and the majority of librarians have not made any substantial progress toward realizing its potential beyond an initial contact with their counterpart in the community.

Concerning the question of benefits of school-public library cooperation, the majority of librarians saw cooperation between schools and public libraries as desirable and believed that sharing materials and ideas would serve children in a wide variety of ways. However, only a few librarians worked together on joint publicity of special community library events or planned joint celebrations. This approach affected the amount of information and reinforcement that was transmitted to the community, and also the time, effort, and any encouragement of new ideas that would have been shared between the two librarians. They did accept the belief that the sharing of expensive resources could save money, but

most did not think that the amount purchased by the library would be worth the difficulty or they used other resources in the area. The librarians did believe that a positive image of librarians would increase the community's awareness of the libraries and could translate into more support at budget time, though a few did doubt that this would actually make a significant difference because both city and school budgets were unable to meet many of their needs now.

In conclusion, although the majority of librarians embraced the topic of school-public library cooperation as timely and beneficial, only a few had taken the initial steps and were growing toward more effective library service while meeting the needs of the community.

Recommendations

If this study were to be replicated in the future, the researcher recommends that the perception of school-public library cooperation between large high schools and public libraries be investigated. It might also be interesting to investigate the probable role of area education agencies, and possibly the influence of the State Library of Iowa and the Iowa State Department of Education on the future of school-public library cooperation. The researcher would hope that the results of this study would be used by both schools and public libraries to gauge their level of cooperation, and that it could be used to further the extent of that cooperation.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to discover the current status of activities, the role of communication, and the benefits associated with cooperation between school and public libraries. The researcher used

the survey method to gather information from school library media

specialists in Iowa elementary schools and children's librarians in Iowa

public libraries. The sample was those elementary library media

specialists and children's librarians employed in the institutions in

the 80 cities served by the Northeast Iowa Regional Library System in

Waterloo. A questionnaire with a cover letter was sent directly to each

of the prospective respondents. Two separate cover letters and two

questionnaires were developed for the prospective respondents. The

questionnaire included preliminary questions addressing each of three

special employment situations that could have existed among the

prospective respondents. If the respondents spent less than 50% of

their time in library positions working with children, the respondent's

questionnaire was not used in tabulating the findings for this study.

The yes-no items in the questionnaire dealt with the respondents'

opinions concerning their participation in cooperative activities, the

level of communication, as well as opinions about the benefits that were

associated with school-public library cooperation when applied to their

community.

Questions that were considered in this study included the

following:

1. What was the current participation rate of school-public

library cooperative activities?

The majority of librarians participated in visits, at least

annually, to the other library in the community, but did not participate

in any extensive planning of programs or services, such as assignment

alerts or reserves for the students. It was encouraging to note the

range of grades and the frequency of library visits, but also discouraging to note that the majority of librarians had not initiated assignment alerts or reserves. These services would take a minimum of planning time, but could also stimulate additional communication and cooperation between the libraries.

2. What level of communication existed in school-public library cooperation?

The majority of librarians have professional contact with each other, although they do not use each other as a resource in the community. The majority of librarians also do not take any opportunities to speak together about the value of library service to local service clubs, work together to set goals for library service, or maintain any regularity in their communication by making materials available for loan to one another's libraries. Without communication, school-public library cooperation would not prove beneficial in any community, and it was apparent that the majority of librarians have not made any substantial progress toward realizing its potential beyond an initial contact with their counterpart in the community.

3. What did professionals think were the benefits of school-public library cooperation?

The majority of librarians saw cooperation between schools and public libraries as desirable, and believed that sharing materials and ideas would serve children in a wide variety of ways. However, only a few librarians worked together on joint publicity of special community library events or planned joint celebrations. This approach affected the amount of information and reinforcement that was given to the

community, and also the time, effort, and encouragement of new ideas
that would have been shared between the two librarians. They accepted
the belief that the sharing of expensive resources could save money, but
most did not think that the amount purchased by the library would be
worth the difficulty, or they used other resources in the area. The
librarians believed that a positive image of librarians would increase
the community's awareness of the libraries and could translate into more
support at budget time, although a few doubted that this would actually
make a significant difference as both city and school budgets were
unable to meet many of their needs now.

Although the majority of librarians embraced the topic of school-
public library cooperation as timely and beneficial, only a few had
taken the initial steps and were growing toward more effective library
service while meeting the needs of the community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, Shirley L. School/Public Library Cooperation: A State of the
    Art Review. n.p.: Syracuse University, ED 192 810, 1980.

----------. "School/Public Library Cooperation-The Way It Is."
    Catholic Library World 52 (February 1981): 280-285.

American Association of School Librarians and Association for
    Educational Communications and Technology. Concept Draft of
    Revised Standards. n.p., 1987.

Billman, Betty V., and Patricia Owens. "School and Public Library
    Cooperation: A Prerequisite for Cooperative Collection
    Development." Collection Management 7 (Fall 1985-Winter 1986):
    183-195.

Buckingham, Betty Jo, and Barry L. Porter. Distinctive Functions of
    School Media Centers and Public Libraries, 2nd edition; A Yardstick
    for Planning School Library Media Centers, 3rd edition.
    Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, ED 208
    854, 1981.

Fleming, Lois D. "Public and School Libraries: Partners in the 'Big'
    Picture." School Media Quarterly 7 (Fall 1978): 25-30.

Krubsack, Harold, Rosanne Krubsack, and Ralph L. Whiting. The
    Cooperative Spirit: School Media Centers and the Public Library.
    Madison: Wisconsin Educational Media Association, ED 261 678,
    1985.

Morning, Todd, and Janet Watkins. "Beyond Assignment Alert." Illinois
    Libraries 67 (January 1985): 37-39.

Public Library and School Library Organizational Relationships and
    Interlibrary Cooperation: A Policy Statement. Madison:
    Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1976.

Roeder, Joan. "School/Public Library Cooperation: A View From The
    'School Yard'." Illinois Libraries 65 (September 1983): 452-454.

Shockey, Annette. "School and Public Library Cooperation: A Call to
    Action." Catholic Library World 49 (May-June 1978): 438-440.

Woolls, Blanche. "The Use of School Libraries and Public Libraries and the Relationship to Collection Development." Collection Management 7 (Fall 1985-Winter 1986): 173-181.

Appendix A

Public Libraries and Elementary Schools
In Sample

Public Libraries

Allison Public Library
Alta Vista Public Library
Legion Memorial Library (Aplington)
Arlington Public Library
Beaman Community Memorial Library
Calmar Public Library
Cascade Public Library
Cedar Falls Public Library
Clarksville Public Library
Clermont Public Library
Colesburg Public Library
Conrad Public Library
Cresco Public Library
Decorah Public Library
Delhi Public Library
Denver Public Library
Dike Public Library
Carnegie-Stout Public Library (Dubuque)
Dubuque County Library (Farley)
Brown Memorial Library (Dumont)
Dunkerton Public Library
Matthias Hoffman Public Library (Dyersville)
Ruth Suckow Memorial Library (Earlville)
Edgewood Public Library
Elgin Public Library
Elkader Public Library
Elma Public Library
Evansdale Public Library
Fairbank Public Library
Farmersburg Public Library
Fayette Community Library
Fort Atkinson Public Library
Upham Memorial Library (Fredericksburg)
Garnavillo Public Library
Greene Public Library
Grundy Center Public Library
Guttenberg Public Library
Hawkeye Public Library
Hopkinton Public Library
Hudson Community Library
Free Public Library (Independence)
Ionia Community Library
Janesville Public Library
Jesup Public Library
Lamont Public Library
Lansing Public Library
Hawkins Memorial Library (La Porte City)
Lawler Public Library
Lime Springs Public Library

Littleport Public Library
McGregor Public Library
Manchester Public Library
Maynard Community Library
Murphy Memorial Library (Monona)
Nashua Public Library
New Albin Public Library
New Hampton Public Library
New Hartford Public Library
Oelwein Public Library
Ossian Public Library
Kothe Memorial Library (Parkersburg)
Plainfield Public Library
Postville Public Library
Readlyn Community Library
Reinbeck Public Library
Shell Rock Public Library
Spillville Public Library
Strawberry Point Public Library
Sumner Public Library
Tripoli Public Library
Volga Public Library
Wadena Public Library
Waterloo Public Library
Waucoma Public Library
Robey Memorial Library (Waukon)
Waverly Public Library
Wellsburg Public Library
Heiserman Memorial Library (West Union)
Westgate Public Library
Winthrop Public Library

Elementary Schools

Allison Elementary School
Aplington Elementary School
Cascade Elementary School
Cedar Heights Elementary School (Cedar Falls)
Helen A. Hansen Elementary School (Cedar Falls)
Lincoln Elementary School (Cedar Falls)
North Cedar Elementary School (Cedar Falls)
Orchard Hill Elementary School (Cedar Falls)
Southdale Elementary School (Cedar Falls)
Valley Park Elementary School (Cedar Falls)
Clarksville Elementary School
Clermont Elementary School
Edgewood-Colesburg Elementary School (Colesburg)
Beaman-Conrad-Liscomb Elementary School (Conrad)
Cresco Elementary School
East Side Elementary School (Decorah)
John Cline Elementary School (Decorah)
West Side Elementary School (Decorah)
Delhi Elementary School
Denver Elementary School
Dike Elementary School
Audubon Elementary School (Dubuque)
Bryant Elementary School (Dubuque)
Eisenhower Elementary School (Dubuque)
Fulton Elementary School (Dubuque)
Hoover Elementary School (Dubuque)
Irving Elementary School (Dubuque)
John Kennedy Elementary School (Dubuque)
Lincoln Elementary School (Dubuque)
Marshall Elementary School (Dubuque)
Prescott Elementary School (Dubuque)
Sageville Elementary School (Dubuque)
Table Mound Elementary School (Dubuque)
Farley Elementary School
Dumont Elementary School
Dunkerton Elementary School
Dyersville Elementary School
Earlville Elementary School
Elgin Elementary School
Elkader Elementary School
Elma Elementary School
Jewett Elementary School (Evansdale)
Fairbank Elementary School
Fayette Elementary School
Fredericksburg Elementary School
Garnavillo Elementary School
Greene Elementary School
Grundy Center Lower Elementary School
Grundy Center Upper Elementary School

Guttenberg Elementary School
Hawkeye Elementary School
Hopkinton Elementary School
Hudson Elementary School
East Elementary School (Independence)
South Elementary School (Independence)
West Elementary School (Independence)
Janesville Elementary School
Jesup Elementary School
Lamont Elementary School
Lansing Elementary and Middle School
La Porte City Elementary School
Lime Springs Elementary School
McGregor Elementary School
Lambert Elementary School (Manchester)
Maynard Elementary School
Monona Elementary School
Nashua Elementary School
New Albin Elementary School
New Hampton Elementary School
New Hartford Elementary School
Wings Park Elementary School (Oelwein)
Harlan Elementary School (Oelwein)
Parkside Elementary School (Oelwein)
South Winneshiek Elementary School (Ossian)
Parkersburg Elementary School
Plainfield Elementary School
Cora B. Darling Elementary and Middle School (Postville)
Readlyn Elementary School
Reinbeck Elementary School
Shell Rock Elementary School
Durant Elementary School (Sumner)
Tripoli Elementary School
Volga Middle School
Black Hawk Elementary School (Waterloo)
Castle Hill Elementary School (Waterloo)
Devonshire Elementary School (Waterloo)
Edison Elementary School (Waterloo)
Elk Run Elementary School (Waterloo)
Grant Elementary School (Waterloo)
Irving Elementary School (Waterloo)
Kinglsey Elementary School (Waterloo)
Kittrell Elementary School (Waterloo)
Lincoln Elementary School (Waterloo)
Longfellow Elementary School (Waterloo)
Lowell Elementary School (Waterloo)
McKinstry Elementary School (Waterloo)
Orange Elementary School (Waterloo)
Roosevelt Elementary School (Waterloo)
East Campus Elementary School (Waukon)
West Campus Elementary School (Waukon)

Washington Irving Elementary School (Waverly)
Margaretta Carey Elementary School (Waverly)
Southeast Elementary School (Waverly)
West Cedar Elementary School (Waverly)
Wellsburg Elementary School (Wellsburg)
West Union Elementary School (West Union)
East Buchanan Central Elementary School (Winthrop)

Appendix B

Cover Letters and Questionnaires

May 2, 1988

Dear Elementary School Librarian:

The topic of school-public library cooperation has generated much interest recently as it becomes more challenging for librarians to meet students' increasing demands for information relying primarily on one library's resources. I am currently working on a research project on this topic to complete the requirements for a master's degree in library science from the University of Northern Iowa. The enclosed questionnaire focuses on the current status of school-public library activities, the role of communication, and the benefits of school-public library cooperation when applied to your community.

I am asking for your assistance in gathering data about cooperative activities. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. All responses will remain confidential. I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience, and would appreciate the questionnaire being returned to me by May 17, 1988. Thank you again for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Suzanne R. Larson
306 - 2nd Avenue
Charles City, IA 50616

Cooperation Among School and Public Libraries Questionnaire

School _____ School District _____

Please answer the following question if you are employed as a full-time or part-time K-6 librarian in the district.

What percentage of your time is spent at the elementary level? _____

Please mark (x) the response that best describes school-public library cooperation in your community in the past school year.

1. Have you had any professional contact with the children's librarian at the public library?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

2. Have you informed the public library of any large class assignments so that materials can be put on reserve for students?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

3. Have you made reference phone calls to the public library if you needed assistance in answering questions for students?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

4. Have classes visited the public library?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

   If YES, what grades visited the public library? _____
   How often? _____

5. Have you and the children's librarian worked together on joint publicity of special community library events such as summer programs for children?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

6. Have joint celebrations of library events such as National Library Week been planned with the children's librarian?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

7. Have you made various materials available for loan to the public library during the summer?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

8. Have you and the children's librarian ever spoken to local service clubs about library service and its value to the community?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

9. Have you and the children's librarian worked together on setting goals for library service within the community?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

10. Do you see cooperation between schools and public libraries as desirable?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

11. Would sharing materials and ideas with the public library serve your community's children in a wider variety of ways than can be accomplished by the school library alone?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

12. Would the compatibility and bulk purchases of audiovisual and computer resources with the public library be economical for the school and community?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

13. Would school-public library cooperation increase community awareness of all libraries and their services and create a positive image of librarians working together?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

14. Would improving community awareness of libraries and their services translate into greater support for both libraries at budget time?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

May 2, 1988

Dear Children's Librarian:

The topic of school-public library cooperation has generated much
interest recently as it becomes more challenging for librarians to meet
patrons' increasing demands for information relying primarily on one
library's resources. I am currently working on a research project on
this topic to complete the requirements for a master's degree in library
science from the University of Northern Iowa. The enclosed
questionnaire focuses on the current status of school-public library
activities, the role of communication, and the benefits of school-public
library cooperation when applied to your community.

I am asking for your assistance in gathering data about cooperative
activities. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed
questionnaire. All responses will remain confidential. I have enclosed
a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience, and would
appreciate the questionnaire being returned to me by May 17, 1988.
Thank you again for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Suzanne R. Larson
306 - 2nd Avenue
Charles City, IA   50616

Cooperation Among School and Public Libraries Questionnaire

Library _____   Community _____

Please answer the following question if you are employed in a small
public library where you have both director and children's librarian
responsibilities, or as a children's librarian on a full-time or
part-time basis.

What percentage of your time is spent performing children's librarian
responsibilities? _____

Please mark (x) the response that best describes school-public library
cooperation in your community in the past school year.

  1. Have you had any professional contact with the elementary school
      librarian(s) in your community?

      _____ YES
      _____ NO

  2. Has the elementary school librarian(s) informed you of any
      assignment alerts so that materials can be put on reserve for
      students?

      _____ YES
      _____ NO

  3. Have you made reference phone calls to the elementary school
      librarian(s) if you needed assistance in answering questions for
      patrons?

      _____ YES
      _____ NO

  4. Have you visited the elementary school library or classrooms
      regularly?

      _____ YES
      _____ NO

      If YES, how often ? _____ What grades? _____

  5. Have you and the elementary school librarian(s) worked together on
      joint publicity of special community library events such as summer
      programs for children?

      _____ YES
      _____ NO

6. Have joint celebrations of library events such as National Library Week been planned with the elementary school librarian(s)?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

7. Has the elementary school librarian(s) made various materials available for loan to the public library during the summer?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

8. Have you and the elementary school librarian(s) ever spoken to local service clubs about library service and its value to the community?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

9. Have you and the elementary school librarian(s) worked together on setting goals for library service within the community?

   _____ YES
   _____ NO

10. Do you see cooperation between schools and public libraries as desirable?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

11. Would sharing materials and ideas with the elementary school library serve your community's children in a wider variety of ways than can be accomplished by the public library alone?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

12. Would the compatibility and bulk purchases of audiovisual and computer resources with the elementary school be economical for the library and community?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

13. Would school-public library cooperation increase community awareness of all libraries and their services and create a positive image of librarians working together?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO

14. Would improving community awareness of libraries and their services translate into greater support for both libraries at budget time?

    _____ YES
    _____ NO