This review focuses on characteristics of effective school library programs which significantly affect student achievement and which have the support of educational decision-makers. In schools with good resource centers and the services of a teacher-librarian, students perform significantly better on tests for basic research skills. The evidence is similarly clear that more reading is done where there is a school library and a teacher-librarian. School resource centers with full-time teacher-librarians even contribute to the development of positive self-concepts. The role of the teacher-librarian requires clarification if there is to be any improvement in existing programs. Teacher-librarians must have teaching qualifications and classroom experience prior to further education and training. The development of student competence is most effective when integrated with classroom instruction through cooperative program planning and team teaching by two equal partners—the classroom teacher and the teacher-librarian—yet communication is often lacking. There is also evidence that there are benefits to students when school and public libraries cooperate, yet public librarians and school librarians communicate very little. The research literature provides considerable evidence and guidance as to what constitutes effectiveness in the implementation of any desired change. A district policy to guide and support implementation and a district plan for a structured process can prove helpful. The implementation of change requires persistent advocacy and continual leadership and school support. With successful programs in place, teacher librarians can then assume more responsibility for writing about their role and about collaboratively planned programs for professional journals read by teachers and administrators. (Contains 88 references.) (AEF)
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One often hears the refrain that there is no research in teacher-librarianship, no proof of effect on student achievement, no concrete evidence of value for money; if only there was some strong justification for school libraries and school librarians, there would be no need to advocate and lobby for adequate staff, collections and facilities. However, there is a strong research base for teacher-librarianship, there is evidence of effect on student achievement and there is ample justification for the presence and effective use of teacher-librarians and school library resource centers. Why then are there ongoing problems of support?

First, the research is not as well known to the profession as it should be and researchers and practitioners alike criticize when it took place, where it took place and with whom it took place. If we accepted our own research and built on it we would progress far beyond the generalization of a single experience and the intuition alone of the principal, teacher and teacher-librarian. Nothing is ever certain in a complex world but research which is reliable, valid and replicated has value and worth.

Second, even with what we do know about effective school library programs and services, we find it difficult to put them in place. Principals and teachers can be convinced of the value of the teacher-librarian and school resource center and hold an image of the appropriate and effective role of the principal, teacher and teacher-librarian as partners in the educational enterprise but the implementation still does not occur, and does not reach a stage of institutionalization, of becoming an integral, essential part of the fabric of the school. In this case the research in curriculum implementation and staff development can provide guidance for the successful initiation, implementation and institutionalization of school library programs.

The terms teacher-librarian and resource center are used here as these are common in many parts of the world. A teacher-librarian is a qualified teacher with successful classroom teaching experience and additional post-baccalaureate education in teacher-librarianship. The teacher-librarian performs a unified role, uniquely combining teacher and librarian, and may work full-time or part-time in the school resource center. The term resource center is similarly used for consistency; the resource center houses the school’s collection of curriculum resources, including information books and other media and imaginative literature; these are coherently and consistently organized for physical access and the teacher-librarian plans with classroom teachers to develop and implement programs which assure intellectual access by increasingly independent student learners.

Research in Teacher-librarianship

The research in teacher-librarianship is rich and diverse and recent publications provide useful guides to the research and scholarly literature (see Haycock, 1990; Krashen, 1993; Lance et al., 1993). This review is delimited to the characteristics of effective programs which affect student achievement in a significant way and which have the support of educational decision-makers like school principals and superintendents. It therefore does not include factors related to the selection and management of resources, to facilities or to general school and classroom practice.

There is a positive relationship between the level of resource center service available and student scholastic achievement. In schools with good resource centers and the services of a teacher-librarian (TL), students perform significantly better on tests for basic research skills, including locational skills, outlining and note-taking, and the knowledge and use of reference materials, including the use of a dictionary and an encyclopedia (Becker, 1970; Callison, 1979; Greve, 1974; McMillen, 1965; Nolan, 1989; Yarling, 1968); they also perform significantly better in the area of reading comprehension and in their ability to express ideas effectively concerning their readings (Yarling, 1968). Indeed, among school and community predictors of academic achievement, the size of the resource center staff and collection is second only to the absence of at-risk conditions, particularly pov-
tery and low educational attainment among adults (Lance, Welborn & Hamilton-Pennell, 1993), and of four other factors that predict student achievement—school resource center collection size; school resource center expenditure; public library collection size; public library expenditure—the greatest predictor is school resource center collection size (Greve, 1974).

The evidence is similarly clear that more reading is done where there is a school library and a teacher-librarian; children also read more where they live close to a public library (Krashen, 1993). Students in schools with centralized resource centers and teacher-librarians not only read more, they enjoy reading more (Lowe, 1984). A print-rich environment, including larger library collections, and a good reading environment, including comfort and quiet, affect reading, literacy development and reading scores (Krashen, 1993). Further, providing time for free voluntary reading in schools has a positive impact on reading comprehension, vocabulary development, spelling, written style, oral/aural language and control of grammar (Krashen, 1993).

School resource centers with full-time teacher-librarians even contribute to the development of positive self-concepts (McAfee, 1981). Why are these gains not realized in all situations and circumstances? First, the role of the teacher-librarian requires clarification if there is to be any improvement in existing resource center programs (Charter, 1982). Principals, teachers and teacher-librarians themselves have many misconceptions about the role of the TL in the instructional program (Bias, 1979; Burcham, 1989; Hambleton, 1980; Hodson, 1978; Jones, 1977; Kerr, 1973; Kim, 1981; Olson, 1966) such that school districts need to provide a clearer definition of the role of the TL (Markle, 1982). TLs need to take an active part in defining their role, particularly in cooperative program planning and teaching and need to communicate their role more effectively to principals and teachers, through in-service programs and through an emphasis on work with people more than management and production processes (Bechtel, 1975; Bias, 1979; Pichette, 1975; Sullivan, 1979). In fact, TLs who place a higher priority on personal relations offer more services to teachers and students; TLs who rate personal relations as a lower priority spend more time on circulation and related tasks (Adams, 1973).

Teacher-librarians require teaching qualifications and classroom experience prior to further education and training as a TL in order to be effective. Prior successful teaching experience is necessary for TLs to perceive and solve instructional problems (Van Dreser, 1971). Exemplary teacher-librarians, as identified in the professional literature and by exemplary principals, display the traits of exemplary teachers—as well, they plan with teachers, use flexible and innovative teaching and public relations approaches, teach well, provide continuous access, design flexible policies, and develop collections which support the curriculum (Alexander, 1992). More years of classroom teaching experience and more preparation in curriculum development and implementation are needed than is currently the case (Corr, 1979). Superintendents, principals and teachers consistently point to the need for teacher-librarians to have more classroom teaching experience if programs are to develop in a credible and successful way (Wilson, 1972).

The development of student competence is most effective when integrated with classroom instruction through cooperative program planning and team teaching by two equal teaching partners—the classroom teacher and the teacher-librarian (Callison, 1979). Minimal gains in research and study skills can be achieved through instruction by the classroom teacher or the teacher-librarian alone (Nolan, 1989). Effective instruction depends on the cooperative effort of both teacher and TL; stated another way, scheduled library skills classes taught solely by the TL are not as effective as integrated, cooperatively planned and taught programs (Smith, 1978). Indeed, not only do flexibly scheduled resource centers provide greater academic benefits, but students themselves believe that the resource center is more useful in their school work than students in scheduled schools (Hodson, 1978; Nolan, 1989). When flexibly scheduled, the TL and resource center can have a significant effect on student achievement in information handling and use and in content areas. Indeed, the most significant changes in library programs occur when the teacher-librarian moves to flexible scheduling and curriculum-integrated instruction; positive cooperative relations with teachers, administrators and students contribute to this success (Bishop, 1992).

It is difficult to imagine why teacher-librarians are not involved in cooperative program planning and team teaching with classroom colleagues as equal teaching partners to the extent that principals, teachers and teacher-
librarians themselves believe that they should be (Corr, 1979; Johnson, 1975; Kerr, 1975; Stanwich, 1982). If the teacher uses the resource center and consults with the TL about planning student work, then the use of the resource center is greater (Hartley, 1980). In fact, students rate schools more highly when there is agreement and communication among principals, teachers and TLs regarding program objectives, and where there is planned, consistent and integrated instruction in resource center use (Scott, 1982). Important factors which affect TL involvement in curricular issues include the principal's attitude towards the TL's role, teacher preference for TLs with successful teaching experience and a teacher's frame of reference, the number of support staff, and degree of teacher understanding of the role of the TL and the potential of the resource center (Corr, 1979). Perhaps most importantly, teacher-librarians require extensive training in cooperative program planning and teaching which builds on prior successful classroom teaching experience. Programs which educate teacher-librarians would do well to structure programs around cooperative program planning and teaching and the skills necessary to convince educators that TLs are vital partners in instruction (Royal, 1981). These competencies, however, tend not to be supervised in practica to the extent that other competencies are.

Cooperative program planning and teaching as an instructional development activity requires more social interaction with other teachers than is required of other roles of the TL yet there is a low level of communication between teachers and TLs (Urbanik, 1984). Teacher-librarians may also need education and training in social interaction skills. Teacher-librarians in exemplary resource centers are extroverted and independent: as leaders they have “tough poise” (Charter, 1982). Teacher-librarians who are less cautious and more extroverted than their colleagues tend to be more successful; the best pair of predictors of high circulation of materials in the resource center is high extroversion and a high degree of curriculum involvement by the TL (Madaus, 1974).

Since principals, teachers and teacher-librarians all agree on the importance of cooperative program planning and teaching, all three should be involved in resolving issues mitigating against substantial involvement. TLs need to organize more inservice training for colleagues (Callison, 1979; Hartley, 1980) and educators of TLs need to revise programs to include courses which foster cooperation and understanding between teachers and TLs (Royal, 1981).

There is also evidence that there are benefits to students when school and public libraries cooperate yet public librarians and teacher-librarians communicate very little with each other (Woolls, 1973) even though students who use school resource centers are more likely to have positive attitudes toward public libraries and to use those libraries (Ekechukwu, 1972). While duplication of services between school and public libraries may be lamented, it will not be rectified by administrators or practitioners in either institution: practitioners even question the motives behind overt suggestions for cooperation—self-preservation and protection of territory override the ideal of cooperation (Dyer, 1976). Adequate funding, staffing and “personality” most positively affect cooperation, while funding, staffing, governance at the state level and work schedules most adversely affect cooperation (Kelley, 1992).

Institutionalization of Change

The research literature provides considerable evidence and guidance as to what constitutes effectiveness in the implementation of any desired change (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). While this overview cannot do justice to the extent of research in this field sufficient conclusions can be drawn which can impact on the effective implementation of cooperative program planning and teaching, and flexible scheduling, across a school district.

The content of effective staff development is research-based (Cawelti, 1989; Griffin, 1987; Howey & Vaughan, 1983), proven effective (Hunter, 1986), practical (Guskey, 1986; Hunter, 1986; Nevi, 1986), and relevant to identified needs and problems faced in the classroom (Daresh, 1987; Elam et al., 1986; Howey & Vaughan, 1983; Orlich, 1989; Paquette, 1987; Rubin, 1987); these are all evident in the effective use of the teacher-librarian through cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling. Successful implementation requires that this new program have clear goals (Cato, 1990), that the nature of the change be explicit and realistic (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Pratt, 1980) and pay particular attention to the contexts, the schools and classrooms, in which teachers work (Griffin, 1987).

An effective implementation plan is
based on an understanding of the developmental aspects of change (Fullan, 1985; Fullan et al., 1986), sets clear expectations and manageable objectives (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988), incorporates realistic time lines (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989a; Dow et al., 1984; Loucks & Lieberman, 1983; Pratt, 1980), allocation of resources and monitoring and feedback procedures (Fullan & Park, 1981), and incorporates the professional development of consultants, principals and resource teachers as well as classroom teachers (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Fullan et al., 1986). In other words, change is a process, not an event like one workshop, and requires the understanding of all “stakeholders”.

A district policy to guide and support implementation and a district plan for a structured implementation process will prove helpful (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Dow et al., 1984; Fullan & Park, 1981; Lee & Wong, 1985; Mooradian, 1985; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). Priorities will need to be established among competing demands if a district is facing several curricula changes at once (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Dow et al., 1984); too often a district library media coordinator will lead a change effort in school library programs while other district and school administrators are leading changes in other areas which are competing for the same time, attention and resources—the response of the school is, understandably, to set its own priorities or to ignore them all.

The importance of the new approach, expectations for its use (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; Fullan & Park, 1981; Loucks & Lieberman, 1983), and implementation plans should be communicated widely throughout the system (Lee & Wong, 1985; Romberg & Price, 1983). Significant changes in behavior, roles and responsibilities expected of teachers need to be described in detail, clarifying both the similarities and differences with what they are already doing (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; Fullan et al., 1986), and teachers need the opportunity to discuss the implications and adaptation with colleagues (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b). Effective change procedures also require some pressure to change (Fullan, 1990) as well as a support system (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989a); this is often done by working with a school staff rather than through cross-district workshops in order to encourage both peer pressure and peer support to change.

Teacher-librarians and their advocates will need to work more effectively with senior education staff. School superintendents support the need for professional teacher-librarians and generally understand the potential impact of a teacher-librarian but they nevertheless often set other priorities (Lowden, 1980). Many superintendents believe that a teacher-librarian is an absolute necessity and few would staff a resource center with only an aide, but a sizable minority still see the TL as a luxury (Connors, 1984). While sometimes skeptical about the TL's and resource center's influence on teaching in the school, superintendents nevertheless believe that teachers would notice if the resource center was closed and teachers would have to teach differently (Connors, 1984). Superintendents also believe that the teaching background and experience of the TL may be too limited to support a significant impact on the school (Connors, 1984). Clearly, TLs and their superintendents need to communicate more often and more effectively if successful implementation is to take place (Payne, 1967).

Implementation requires the involvement and support of the right people and groups within the district at the right time; both educational and political criteria should be used to select a district planning committee to ensure the quality of the plan and its acceptability (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b). One goal is the creation of a well-informed group of teachers with a clear sense of mission and the confidence that can bring about change (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988); an internal advocacy group improves the chances for change by putting pressure on the people and the organization (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988).

The implementation of change requires persistent advocacy and continual leadership and school support (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b). Program leaders, like district coordinators, need to anticipate initial resistance to change, need to deal with how people feel about change, need to deal with conflicts, need to know what can be done to lessen anxiety and need to know how to facilitate the change process (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). The school library media coordinator can have a positive effect on school resource center program development in the school district (Coleman, 1982); even the existence of a coordinator seems to result in significantly higher implementation of guiding
principles for personnel, budget, purchasing, production, access and delivery systems, program evaluation, collections and facilities (Coleman, 1982), and the higher the coordinator's position is placed in the hierarchy, the wider the range of activities that can be performed in the development and regulation of school resource center programs and services (Carter, 1971). The coordinator must be more involved in curriculum and public relations work, however.

The role of the principal is the key factor in the development of an effective school resource center program. The principal is the single most important player in the change process and plays a direct and active role in leading any process of change by becoming familiar with the nature of the change and by working with staff to develop, execute and monitor a school implementation plan (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; Fullan & Park, 1981). Principals are in the strongest position to conduct personal advocacy of innovations in the schools (Pratt, 1980)—through visible and clear support the principal can significantly affect the implementation and institutionalization of educational change (Gersten, Carnine & Green, 1989). The district needs to provide training and follow-up for principals to take responsibility for facilitating implementation in their schools (Fullan & Park, 1981).

Successful implementation requires principal support both substantively (by ensuring resources are available and schedules are accommodating) and psychologically (by encouraging teachers, acknowledging their concerns, providing personal time and assistance, rewarding their efforts, and communicating that the implementation is a school priority) (Cato, 1990; Cox, 1989; Fullan & Park, 1981; Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986; Loucks & Lieberman, 1983; Virgilio & Virgilio, 1984). Successful implementation requires that principals create the climate (collegiality, communication and trust) (Fullan et al., 1986) and the mechanisms (time and opportunity, interaction, technical sharing and assistance, and ongoing staff development) to support the implementation of innovation (Cox, 1989; Fullan, 1985; Fullan et al., 1986; Pratt, 1980). Even the attitude of the principal toward the role of the teacher-librarian affects the TL's involvement in curricular issues (Corr, 1979). Indeed, exemplary school resource centers are characterized by strong administrative support (Charter, 1982; Shields, 1977). Principals in schools with exemplary resource center programs integrate the resource center in instructional programs, encourage student and teacher use and provide flexible scheduling (Hellene, 1973).

Plans for effective staff development recognize that change is a gradual and difficult process (Guskey, 1986), provide sufficient time to produce demonstrable results (Hunter, 1986; Rubin, 1987) and demonstrate that the strategies will bring about short and long term benefits to students (Rubin, 1987). Short presentations can be invaluable as awareness sessions and in helping people to make decisions about those areas where extended workshops would be beneficial (Nevi, 1986) but they will not result in changed practice. The steps in effective staff development include the presentation of information or theory, modeling or demonstration of the change, an opportunity to practice, feedback (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1985; British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989), and on-site assistance to staff in the form of technical assistance, coaching and/or peer support (Cawelti, 1989; Hunter, 1986; Kent, 1985; Rubin, 1987; Showers et al., 1987; Sparks & Bruder, 1987; Van Sant, 1988). This is particularly effective through a collegial support system that values growth activities, provides moral support and facilitates small group interaction (McGiffin, 1990; Paquette, 1987).

Building on the research in teacher-librarianship—through role clarification, cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling—and in curriculum implementation and staff development—through careful planning, effective leadership, credible in-service and coaching, with both pressure and support—teacher-librarians and other educators can implement the major changes required for TLs and resource centers to become effective agents for student achievement. Too often we believe so much in the value of our programs that we think that a "one-shot" workshop will change the way principals schedule, the way teachers teach and the way teacher-librarians plan with colleagues, and then we are disappointed when these changes do not occur. The implementation of a change as significant as cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling, however, requires the involvement of all the partners and systematic and ongoing training, pressure and support.

With successful programs in place, teacher-librarians can then assume more responsibility for writing about their role and
about collaboratively planned programs for professional journals read by teachers and administrators (Mack, 1957). This accepted means of communication is not being used to its fullest potential in communicating the contribution of teacher-librarians and school resource centers and the curricular role of the TL (Van Orden, 1970), and this can be done effectively only by TLs themselves (Holzberlein, 1971). It is critical that principals and teachers read about exciting approaches such as resource-based teaching and learning in the journals that they read since they are not going to read ours. The successes of cooperatively planned and taught units of study need to be celebrated not only in our publications but also in the publications of our teacher partners and in the publications of principal leaders.

For an information profession, we need only learn from our research and build on its precepts in order to become that force for excellence that is within our grasp. We have the evidence that we can make a difference through cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling; we have the principles for the effective initiation, implementation and institutionalization of change. Now we need only do it.
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