University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)   **Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln**

July 2005

Characteristics of Successful Partnerships Between Libraries, Schools, and Community Agencies

Carol A. Brown
East Carolina University

Characteristics of Successful Partnerships Between Libraries, Schools, and Community Agencies

Dr. Carol A Brown
Assistant Professor
Librarianship, Educational Technology & Distance Instruction
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27858-4353

Introduction

Collaboration is constantly promoted as a valued activity for educators, librarians, and social service professionals.[1] Shared resources, as well as shared responsibilities, can lead to reduced costs and positive outcomes for a collaborative project.[2] For libraries, this could mean expanded services and greater visibility in the community. The proliferation of digital information means that no one agency or entity can hold all the necessary information needed by our society. In addition, we want and need to provide full access to all people, including those with disabilities, who live in rural or remote regions, or who have an economic disadvantage. The Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) promotes the use of technology for sharing information between libraries and community agencies. LSTA funds are made available to state library agencies, with subgrants to public, academic, research, school and special libraries within each state. Appendix I provides an overview of LSTA projects during a two-year period. Primary goals are to provide extended library services and increased access to information for children and youth within their communities. This list of projects is only a portion of the 275 grants awarded nationally through LSTA . Other grants are awarded for collection development, technology enhancements, and collaboration between museums and libraries.[3]

The Powerful Partners Collaboration Grant is an example of a collaborative effort in educational outreach for youth and greater visibility for libraries in the community. The grant is one of several offered by the State Library of North Carolina and is an initiative of LSTA. Grant writers and recipients for Powerful Partners must be visionaries who can serve as leaders for the purpose of combining resources and efforts for the benefit of youth and children. Indeed, the use of effective strategies for successful collaboration is a qualifying characteristic for grant recipients. In the grant's guidelines there are clear directives for identifying a community need and providing services to meet those needs by forming strong, well-developed partnerships.[4] The creative energy resulting from these collaborations provides young people opportunities to experience a variety of resources, talent, and perspectives. In addition, community-based projects bring diverse perspectives that can strengthen the quality of the collection in the school libraries, and attract school children to public library services. Monies for these grants are

dispersed from LSTA funds and are for the years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.[5] A description of Powerful Partner Grants is provided in Appendix II.

State Library Federal Programs Consultant Penny Hornsby serves as the contact for Powerful Partners Collaboration Grant. In an interview, Hornsby reported that the operative word for Powerful Partners is "collaboration." To be competitive for the grant, the applicant must describe a project that includes elements of a successful collaboration. Guidelines for the partnerships include recommendations from the Wilder Foundation. The Amherst H. Wilder Foundation is a nonprofit health and human services organization that supports research and evaluation to strengthen individuals, families, and communities.[6] One area of their research is focused on identifying which factors contribute to successful partnerships between public and private agencies.

The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory was developed to provide an instrument for measuring success in the collaborative venture or as a method for predicting likelihood for success. It could also be a method for assessing readiness to begin a collaborative project. The items within the inventory are designed to be descriptive of effective collaboration, and prescriptive if scores from the inventory indicate weaknesses for a particular factor. Scores are calculated by simply figuring the arithmetic average for each response to items in the inventory. The authors recommend the following values for scores:

- Scores 4.0 or higher indicate strength in the area of that factor or likelihood for success in the area as described in the survey

- Scores 3.0 to 3.9 indicate borderline performance for the factor and may need discussion by the project team members.

- Scores of 2.9 or lower indicate genuine concern for change or revision among practices within the group. [6]

Research Question

Over a two-year period, 18 documented cases for the Powerful Partners grant were made available for review. The North Carolina State Library provided contact information for the grant writer, dates, and locations. For this study, there are three questions. First, have grant recipients been satisfied with partner organizations and is there a perception that outcomes were positive? Second, what factors can be identified as predominant within their partnership, and third, are there correlations between scores from the case study provided by the Wilder Foundation and scores from a survey sent to NC librarians and their partners?

Methodology

Both quantitative data from surveys and qualitative data from telephone interviews were used to draw conclusions related to these questions. A 48-item survey was developed to measure perceived satisfaction and effectiveness for the partnership. The survey items replicate the content suggested for the 20 factors recommended by the Wilder Foundation. Three of the survey items were designed to gather demographic

"Characteristics of Successful Partnerships Between Libraries, Schools, and Community Agencies." Carol A. Brown. *Library Philosophy and Practice* Vol. 6, No. 2 (Spring 2004)

2

information for the survey participants. Questions include geographic location, economic conditions, and level of illiteracy for the community. Participants in the survey were instructed to respond to each item by selecting 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 on a Likert Scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Methods used to tally and calculate the responses were the same as those used by the Wilder Foundation for their case study.

Surveys were mailed to all 18 Powerful Partners grant recipients and their partner schools. These included public library personnel in addition to school librarians who had partnered with the public libraries. Of the 22 surveys mailed, there were 13 responses. Two of the responses were from school librarians. The remaining 11 were from public librarians. The results were tallied and calculated to determine the mean for each item. Telephone interviews were used to gather additional information beyond the quantitative data provided in items on the survey. Open-ended questions were designed to determine the occurrence of three main themes for each partnership. These were *shared vision, mutual trust and respect,* and *distinctive and unique objectives for the project.* Interviewees were selected from survey respondents with consistently high scores on their responses and those who had highly variable scores for their responses. In the final analysis, six individuals were interviewed by phone or in a face-to-face taped interview.

Results

Participants are from all areas of the state including mountain, coastal, piedmont, rural and urban central regions. Communities are diverse with industrial, farming, tourist, retail/commercial, and research/education as the predominant means for employment. Illiteracy is a concern for many of those responding to the survey but it is not as serious as predicted. The Wilder Foundation has provided information from case studies that can be used as baseline data needed for identifying collaborative projects that are likely to be successful.[8] Data supplied by the Wilder Foundation were used to make comparisons between Wilder Foundation case study projects and Powerful Partners projects in North Carolina. Although the number of participants from North Carolina was small, those responding clearly show a positive perception for their projects associated with factors identified for successful collaboration. As can be seen in Table 1, scores for NC Powerful Partners are closely aligned with scores supplied by the Wilder Foundation case studies. A close examination of scores for each of the individual factors shows four factors with differences between Powerful Partners projects and The Wilder projects.

Table 1. Comparison of factors affecting collaboration between NC Powerful Partners and case study provided by Wilder Foundation.

Factors Affecting Success in Collaboration Likert Scale using 1 for lowest to 5 for highest in agreement.	AVG scores Powerful Partners of NC N=13	AVG scores WILDER FOUNDATION case study N=18
History of collaboration or cooperation in community –V*, T*	**3.75**	**4.2**
Group seen as legitimate leader in the community -V, T, G*	4.15	4.4
Favorable political and social climate-V	4.4	4.5
Mutual respect, understanding and trust-T	**4.8**	**3.3**
Appropriate cross section of members-V, G	4.2	4.4
Members see collaboration as in their self-interest-V, G	4.8	4.5
Ability to compromise-G	4.1	4.3
Members share a stake in both process and outcome-V, T	4.3	4.4
Multiple layers of participation-V, G	4.1	4.6
Flexibility-T	4.4	4.4
Development of clear goals and policy guidelines-G	4.1	4.1
Adaptability -T	4.2	4.6
Appropriate pace of development-G	**3.75**	**4.3**
Open and frequent communication-T	4.3	4.4
Established formal and informal relationships-T	**4.5**	**2.4**
Concrete attainable goals and objectives-G	4.5	4.2
Shared Vision-V	4.35	4.4
Unique purpose-V, G	4.15	4
Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time-G	**3.9**	**4.5**
Skilled leadership-T	4.5	4.4
AVG scores for 20 factor categories	**4.265**	**4.215**
*Survey item includes elements of the following: V = shared vision, T = mutual trust, G= distinctive goals		

Note in the Table the survey item related to "mutual trust and respect." Powerful Partners scored an average response of 4.8 on the Likert scale, whereas Wilder reported a much lower average response of 3.3 from participants in their case studies. A second factor of interest is related to "establishing formal and informal relationships." Powerful Partners scored a high 4.5 average response for the survey item related to "establishing formal and informal relationships". Wilder Foundation reported a much lower average response (2.4) for this same survey item. Other differences include self-reported satisfaction with "adaptability of team members to make needed changes" and "availability of resources (human services) to achieve goals for the project". In two of the interviews, the Powerful Partners reported concerns with lack of time for scheduled meetings, planning, and deadlines for the project.

> We as sponsors had to deal with illness, job transfers and scheduling
> conflicts with facilities, but we still were able to pull it off and very

successfully! ...The only negative aspect was that there never seemed to be enough time. It was often difficult for people of different organizations and different schedules to coordinate meetings, activities, etc....we however made the best of the time together.

One other difference is noteworthy. For the factor, "history of collaboration within the region", Powerful Partners have an average score of 3.75, where as the case study average is 4.2 (see Table 1). Even with a lower score for history of collaborative projects, the NC Powerful Partners scored a high average for all factors, slightly higher than the average for the18 projects used for the Wilder case studies (NC = 4.26, Wilder cases = 4.21).

Elements for "Shared Vision"

Clearly, a shared vision is a common and recurring theme for all the partnerships interviewed. Each of the participants stated that the partnership "came together" because they wanted to serve the youth and children in the community through books, technology, or other information resources. For those who started with a concept for a project already formed, initial meetings consisted of brainstorming sessions to talk about problems and issues in the community. Dialog in these meetings was to identify problems and generate possible solutions to the problems. Those participating in the first few meetings made recommendations for additional partners who might be suitable for the project. For others, the project goals and objectives had been defined earlier in the grant process, and the first meetings were more focused on timelines, sharing of resources, and strategies for implementation of the project goals. Whether the project goals were already established, or problem-finding sessions preceded this, the vision for the project was created through interagency collaboration. The following comments from a rural coastal community, with high illiteracy, support the idea that a shared vision is critically important to the success of the projects.

> Whatever little problems that we might have encountered did not interfere with our goal for getting books and resources into the hands of these children. . . . Shared vision was the result of a need in our community.

Another project resulted from economic needs within a rural mountainous community.

> We wanted to provide information and support for preparation, training, and specialized education for good jobs. It was gratifying to see this shared vision. There was a process for generating this shared vision. We met regularly to determine our goals and a common vision. We had to build relationships to do this and it took time. All those on the planning team formulated the vision statement. . . .

The following statements reflect a situation in which the shared vision evolved from open communication and trust. These comments are from a respondent in an urban setting located near a research based, academic community.

> Our shared vision began as a result of our conversations. We started by inviting potential partners. By starting from no preconceived idea of our goal and by developing goals together, we were easily able to develop a shared vision. We brainstormed and looked at the needs for the community. Actually, the best part of the collaborative experience was during the initial meetings.

Note in Table 1, high scores for both "shared vision" and "open communication" were reported by a large number of survey respondents.

Elements for "Mutual Trust"

The interviews contained many comments focused on conditions leading to personal feelings of trust. For one participant, failed trust was a factor leading to some disappointment.

> We started well, then lost trust in the end. We met regularly but some members didn't reveal that they were experiencing failure and that they were struggling. Thus, at the end, we lost the trust that we had experienced in the beginning.

Most of the participants reported a positive experience for mutual trust and respect. Further study on the values and norms for this geographic region, compared to other regions in the country, may reveal a difference in levels of trust and respect. For example, did the grant's participants enjoy camaraderie simply because of the success of the partnership or was it the other way around, camaraderie producing a sense of trust? What about similar values and norms? Could these be stronger factors than positive personal relationships?

> I think our shared vision built trust. ....another thing that built trust was the type of relationship we enjoyed....we developed a mentor-mentee relationship. This was meaningful for both of us and contributed to our trusting relationship.

Elements for "Distinctive Goals."

Collaboration requires the commitment of organizations and their leaders. "Two or more organizations are not just mushed together,"[9] but instead, a new common mission and goals are created. Many of the studies for successful collaboration consistently identify a unique goal or set of objectives for the project. These should be separate and distinctively different from goals and objectives already identified by contributing agencies, organizations, or individuals.[10] Each agency will have specific resources that

"Characteristics of Successful Partnerships Between Libraries, Schools, and Community Agencies." Carol A. Brown. *Library Philosophy and Practice* Vol. 6, No. 2 (Spring 2004)

6

are available for the community. Because of administrative and bureaucratic policies, these resources are often carefully guarded by the contributing agency. The desire for personal recognition can hinder the blending of resources to achieve a distinctive goal for the project. Some of the participants for this study reported problems with ownership of goals and for a "coming together" to generate a distinctive goal statement for the project.

> We had to build relationships to do this and it took time. I think you can't rely on just one key relationship but reach out to several who may contribute to the collaboration. There is some frustration in building these relationships.

Others reported a more favorable experience when determining distinctive goals for the project.

> Our goals were related to computer literacy, but the unique and distinctive goal for the partnership was to experience successful collaboration. So, while the youth were learning research skills on the computer, team members learned about strategies for successful collaboration.

Conclusions

Powerful Partner grant recipients from North Carolina libraries have demonstrated positive outcomes for projects that require interagency collaboration that meet an identified need within the community. Although the sample size was small, interviews and survey responses come from urban, rural, suburban, and industrial populations representing a diverse perspective. It may be suggested that data from this study could be generalized to library communities in other regions and states. Average scores from self-reported survey data indicate that grant participants have adopted recommendations for successful collaboration as reported in the literature. There was also willingness among several of the participants to offer candid remarks for changes leading to improvement in future projects.

Survey respondents with high scores for all items and respondents with varying scores were called for a telephone interview. Those with low scores in the item "formal and informal communication" , and for the item related to "adequate human resources," reported (through interviews) that lack of time and/or motivation by partners seemed to reduce effectiveness of the partnership. Partners may not have been able to schedule time for planning, thus commitments for resources and other contributions were lacking. Lack of time and strategies for time management were obstacles.

A second concern was related to open communication and follow-up with all the stakeholders involved. Comments related to open communication followed a pattern for lack of time by one or more partners within the collaboration. Lack of sustained motivation was also mentioned which would suggest that partners who are fully and consistently informed for all facets of the projects are more likely to maintain enthusiasm and commitment. Mattessich emphasizes the importance of ongoing visibility of goals throughout the life of the project.[11] Informal communication that reminds partners of the mutually beneficial goals could provide the incentive needed for partners to remain

committed even when obstacles related to time and dwindling resources occur. Another important factor is related to type of communication.[12] Impersonal correspondence or other forms of written communication may not have the effect needed to gain attention from a partner who faces new and more pressing priorities. When partners lose interest, personal contact through telephone or visits may revitalize interest.

However, there were others who reported a very high level of satisfaction because, even with obstacles such as lack of time to meet and plan, goals were achieved. There were those, participating in the interviews, who exhibited a synergy that is hard to define and quantify. One partnership resulted in a mentor-mentee relationship. The principle grant writer, provided valuable guidance and mentoring for the younger, less experienced, partner. One explanation for this kind of outcome could be related to initial brainstorming sessions in which all partners work together to generate the shared vision statement. Natural leaders would emerge and those with unique and specific skills could be identified for the good of the project. Another constant theme that seemed to contribute to synergy among partners was the mutually, altruistic desire to achieve goals for the good of their community. Comments from those participating in the interviews consistently reported commitment to the project's goals was stronger than barriers caused by lack of time.

Wilder Foundation's 20 factors for successful collaboration can be aligned with the three commonly occurring themes – (1) shared vision, (2) mutual trust/respect, and (3) unique/distinctive goal statements. These clearly emerged during analysis of dialogs from the interviews. Organizations and agencies may find it useful to begin planning with these three themes in mind followed by implementation of more specific (and measurable) strategies based on the 20-factor inventory.

Although participants were able to identify and report problems that caused some dissatisfaction with the partnerships, those responding to the interviews voiced a desire to participate in future or continuing partnerships with those within their community. Clearly, the personal satisfaction experienced by completing their visions and achieving goals for services to children and youth in their communities was a dominant theme from this study.

Notes

1. Gail Bush, *The School Buddy System: The Practice of Collaboration* . (Chicago: American Library Association, 2002) 149 p.; Steven Lesky, Elizabethann O'Sullivan, and Barbara Goodmon, "Local Public-Nonprofit Partnerships: Getting Better Results." *Policy & Practice of Public Human Services* 59 (Sep. 2001): 28 – 33.
2. Cynthia Franklin, and Calvin L. Streeter, "School Reform: Linking Public Schools With Human Services." *Social Work* 40 (Nov. 1995): 773-83.
3. Institute of Museum and Library Services. "Grants to State Library Agencies", <www.imls.gov/grants/library/lib_gsla.asp> (Accessed June 18 2003)
4. State Library of North Carolina. "LSTA Powerful Partners Collaboration Grants", <statelibrary.dcr.state.nc.us/lsta/PP_GL_03-04.pdf (Accessed May 15 2003)
5. State Library of North Carolina, "LSTA, Library Services and Technology Act: Previous Awards" <statelibrary.dcr.state.nc.us/lsta/PrevAwards.htm> (Accessed June 18, 2003)

6. Paul W. Mattessich, and Barbara R. Monsey, *Collaboration: What Makes it Work: A Review of Research Literature on Factors Influencing Successful Collaboration* (St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1992) 47.

7. Wilder Foundation. "Wilder Foundation Factors Inventory", <www.wilder.org/pubs/inventory/CollaborationA.html > (Accessed May 15 2003)

8. Paul W. Mattessich, Marta Murray-Close, Barbara R. Monsey, and The Wilder Research Center, *Collaboration: What makes it Work* . 2 nd ed. (St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2001) 26.

9. Lizabeth A. Wilson. "Collaborate or Die: Designing Library Space." *Association for Research Libraries. A Bimonthly Newsletter of Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC* (June, 2002). <www.arl.org/newsltr/222/> (Accessed May 15, 2003)

10. Hal A. Lawson, and Wayne Sailor, "Integrating Services, Collaborating, and Developing Connections With Schools." *Focus on Exceptional Children* 33 (Oct. 2000): 1-22; Charles Bruner. "Thinking Collaboratively: Ten Questions and Answers to Help Policy Makers Improve Children's Services." ERIC document: ED 338 984, 1991.

11. Paul W. Mattessich, Marta Murray-Close, Barbara R. Monsey, and The Wilder Research Center, *Collaboration: What makes it Work* . 2 nd ed. (St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2001) 17.

12. Paul W. Mattessich, Marta Murray-Close, Barbara R. Monsey, and The Wilder Research Center, *Collaboration: What makes it Work* . 2 nd ed. (St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2001) 24

Appendix I

Overview of LSTA grants projects with a focus on collaboration between libraries and community agencies with goals for reaching children and youth.

Tri-Valley High School, Dresden - "Muskingum Valley Library Link" - $54,329 Seven elementary schools in two school districts in Ohio automated and linked their collections in a project using LSTA funds. The project has deepened the partnership between the school and public library and has been a catalyst for other cooperative ventures between two schools.	*Public Library of Des Moines, Des Moines - "Public/School Library Partnership" - $20,000* This project created a partnership between the Public Library of Des Moines (PLDM) and Des Moines Public Schools. It provided improved library service to students by developing a direct link between each school's library and the curricula-supporting information resources only available from the Public Library of Des Moines.
Milwaukee Public Library, Milwaukee - "Books on the Go" - $74,900 - While the idea of offering story times and getting books into preschoolers hands is not a new one for the library, focusing on the childcare audience is. 420 childcare centers in Milwaukee are members of the Books2Go program and checked out a total of 9,184 library books and attended 332 story times at the Milwaukee Public Library in 2002.	*Southcentral MN InterLibrary Exchange, Mankato - "Waseca Virtual History Museum" - $25,000* With research instruction from the partners, students will select and digitize photographs and images of artifacts to tell stories of Waseca County's heritage. In the process, they will demonstrate their proficiency under the state standards of learning.
Colorado State Library, Denver - "Power Libraries: Linking School Library Media Programs and Standards to Student Achievement" - $180,000 Pilot partnerships between high schools and libraries have been established to promote learning links that expand students' academic research environment.	*Sparks High School Library (Washoe), Sparks - "Sparks - Booktalking for Literacy" - $20,000* A collaborative effort between the public schools, the Northern Nevada Literacy Council, and the Washoe County Library partnership branch at Mendive Middle School. It was developed to increase community awareness about library services and the availability of literacy courses.
LaRue County Public Library, Hodgenville - "Library/ School Partnership - "Wings"" - $10,000 The Hodgenville, KY, LaRue County Public Library implemented a project to stimulate reading in educationally at-risk middle school children with performing arts. Remedial reading teachers held 64 school and library sessions for children with poor social and reading skills to prepare for their performances.	*Idaho State Library, Boise - "Continuing Education - Workshops" - $1,200* The Idaho State Library provides a series of workshops to help teach basic skills in librarianship for small libraries and school library aides. Working in partnership with other states the State Library offers the Alternative Basic Library Education (ABLE) E-course online.
Geneva Free Library, Geneva - "Families Read!" - $24,091 According to one Head Start Family Worker, her families feel "a lot less intimidated" by the library as a result of this grant. The project created a partnership between the Geneva Free Library, Geneva Head Start and Geneva Housing Authority to promote family literacy.	*Ames Public Library, Ames - "Books for Babies" - $165* Public libraries in Story County and Mary Greeley Medical Center in Ames created a gift packet for every child born at Mary Greeley Medical Center. The packet included a board book suitable for very young children, a paperback book for parents on how to read to children, parenting information, and a coupon for a second gift book to be redeemed at any Story County library.
Idaho State Library, Boise - "First Book" - $30,600 The Idaho State Library partnered with Idaho Public Television to bring the First Book program to 761 at-risk children. First Book is an	*Canton Public Library, Canton - "PULSE (Advanced Technology)" - $104,843* "Partnership Uniting Libraries & Schools Electronically" uses leading-edge technology to create a long-term, virtual library-school partnership to maximize access for

outreach program that provides a book a month for a year for each participating child. The books are given in conjunction with an educational activity and information for families to extend learning at home.	teachers and students to electronic resources of the public library.
Estill County Public Library, Irvine - "Early Childhood Development – Bridge to Literacy 04-4D2a" - $10,000 The project offers an infant/toddler area within the library where none previously existed; offers "Story Saks" which are circulated by the library and several partnering agencies in order to promote interest in reading to young children; and provides a series of classes to the parents and caregivers of the county's neediest children because very little parent education is available in the county.	*Metronet, St. Paul - "The E-Books Project" - $200,000* Metronet, a Multitype Regional Library System located in the Twin Cities, is working with several other library partners throughout the state to provide a substantial sampling of e-books to public, publicly accessible special, academic and school libraries throughout Minnesota.
Carroll County Public Library, Westminster - "Discovery Zone" - $32,000 The Discovery Zone enables the Carroll County Public Library to reach out to at-risk families. Two local branches have eye-catching and inviting places for children and their families. Partnership agencies help to identify families for the project and provide support to the Library and the families to keep them active in the program.	*Geneva Free Library, Geneva - "Families Read!" - $19,907* Staff at the Geneva Free Library of New York used LSTA funds to work with community partners to reach families who don't use the library. The project served 751 residents through 12 partnerships with organizations like Head Start and a housing project.
Henderson District Public Libraries, Henderson - "Cybrary for Low-Income Youth" - $30,375 The Cybrarian and volunteers from project partners, including high school computer clubs, the local community college campus, and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, train the children in low-income schools to ensure a better-education and more literate population.	*Provo School District Library Media TeachersSunset View Elementary, Provo - "Library/Media Collaborative Training/Production Lab" - $30,502* A collaborative library lab where Library Media Teachers of Provo School District have access to current hardware, software, and training. It refines teacher skills in using technology to locate use and present information, and assists the teachers in producing multimedia lessons for use in teaching USOE K-12 Library Media Core Curriculum.
Multnomah County Library, Portland - "Talk It Up! Book Discussion Groups for Kids, Year 2" - $65,437 Elementary and middle schools students chat online about their favorite books. As a result of the project 13 monthly discussion groups have been established at county schools, community centers, and the library. The project Web site provides 67 discussion guides.	*Eureka Public Library District, Eureka - "From Freshman to Senior" - $28,106* Through the "Capturing Memoir" project, Eureka College students and elders from Maple Lawn Homes partnered with the Eureka Public Library to provide intergenerational experiences with each other that yielded rich personal relationships. The elders received instruction in word processing before learning how to write and produce memoirs.
OLIS/Library Programs, Providence - "Local Library Development" - 15,000 children participate in Rhode Island's popular Statewide Summer Reading Program "Camp Out with a Good Book." The program boasts eight theme-related performers conducting 289 shows attended by over 16,000 children and adults. Corporate partners include The McDonald's restaurants of Rhode Island.	*Public Library of Des Moines, Des Moines - "Public/School Library Partnership" - $20,000* Partnership between the Public Library of Des Moines (PLDM) and Des Moines Public Schools. Provides improved library service to students by developing a direct link between each school's library and the curricula-supporting information resources only available from the Public Library of Des Moines.
Hillsborough County Public Library	*Southcentral MN InterLibrary Exchange, Mankato -*

Cooperative, Tampa - "Juniors to Seniors: Hillsborough Remembers" - $63,799 This oral history project brings high school students and seniors together to make history. Students interview seniors and library staff mount transcripts and photographs. Hillsborough County's Department of Aging Services, the Hillsborough County School District, and the Tampa Bay History Center. Appendix I. continued	*"Waseca Virtual History Museum" - $25,000* Collaborators from the historical society, the public library, and the school media center will work with a U.S. history high school class to design and implement a virtual museum Web site. With research instruction from the partners, students will select and digitize photographs and images of artifacts to tell stories of Waseca County's heritage.
Tri-Valley High School, Dresden - "Muskingum Valley Library Link" - $54,329 Students and teachers have online access to collections of each school and the county library. The project has deepened the partnership between the school and public library and has been a catalyst for other cooperative ventures between two school districts that have a history of rivalry.	*Sparks High School Library (Washoe), Sparks - "Sparks - Booktalking for Literacy" - $20,000* Collaborative effort between the Washoe County School District - Sparks High School Library, the Northern Nevada Literacy Council, and the Washoe County Library partnership branch at Mendive Middle School. It was developed to increase community awareness about library services and the availability of literacy courses.
Milwaukee Public Library, Milwaukee - "Books on the Go" - $74,900 Milwaukee Public Library partnered with 420 childcare centers in Milwaukee. Members of the Books2Go program checked out a total of 9,184 library books and attended 332 story times at the Milwaukee Public Library in 2002.	*Providence Public Library, Providence - "Rhode Island Family Literacy Initiative: Family Reading Program" - $64,471* Public libraries in eight cities host this statewide, intergenerational literacy program in RI. Parents are encouraged to become active partners in their children's literacy development while strengthening their own literacy skills with reading, writing, and language instruction.
Colorado State Library, Denver - "Power Libraries: Linking School Library Media Programs and Standards to Student Achievement" - $180,000 Recent findings strongly indicate that libraries have a positive impact on assessment scores when the library program works with and is included in the school curricula, and the library media specialist is an instructional leader in the school. Pilot partnerships between high schools and libraries have been established to promote learning links that expand students' academic research environment.	*Watauga Regional Library, Johnson City - "Services for Children Living in Poverty" - $4,981* LSTA funding to Watauga Regional Library placed appropriate books into the hands of children and parents participating in child abuse prevention programs and the therapists and counselors who serve them. The library partnered with the county children's advocacy center, child abuse counselors, and Kingsport City Schools to select and distribute the 405 books and materials.
Cleveland Area Metropolitan Library, Shaker Heights - "Services to the Underserved" - $180,467 This collaborative program equips public libraries, school districts, and parents/guardians with software and training to assist student patrons to prepare for and succeed in passing the Ohio Proficiency Tests for the 4th, 6th, and 9th grades.	*LaRue County Public Library, Hodgenville - "Library/ School Partnership - "Wings"" - $10,000* Giving Pre-Teens "Wings": The Hodgenville, KY, LaRue County Public Library implemented a project to stimulate reading in educationally at-risk middle school children with performing arts. Remedial reading teachers held 64 school and library sessions for children with poor social and reading skills to prepare for their performances.
State of Vermont Dept. of Libraries, Montpelier - "Statewide Library Development/Born to Read Partnership" - $1,562 An intense yearlong campaign in the state was designed to raise awareness of the importance of reading to young children. The project provided	*Geneva Free Library, Geneva - "Families Read!" - $24,091* The project created a partnership between the Geneva Free Library, Geneva Head Start and Geneva Housing Authority to promote family literacy. The library provided a reading-related program and in service

tote bags filled with children's books and informational materials to families with infants through pediatrician offices. Additional free books were distributed at public libraries, and LSTA funds paid for a consultant to share with librarians her expertise on reading to children.	training. A mini-library was opened at the Courtyard Apartments which included evening hours. Monthly visits to the library were co-sponsored by the Housing Authority who provided free transportation.

Appendix II.
State Library of North Carolina Powerful Partners Grant recipients and their partners over a two-year period, 2000-2001; 2001-2002. Surveys were mailed to a participant for each project.

Name of Project	Amount of Funds	Partners
Low Income Family Literacy Project	$55,000	Asheville-Buncombe Library System and the Buncombe county Health Department
West Asheville Hispanic community Out-reach Project	$55,000	Asheville-Buncombe Library System, the Migrant Education Program of the Buncombe County Schools, Western North Carolina Community Health Services, Catholic Social Services and others.
A Community Celebration of History	$5,500	Sherrills Ford Branch of Catawba County Library System, Sherrills Ford Elementary School and the Catawba County Community School Program
Library Youth Partnership Project	$31,484	The Durham County Library, the NC Museum of Life and Science, and Hillside and Southern High Schools. Includes 550 elementary school children and 12 high school students.
Minority and At-risk Youth Writing and Photography Project	$30,616	Forsyth County Public Library, County Hispanic Services, the *Winston-Salem and Que Pasa* newspapers, and the Sawtooth Center for Visual Art.
Write Between the Lines	$47,695	Haywood County Public Library, the Haywood County Community College, Haywood County Public Schools and *Smoky Mountain News*
The Village Storytelling Festival	$11,269	Public Library of Charlotte & Mecklenburg County, The University City Regional Library, Nathaniel Alexander and Morehead Elementary Schools.
Family Computer/Internet Workshops	$5,500	Cherokee County Library and the Cherokee County Schools
A Community of Readers	$40,150	Pettigrew Regional Library, Perquimans County Public Library, Public School System, County Chamber of Commerce, Communities in Schools, and the Childcare Resource and Referral Programs.
The Literary Connection	$56,200	Granville County Public Library, West oxford Elementary School, Butner-Stem Middle School, and Granville Education Foundation.
Middle Mix-ups Book Discussion Groups	$16.720	Watauga County Library, Watauga County Schools, Appalachian State University, and the Watauga Education Foundation
Hispanic Literacy Outreach Program	$13,970	Wake County Public Library, Zebulon Elementary, Easter Regional Human Services Center, and St. Eugene Catholic Church.
PAIRS (Partners in Reading)	$26,345	Cumberland Public Library, Cross Creed Reading County, and tutors provided by local schools' Beta Club and National Honor Society
Project InterAct	$14,386	Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, Children's

		Theatre of Charlotte, and at-risk children from area schools.
Life Skills through Cooperative Extension Programs	$46,000	Northwestern Regional Library (includes 4 counties), community colleges, and Cooperative Extension Programs.
Our Own Back Yard a Very Good Place to Start	$50,000	Rockingham County Public Library System, Rockingham County Schools, the School Media and Technology Center, and multiple community agencies.
Mastery of Computer Competencies for 8th graders	$49,678	Wake County Public Libraries, Boys and Girls Club, and East Wake Middle School.
Web of Support	$30,509	Wiley International Elementary Magnet School, Pullen Memorial Baptist Church, Wake Technical Community College.