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The purpose of this experimental study was to determine which public relations methods would best inform the first through fifth grade classroom teaching staff at Holly Heights School about the work of the library media center, the roles of the library media specialist, and the research that states how important collaborative educational activities are for students, so that teaching staff members would choose to participate in some type of collaborative instructional activities with the library media specialist to benefit the students. This study was conducted with 18 first through fifth grade teaching staff members at Holly Heights Elementary School in Millville, New Jersey using three variables. Pre-experimental and post-experimental treatment observations were recorded and examined.

The researcher concluded that no one public relations method informed or influenced the subjects to actively seek out collaborative educational activities with the library media specialist. Other conclusions included the fact that there was an interest in collaborative activities in the future, that the amount of time for information sharing with the subjects needs to be increased, and that time to plan collaborative educational activities is a major concern to teachers.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

According to the American Association of School Librarians' *Information Power* (1998), library media specialists' four roles are program administrator, information specialist, instructional partner, and collaborative teacher. All of these roles are important to the student body, staff, and administration of a school system. Yet, the third and fourth roles, instructional partner and collaborative teacher, are considerably harder to fulfill because of the need for collaborative partners, such as classroom teachers. In order for this partnership to become a reality, school library media specialists need to use public relations methods to garner partners and collaborators.

*Information Power* (AASL, 1998) continues, “A well-documented, well-publicized program affirms its own excellence and demonstrates its value to the entire learning community. An effective program increases its stature through regular, systematic communication about its mission, goals, functions, achievements, and overall impact” (p.112). In essence, the school library media specialist needs to sell his/her roles, successes, and the goals of the library media center. The library program needs to be publicized to the educational community, just like any other business advertising to its clientele.

Significance of Problem

Studies have shown that strong library media center programs enhance student learning. Higher achievement test scores have been shown to be related to the amount of
time students receive instruction from a certified library media specialist (Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, and Rodney, 1999). High schools with the best achievement test scores have library media specialists who are more likely than those from other high schools, to plan collaboratively with classroom teachers (Lance, Rodney, and Hamilton-Pennell, 2001). Another study recommended that all elementary school libraries be staffed with a credentialed library media specialist who engages in collaborative instruction with classroom teachers to enhance learning and achievement (Todd, Kuhlthau, and OELMA, 2003).

In his speech at the 2002 White House Conference on School Libraries, researcher Dr. Keith Curry Lance stated, “When school librarians demonstrate...leadership...they can create an environment conducive to collaboration between themselves and classroom teachers” (Lance, 2002, Collaboration & Information Literacy, ¶ 1). Research results do indeed show that classroom teachers and library media specialists need to be collaborative educational partners for the good of the students. The question that logically follows is, “but how to make it happen”?

Purpose of Study

Fixed library schedules, unawareness of the beneficial affects of collaboration, overwhelming daily schedules, lack of interest, and lack of understanding of how collaboration works, all limit classroom teachers and library media specialists from working as collaborative partners. Yet, classroom teachers’ lack of knowledge and understanding of the library media specialist’s role may be a far greater problem than any of the others. One way to begin to solve this major problem is for public relations
methods to be employed by the school library media specialist to advertise the jobs of the media specialist and to boast about the successes of the school library program.

Research results showed the importance of strong, collaboration-based library media centers in schools. Yet, there was little research which presented evidence, for school library media specialists, to indicate which public relations methods can promote more knowledge of a library media specialist's role, and therefore, more library use and collaborative partnerships.

Many classroom teachers in the Holly Heights Elementary School were unable or unwilling to work collaboratively with the library media specialist. Using an experimental model, the purpose of this study was to determine which public relations methods would best inform the first through fifth grade classroom teaching staff at Holly Heights School about the work of the library media center, the roles of the library media specialist, and the research that states how important collaborative educational activities are for students, so that teaching staff members would choose to participate in some type of collaborative instructional activities with the library media specialist to benefit the students.

The information gained from this research was important because students perform better and learn more when collaboration occurs between teachers and library media specialists. The information was considerably more important to library media specialists who find it difficult to fulfill their roles as instructional partners and collaborative teachers. Elementary schools, in particular, need to ignite the collaborative spirit in teachers for the good of the children. Library media specialists need to be allowed to fulfill their role as collaborative teachers for students to learn deeper and
achieve more. School library media specialists need to advertise and sell themselves to
the educational community.

Definitions of Terms

Abbott school – a school in “one of New Jersey’s 30 poor urban school districts”
(New Jersey State Department of Education, 2005).

Classroom teacher – “an instructor” (McCain & Merrill, 2001, p. 192). For
purposes of this research, classroom teacher, teacher, and staff are used interchangeably.

Collaboration – “refers to the cooperative efforts between teachers and library
media specialists to plan, develop, and implement information literacy skills into the
classroom curriculum” (p. 40).

Cooperative planning – “collaboration between teachers and library media
specialists to integrate information literacy skills into the classroom curriculum. The
term is used interchangeably with collaborative planning” (p. 47).

Cooperative teaching – “implementation of information literacy skills into
classroom instruction by both the teacher and the library media specialist. This term is
used interchangeably with collaborative teaching” (p. 47).

Fixed library schedules – “a way to use the library media center where classes are
scheduled for a specific day and time regardless of student need” (p. 75).

Flexible schedules – “a type of library media center organization that permits
classes and individual students to use the library media center as the need arises” (p. 75).

Library media center – “an area in a school that contains varied formats of
materials and equipment with programs and services provided by a library media
specialist and additional staff...” (p. 113). For purposes of this research, LMC is used as an abbreviation.

Library media specialist – “the professional administrator of a library media center who has the appropriate degree and meets the requirements for state certification” (p. 114). The researcher is the library media specialist in this experimental study. For purposes of this study, the terms librarian, teacher-librarian, or LMS are used interchangeably.

Program – “a plan or system, such as a library media program or a school instructional program, that is developed and implemented” (p. 157).

Public relations – “(PR) activities, programs, and marketing techniques designed to promote public understanding of the policies, procedures, programs, and services of a library” (p. 160). This term is used interchangeably with advertising and advocacy.

Assumptions and Limitations

This experimental research was conducted in Holly Heights School in Millville, New Jersey, one of six elementary schools within the district. The researcher assumed that the teachers would respond in some way when approached by the library media specialist. The assumption was also made that the teaching staff did not understand the instructional partner and collaborative teaching roles of the library media specialist. The researcher assumed, too, that some teachers were open to discovering new ways to teach the students of Holly Heights School that might promote their learning and advance student achievement.

This research did have its limitations. The experimental research was being conducted at only one school in the Millville Public School District; therefore, the results
of the experiment were limited to only this school and cannot be generalized. Since this research was being done within a 45 school day time period, it was impossible to test every single public relations method in this one building in a limited amount of time.

As the researcher planned for this experimental research within the Holly Heights School, it was understood that advertising does need to be consistent and repetitious. Teachers are creatures of habit and, like in any other profession, find change hard at times. This experimental research was completed with respect for the teaching profession and with the utmost hope that the teaching staff at Holly Heights School was informed about the roles of the library media specialist in any event.
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CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

*Information Power* (AASL, 1998) stated, “A well-documented, well-publicized program affirms its own excellence and demonstrates its value to the entire learning community. An effective program increases its stature through regular, systematic communication about its mission, goals, functions, achievements, and overall impact” (p. 112). A school library media center needs to sell itself and share its goals to the entire school community. A school library needs to market itself and advertise as if it were a product. The library media center needs to highlight its successes and focus on the opportunities which are available to all members of the learning community. A school library media center needs to employ public relations techniques in order to sell the library media specialist’s roles as a collaborative teacher and an instructional partner.

Research on the Importance of Collaboration

There is no doubt that collaboration is essential for school library media specialists to fulfill their roles as instructional partners and collaborative teachers within their schools. Dr. Keith Curry Lance (2002) wrote that his six state studies, beginning in 2000, “indicate that students perform better academically where the LMS is part of a planning and teaching team with the classroom teachers...” (p. 3) He further reported that one successful predictor of library media development was staff activities. “Key activities...” were the “library media specialist’s roles as...a provider of in-service
training to teachers; a school leader…, and a collaborator with classroom teachers in the planning and delivery of instruction” (p. 4-5).

In the Alaska state study, Dr. Lance and his associates (1999) found that the more time the LMS devoted to “planning instructional units cooperatively with teachers and providing in-service training to teachers and other staff” (p. 2) the higher students’ test scores.

In the Ohio Research Study Fact Sheet, Dr. Ross J. Todd (2004) recommended that all schools be staffed with librarians “who engage in collaborative instructional initiatives” and who fulfill the role as an “educational partner-leader who mutually collaborates, negotiates, and plans with school administrators, teachers, students and parents…” (p. 1). In the final reflections section of the study, Dr. Todd and his associates (2004) stated,

The dynamics of the school librarian as an information-learning specialist, working mutually with classroom teachers to foster opportunities for students to learn well in information age schools, particularly through effective school libraries needs to be positioned as mainstream educational best practice in both programs of teacher education and education of school libraries (p. 25).

In the Texas school libraries research study, Dr. Smith (2001) identified four variables relating to teaching activities, school library media specialists, and students’ achievement scores. They were “planning instructional units with teachers, teaching cooperatively with teachers, providing training to teachers, and assisting teachers in accessing…information…” (p. 95).
All of these studies concluded that the library media specialist must collaborate and cooperate with classroom teachers in order to create the best over-all learning environment for students in schools. Getting to that point is the problem for most school library media specialists.

In an article entitled “What Works? Marketing? Public Relations? Yes, and More- Advocacy Background,” Wallace (2004) stated that on-going advocacy was the central step along the continual path to teacher and library media specialist collaboration. Building alliances with teachers contributes to their knowledge base about the role of the library media specialist. Library media specialists need to become the changing force, or leaders. Library media specialists need to connect all interested parties and then provide them the care they need in a personal relationship of learning. The library media specialist provides the energy to maintain interest and involvement. Wallace noted that not only does marketing and public relations work, but an advocacy base must be present to produce change and to develop the collaborative spirit needed in schools.

So, in order to develop the advocacy base and build upon it, in order to share what the library media center has available and what the media specialist can do to collaborate and be a partner with teachers, there must be public relations efforts.

Literature Promoting Public Relations

No research was found that provided answers to library media specialists’ questions on how to promote the library media center and the media specialist so that classroom teachers clamor to collaborate with them. However, there were suggestions on how to promote the center and the work the media specialist does.
In her book, *New Steps to Service: Common Sense Advice for the School Library Media Specialist* (1998), Ann Wasman wrote that it was up to the LMS to inform all patrons, including the teaching staff and administration, about the programs and positive benefits of the library media center. “This is done by informing, educating, and involving all parties-by developing good public relations” (p. 197). She suggested a two-step approach. Step one was to do good work. Step two was to tell someone about it. The good work of the library media specialist cannot be spread by keeping quiet. In her opinion the library media specialist must be consistent and persistent.

Wasman (1998) did suggest some public relations ideas. They included creating “stories or photo essays about ‘how the LMC saved my day’”; requesting that teaching staff “send letters to parents explaining units to be undertaken in the LMC with the library media specialist as a teammate and inviting them to visit”; or having the staff “invite the principal, a board member, or the superintendent to see the results of class work in the LMC or just send the resulting projects to a school board meeting” (p. 199). She pointed out that none of these activities could be accomplished without a library media specialist’s participation or initiation. She recommended focusing on one target group a month.

Wasman (1998) also suggested that the key was focusing attention on the library media center. The library media specialist should “…initiate one big project each year that generates lots of involvement with significant numbers of students and teachers and that can culminate in a public program…Above all, don’t be afraid to take credit, to get recognition, and to let others know you ‘done good’” (p. 202).
Carol Keamey, author of *Curriculum Partner: Redefining the Role of the Library Media Specialist* (2000) stated that the library media specialist can restructure and redefine his/her role by focusing on one individual or small group at a time. Library media specialists must use leadership skills in order to promote their new roles. Leadership in writing and planning curriculum, assisting teachers in teaching their content areas through informational aid and cooperative teaching, understanding teachers’ roles, and initiating in-service to meet teachers’ needs, were all steps in the leadership process. In Kearney’s opinion building partnerships with administrators and teaching staff can overcome challenges in the process of restructuring and redefining the role of the library media specialist.

Kearney (2000) focused one entire chapter in her book on redefining leadership for the library media specialist. To her, leadership began with a vision that inspires others. The second ingredient was using good communication skills. Kearney identified demonstrating trust and being an expert in the field as the next two parts of developing a library media specialist’s leadership role in the school. Effective personal skills round out a good leader and make the person easier to work with on a daily basis. According to Kearney, being a leader was the first phase of good public relations.

In his article “The Invisible School Librarian,” Gary Hartzell (1997) stated “unless the library is forcibly brought to the attention of teachers and administrators, it’s likely to go unnoticed and undervalued” (p. 25). He pointed out that teachers and administrators do not think in terms of library media specialists as “teacher, staff developer, or instructional consultant” but rather as “support resources” (p. 25). Hartzell argued that “the role and contributions of school libraries” (p. 27) must be made visible.
He stressed that there was no limit to the way one can make oneself visible in the role of library media specialist. He suggested that library media specialists need to increase their influence. Interacting with educators and parents, influence-building among educators in the school, and interpersonal workplace relationships were all suggestions on how to continually build influence. Hartzell also pointed out that presenting in-service for classroom teachers builds influence and “gather(s) recognition and support from other educators…” (p.29) He stated that teachers were not aware that library media specialists “can provide new approaches to teaching and learning” (p.25).

Researcher Ken Haycock (2003) stated in one of his speeches,

Teacher librarians who are less cautious and more extroverted also tend to be more successful. They demonstrate tough poise. Circulation of materials increases when the teacher librarian demonstrates more extroverted behaviors and greater curricular involvement. Similarly, as personal relationships increase as a priority, services increase (p. 4).

Haycock (2003) also pointed out that the Association for Teacher Librarianship in Canada and the Canadian School Library Association specify professional competencies for teacher librarians, including that the teacher librarian “places a priority on staff relationships and leadership…” and “provides appropriate information, resources or instruction to satisfy the needs of individuals and groups” (p. 4).

Satisfaction is important to patrons, including teaching staff. “There is no better publicity medium than a satisfied user,” announced the Library Imagination Paper (PR for School Libraries, 2003). The authors touted involvement as the “key word for successful PR” and suggested that LMS get the “faculty involved in the choice of new
materials and in the effective use of materials already in the library—they can’t use what they don’t know about” (p. 2).

In “38 Steps to a Well-Rounded PR Program,” learning resource specialist Deborah Cavitt (1998) provided ideas for promoting the library media center. She suggested providing teachers with the library schedule, providing lists of new materials, sharing clip art, and printing out resource lists of software and important websites. She recommended a suggestion box in the library, delivering materials personally whenever possible, and sending cards or bookmarks to celebrate teachers’ birthdays. Cavitt also suggested that the LMS clip newspaper articles that feature staff and deliver the clippings to staff members. She recommended collecting sports event schedules, recipes, and other items of personal or school interest and giving them out to teachers during special celebration weeks during the year, all in the name of public relations.

In 1997, the Library Research Service reported on workshops conducted to develop the “marketing and customer service skills of school library media specialists” and to encourage them to “understand that the status of their positions can be largely attributed to factors under their own control” (1998, p.1). In a follow-up survey of the LMS involved in the workshops, respondents indicated that “teachers...consider library media specialist positions more essential, thanks to the changes flowing from the workshops” and “nine out of ten responding participants report improved communication with colleagues...” (p.2). The marketing and communication skills all contributed to better public relations, better understanding of the library media specialist’s job, and improved customer service.
At a recent Educational Media Association of New Jersey Conference (2004), library consultant Nancy Miller, and researcher and internationally known presenter Connie Champlin presented a workshop entitled “Collaborating for Achievement: A Winning Combination in Elementary School Programs.” Their message was clear. Library media specialists must market their programs “to change perceptions of who we are, to gain and maintain respect as a valuable asset and to demonstrate with data” the contributions we make (Miller, 2004).

Summary

All of the suggested ideas presented may lead to more collaborative instructional activities between library media specialists and classroom teachers. Yet there were no definitive public relations methods identified that have been proven to work best when marketing a school library media center to classroom teachers. Did such public relations methods exist that increased the use of the library media center for collaborative instructional activities to benefit the students of an elementary school?

There is no doubt the four roles, according to the American Association of School Librarians (1998), that library media specialists perform must be discussed and then understood. Leadership, communication, information, personal relationships, and advertising are just a few of the skills a library media specialist needs to rely on to create a collaborative situation with classroom teachers.

The American Association of School Librarians stated, “A well-documented, well-publicized program affirms its own excellence and demonstrates its value to the entire learning community. An effective program increases its stature through regular,
systematic communication about its mission, goals, functions, achievements, and overall impact" (1998, p. 112).

Good public relations are the key. Finding the best working method was the problem to be solved.
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CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this experimental study was to determine which public relations methods would best inform the first through fifth grade classroom teaching staff at Holly Heights School about the work of the library media center, the roles of the library media specialist, and the research that states how important collaborative educational activities are for the students, so that teaching staff members would choose to participate in some type of collaborative instructional activities with the library media specialist.

Research Question

The research question for this study was: Which public relations methods were best to use with classroom teachers so that those teachers would choose to work collaboratively on instructional activities with the library media specialist to benefit the students?

Design and Justification

Powell (1997) stated, “Applied research...emphasizes providing information that is immediately usable in the resolution of actual problems” (p.45). This experimental study model searched for answers to help the library media specialist fulfill the roles as outlined in the AASL’s Information Power (1998).
This experimental research was important to perform. Research in library studies and services are usually not done this way, but Powell (1997) stated, “…experimental research holds significant potential for the resolution of library-related problems” (p. 131).

Past research has shown that collaboration between classroom teachers and the LMS had positive affects on students and student achievement, but little has been written in the literature about how the LMS should go about achieving this cooperative spirit with the teaching staff. Historical research and survey or interview methodology would not provide the researcher with the information needed in order to discover the best public relations methods. An experimental model was necessary so that causal relationships might be established. A causal relationship occurs when a single event takes place and that in turn makes another event transpire. The causal relationship, in this study, was between the public relations methods employed by the researcher and the use of the library and the library media specialist’s services; in particular, use for collaborative activities by classroom teachers in grades one through five.

Population and Sample

The population and sample for this experimental study were the first through fifth grade classroom teachers at Holly Heights School in Millville, New Jersey. This is an Abbott school district in southern New Jersey. The school houses kindergarten through fifth grades. There were 24 classroom teachers in grades kindergarten through five, but only 18 teaching staff members were involved in the study, since the kindergarten and resource room teachers were not included.
For this experimental study, the teaching staff members were randomly assigned to groups. The researcher drew grade level teacher names from a bag to randomly assign subjects to experimental and control groups. Each subject was assigned an identification number (see Table 1) where the numeral represented the subject's grade level and the capital letter was randomly assigned to protect the subject's identity.

**Table 1**
*Teachers Randomly Assigned to Experimental and Control Groups, Stratified by Grade Level*

n=18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gr. 1</th>
<th>Gr. 2</th>
<th>Gr. 3</th>
<th>Gr. 4</th>
<th>Gr. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
<td>5C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Classroom teachers were given ID numbers so as not to reveal their identity.

**Variables**

There were independent and dependent variables in this study. The independent, or experimental variable, was the type of public relations method the researcher employed. The three methods included in the experiment were: Casual Face-to-face Contact between the classroom teachers and the LMS; Coffee and Cake Connection; and The Holly Herald Special Limited Edition. Table 2 shows the planned treatment schedule.

The dependent variable, or effect, is changed by the independent variable. In this study, it was hoped that the change in teachers' use of the LMC and LMS, or the dependent variable, would be displayed in post-experimental record keeping.
Table 2

**Planned Experimental Treatment Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Day/Date</th>
<th>Grade Treated</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Teacher ID</th>
<th>Which Treatment?</th>
<th>Where Treatment Took Place?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mon./Jan. 24</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Holly Herald Special Limited Edition</td>
<td>Mailboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tues./Jan.25</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3B, 3C</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed./Jan 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs./Jan. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri./Jan 28</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1B, 1D, 2B, 2C</td>
<td>Coffee and Cake Connection</td>
<td>LMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mon./Jan.31</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Holly Herald Special Limited Edition</td>
<td>Mailboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tues./Feb. 1</td>
<td>4th &amp; 5th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4A, 4B, 5B</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed./Feb.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs./Feb. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri./Feb. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mon./Feb.7</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Holly Herald Special Limited Edition</td>
<td>Mailboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tues./Feb. 8</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1B, 1D</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed./Feb.9</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2B, 2C</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs./Feb. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri./Feb.11</td>
<td>4th &amp; 5th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4A, 4B, 5B</td>
<td>Coffee and Cake Connection</td>
<td>LMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Make-up day to allow for teacher/researcher absences

*b Researcher out of building
Casual Face-to-face Contact between the experimental classroom teachers and the researcher included a 10-15 minute 8:30 AM morning classroom visit to individual teachers to talk about what the library media specialist offers and an abbreviated discussion handout of research by Keith Curry Lance (2002) to support the importance of collaboration (see Appendix A). Each teacher in the experimental group was visited once within the 15 day time period the experiment took place. The control group teachers were not visited.

Coffee and Cake Connection was a breakfast meeting held in the library media center three different times, focusing on various grade levels in the 15 day time period. Invitations were delivered to teachers’ mailboxes five days beforehand (see Appendix F). A reminder note was delivered to the mailbox the night before the Coffee and Cake Connection. On the specified morning, by grade levels, the experimental group classroom teachers met between 8:30 and 8:55 AM with the researcher inside the library, discussing goals and collaborative activities available to them and their students. An article entitled “The Essential Link” by Lee Sherman (2003) which focused on the positive effects of library media specialists and library media centers on students including past research was reviewed, discussed and commented on during the Coffee and Cake Connection (see Appendix B). Coffee, orange juice and cake were available for those attending these morning meetings. The control group teachers did not participate.

The Holly Herald Special Limited Edition sheets were supplemental information sheets published in the same vein as the library media center monthly newsletter, The Holly Herald. The three Holly Herald Special Limited Editions highlighted research on...
the effects of school library media centers on students and ideas on collaborative instructional activities available to the teaching staff and their students. Book lists and websites matching classroom curriculum, suggestions on how and where the teachers and the LMS could meet to develop collaborative activities and plans, and essential vocabulary were provided (see Appendix C).

During the experiment, all 18 teachers from both the experimental and control groups from grades one through five, received a Holly Herald Special Limited Edition in their mailboxes. Only the nine subjects in the experimental group were visited with a Casual Face-to-face Contact meeting in their classrooms. The same nine subjects also were treated with a Coffee and Cake Connection on a rotating basis according to grade level.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

The pre- and post-experimental data collections for this study were very similar. The researcher created a chart to record the day of the week, date and time of any contacts with teachers relating to library and library media specialist services. The data collected also included the initiator of the contact, the request, and whether or not the request was met satisfactorily. A comments section was added to the chart to help the researcher recall important events related to the contact, if any.

In the pre-experimental phase, data were simply collected over a 15 school day time period through record keeping. These log entries (see Table 3) show the date, day and time of the encounter, as well as who initiated the encounter and if the results were satisfactory to either party.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon./Nov. 8, 2004</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>2nd/2B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Request through a note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./Nov. 9</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>5th/5B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed./Nov. 10a</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>2nd/2B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Info. On Compass Rose</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Request through a teacher's aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs./Nov. 11</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>2nd/2B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Sharing a book</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri./Nov. 12</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>2nd/2D</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>I Love to Write Day</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon./Nov. 15</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Hallway</td>
<td>5th/5A, 5B, 5C, 2nd/2A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./Nov. 16a</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Hallway</td>
<td>1st/1C</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Book list for girls</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed./Nov. 17</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Hallway</td>
<td>1st/1A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Shows researcher art project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs./Nov. 18</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Hallway</td>
<td>1st/1A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Shares art w/researcher</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri./Nov. 19</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Hallway</td>
<td>1st/1A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon./Nov. 22a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./Nov. 23a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed./Nov. 24a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon./Nov. 29a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./Nov. 30a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a No contacts were made on these days.
The post-experimental log was set up exactly the same way. The data was collected for 15 school days after the 15 day treatment. The only difference was that an independent variable was added to the chart if the researcher was able to ascertain by questioning the classroom teacher, if a particular public relations method, influenced them in any way. The researcher also kept a daily journal, noting any interesting observations and adding opinions while conducting the 15 school day experimental section of this research (see Appendix D).

Reliability and Validity

This experimental research was reliable for the defined sample. The population and sample in this study consisted of elementary school classroom teachers for grades one through five. Therefore, this experimental research was conducted on a homogeneous group. This fact lends credibility to the results.

The data collection method was simple and repeatable. The logs were based on a design suggested by Dr. M. L. Shontz (personal communication, October 11, 2004). This experiment could be repeated in another location, such as another similar elementary school with a library media center.

The researcher hoped to identify causal relationships between the public relations methods used in the experiment and the use of the library media center and library media specialist by the classroom teachers. If the researcher can guarantee no other relationships causing a change in the teachers' behaviors, then this experimental research was internally valid. If the findings of this experiment hold up when conducted by other sources, then this experimental design also has external validity.
Data Analysis

Once the post-experimental 15-day time period expired, the researcher looked at the pre-and post-treatment observation logs to discern any differences in the types of contacts made and the requests. These differences helped the researcher draw conclusions about a treatment's effect on the participant groups.
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CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Purpose

The purpose of this experimental study was to determine which public relations methods would best inform the first through fifth grade classroom teaching staff at Holly Heights School about the work of the library media center, the roles of the library media specialist, and the research that states how important collaborative educational activities are for students, so that teaching staff members would choose to participate in some type of collaborative instructional activities with the library media specialist to benefit the students.

Pre-Treatment Observations

Pre-treatment observations were made for 15 school days prior to administering the three treatments to the experimental group of subjects. The 15 observation days included eight days of contact between the teachers and the LMS. Seven of the contacts were teacher initiated, while one initiated by the LMS. None of those were collaborative in nature, yet all requests were met satisfactorily. Pre-treatment observations noted in the researcher's log included subjects looking for particular books, asking the LMS for information and sources of information and sharing class work/projects with the LMS (see Table 3).
Experimental Treatment

Prior to the beginning of the actual experimental treatment in January, 2005 (see Table 4) all participants received a consent letter explaining that they may be involved in some activities with the LMS but that they were able to decline to participate at any time (see Appendix E).

Experiment One

Holly Herald Special Limited Edition

Even though all classroom teachers, n=18, received the Holly Herald Special Limited Edition (see Appendix C) in their mailboxes, only five of the nine control subjects responded in any way, during the treatment, to the Holly Herald Special Limited Edition. Interestingly, control subjects 5A, 5C, 1A, 1C, and 2D requested information on what to do after they read the Holly Herald Special Limited Edition that was placed in their mailboxes. Teacher 2D apologized to the researcher for not showing up to a Coffee and Cake Connection even though 2D was not invited. Teacher 1A approached the researcher to report that the subject knew the researcher wanted teachers to use the library more. Teacher 1A then proceeded to ask the researcher to help students find out simple facts about Washington and Lincoln for a classroom writing project. None of the experimental group subjects responded to the Special Limited Editions in any way during the experiment.

One control subject showed a response to the papers in the post treatment observation although none of the experimental subjects did. Teacher 4C revealed to the researcher that her class was studying animals in science. Teacher 4C whispered it to the researcher as she dropped her class off at the LMC for a scheduled 40 minute period.
Table 4
Actual Experimental Treatment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Day/Date</th>
<th>Grade Treated</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Teacher ID</th>
<th>Which Treatment?</th>
<th>Where Treatment Took Place?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mon./Jan. 24, 2005&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Holly Herald Special Limited Edition</td>
<td>Mailboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue./Jan. 25</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed./Jan. 26</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3B, 3C</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs./Jan. 27&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri./Jan. 28</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1B, 1D, 2B, 2C</td>
<td>Coffee and Cake Connection</td>
<td>LMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mon./Jan. 31</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Holly Herald Special Limited Edition</td>
<td>Mailboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue./Feb. 1</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4A, 4B, 5B</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed./Feb. 2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs./Feb. 3</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3B,3C</td>
<td>Coffee and Cake Connection</td>
<td>LMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri./Feb. 4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mon./Feb. 7&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue./Feb. 8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wcd./Feb. 9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All 1B</td>
<td>Holly Herald Special Limited Edition</td>
<td>Mailboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs./Feb. 10</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1D, 2B, 2C</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri./Feb. 11</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4A, 4B, 4B</td>
<td>Coffee and Cake Connection</td>
<td>LMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>School closed-snow
<sup>b</sup>Make-up day to allow for teacher/researcher absences
<sup>c</sup>Researcher out of building
<sup>d</sup>Unforeseen circumstances
Later, when the researcher asked Teacher 4C why she shared that information, she replied it was "because of the papers [Holly Herald Special Limited Editions] that have been in my mailbox."

Experiment Two

Casual Face-to Face Contact

Grade Three

The Casual Face-to-face Contact classroom visits to the experimental third grade group subjects began with a review of a brief synopsis handout of Keith Curry Lance's research (see Appendix A). Grade three experimental teachers 3B and 3C listened intently. The researcher explained how collaboration works and how a working schedule could be made if the teacher was interested. The researcher gave examples of how the teacher and LMS could work together. Both teachers had ideas for topics that could be covered, but neither wanted to plan something definitely. Teacher 3C suggested the LMS come into work with her students on pop-up books to go with a new story the third graders were working on in a week or so.

Grades Four and Five

Experimental Teacher 4A welcomed the researcher into the classroom, but continued to work on other things while the researcher discussed the brief research handout (see Appendix A). A discussion ensued about when such an activity could happen and the teacher was informed that the LMC was open most of the day on Mondays for collaborative work to happen. The researcher reminded the Teacher 4A that plans could be made for a collaborative project in the future, while the teacher continued to work on her classroom preparedness.
Experimental teacher 4B listened intently to the synopsis of the research handout, but believed it was a stressful time of year for her because of having to prepare for the standardized tests. Teacher 4B mentioned that animals would be a topic in science later in the year and the researcher suggested that Teacher 4B approach her as the time drew nearer, when Teacher 4B felt she could work collaboratively.

Experimental Teacher 5B listened while the research handout was reviewed. When the researcher suggested that she could help with research and projects for the fifth grade, the Teacher 5B responded that another fifth grade teacher was in charge of research. Teacher 5B reminded the researcher that she does work with the LMS by explaining about skills she teaches in her language arts class, such as visualizing. This teacher previously asked the researcher to have students do this within the library while listening to stories.

Grade Two

Experimental Teachers 2B and 2C were visited at the same time in the same classroom. The researcher reviewed the research handout (see Appendix A). The teachers understood the concept and realized they would need to have time to plan with the LMS. The researcher stressed that if they were interested, the LMS would see to it that there was a time for meeting and planning. Teacher 2B was also concerned about when, during the school day, the collaborative activities would take place. The discussion of time on Mondays was reviewed.

Grade One

Experimental Teacher 1B sat and listened to the researcher review handout (see Appendix A) while working on preparing for class. She did not respond to the review or
to suggestions of how collaboration could work between her and the LMS. Teacher 1B took the handout and thanked the researcher.

Experimental Teacher 1D was welcoming and stood next to the researcher while the research review was conducted (see Appendix A). She understood the concept and thought collaboration was a good idea. The researcher asked Teacher 1D to keep it in mind for upcoming lessons or units.

Experiment Three

Coffee and Cake Connection

Grades One and Two

Only two of the four experimental subjects from Grades One and Two invited to their Coffee and Cake Connection arrived and participated, and one of those two was late. Experimental Teacher 1D listened as the researcher spent about five minutes going over the handout “The Essential Link” (see Appendix B). The researcher explained the roles of the LMS and the fact that collaboration is good for students. Then experimental Teacher 2C entered the LMC. The researcher began to discuss examples of how the LMS could work with the teachers and science books were on display as a topic of discussion. Teacher 2C quickly turned the conversation to the new science curriculum for next year and the discussion did not return to the LMS. Teacher 1D, the first teacher to show up that morning, thought she might use the LMC to help with National Poetry Month this year.

Not all of the experimental subjects arrived at the LMC for Coffee and Cake Connection during their scheduled time. The absent subjects chose not to participate for unknown reasons.
Grade Three

Both experimental Teachers 3B and 3C were late coming into the LMC for Coffee and Cake Connection. The article, “The Essential Link” (see Appendix B) was reviewed focusing on highlighted areas and research. The subject of arranging a time for when to do a collaborative project was discussed. New reference books had just been ordered for the LMC, so the teachers were informed that those books would be handy if either teacher decided to work on a collaborative project with the LMS.

Grades Four and Five

Only one fourth grade subject, experimental Teacher 4B, showed up in the LMC. Experimental Teacher 5B arrived late to the Coffee and Cake Connection. The article, “The Essential Link” (see Appendix B) was reviewed and the issue of time for working collaboratively was raised by both subjects. They were both congenial and listened thoughtfully. As these teachers left the LMC, it came to the researcher’s attention that the other fourth grade experimental subject’s invitation had been delivered to the wrong mailbox. The researcher immediately went to experimental Teacher 4A’s classroom and explained the situation. Because she had a student teacher working in her classroom, the subject was able to accompany the researcher to the LMC for coffee, cake, and discussion. Teacher 4A wondered if some kind of project could be done with her children concerning health, since she was responsible for teaching health to the students for the semester.
Post-treatment Observations

Post-treatment observations revealed interactions similar to pre-treatment observation interactions between subjects and the LMS. Subjects requested certain books on particular topics and videos. Only Control Teacher 4C, on the second day of the post-observation period (see Table 5), informed the LMS that her students were studying animals in their science class. Control Teacher 4C told the LMS no other information at that particular moment. When approached by the researcher and asked why that information was shared, Teacher 4C referred to the Holly Herald Special Limited Edition (see Appendix C) that had been placed into her mailbox. The researcher found it curious that the information on paper moved the subject to reveal a topic that could easily be used in a collaborative project, yet Teacher 4C did no more than to just reveal the topic to the LMS.

Those subjects who attended the Coffee and Cake Connection allowed the researcher to review “The Essential Link” (see Appendix B) article for facts and research important to this experiment. They were congenial and for the most part seemed open to new ideas. Yet, there was no difference in the pre- and post-treatment observations. The experimental subjects did not refer to or make reference to the article (see Appendix B) from the “Connection” meeting. Their use of the LMC and LMS did not increase or decrease. The materials they were searching for did not vary and collaboration was not a topic in any observation.

Casual Face-to-face Contact classroom visits did not play a role in any subjects’ requests made in the post-treatment observations either. All of the experimental subjects did allow the researcher to explain the research synopsis handout (see Appendix
Table 5

**Post-Treatment Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon./Feb. 14</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>2nd/2C</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./Feb. 15</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>4th/4C</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Told me class was studying animals</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed./Feb. 16</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>5th/5B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Request through a note</td>
<td>Holly Herald Special Limited Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs./Feb. 17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri./Feb. 18</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>1st/1D</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./Feb 22</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>3rd/3C</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Folktales</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed./Feb. 23</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>3rd/3B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Books, Brochures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs./Feb. 24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon./Feb. 28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./March 1</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>4th/4A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed./March 2</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>3rd/3C</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Request through a note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs./March 3</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>3rd/3D</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Request through a note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri./March 4</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>4th/4A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Mysteries</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon./March 7*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues./March 8</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>1st/1D</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No contact made on these dates
A) and propose collaboration as a teaching methodology that encourages students to perform and produce better results. Yet none of the experimental subjects, when observed in the post treatment observation period, referred to or even mentioned collaboration. The post treatment observations revealed nothing different in how they approached the LMS or how they used the LMC. The subjects relied on the LMC for information, books and videos before and after the classroom visits. Interest in collaborative activities did not increase.

Post-treatment observation ceased on March 8, 2005. Yet, it is interesting to note that the following Monday, March 14, 2005 the researcher was approached in the hallway by experimental Teacher 1D. She requested information on author addresses. The subject continued to talk to the LMS about the letter writing unit she was working on with her first grade class. Experimental Teacher 1D thought this could be a project she and the LMS could work on together. She wanted to collaborate on a final lesson for a classroom unit. The LMS and Teacher 1D met for lunch that afternoon and began to plan the lesson together.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Using an experimental model, the purpose of this study was to determine which public relations methods would best inform the first through fifth grade classroom teaching staff at Holly Heights School about the work of the library media center, the roles of the library media specialist, and the research that states how important collaborative educational activities are for students, so that teaching staff members would choose to participate in some type of collaborative instructional activities with the library media specialist to benefit the students.

The population used for this research included all eighteen first through fifth grade teachers at Holly Heights School, an elementary school in the Millville School District in New Jersey. The subjects were randomly divided up into two groups with nine control group subjects and nine experimental group subjects. Three types of public relations methods were employed in this experiment. An informational paper, The Holly Herald Special Limited Edition, was presented in all eighteen subjects' mailboxes (see Appendix C). The nine members of the experimental group also received two additional treatments. Each experimental subject was treated with a Casual Face-to-face Contact visit in their classroom. During the visit the researcher reviewed a research synopsis (see Appendix A) and offered suggestions for working together as collaborative teammates.
Groups of two to four experimental subjects were invited to attend a Coffee and Cake Connection held in the library media center. During this morning meeting, the researcher reviewed "The Essential Link" (see Appendix B) focusing on collaboration and research pertaining to collaboration along with holding informal discussions about how collaboration could work at Holly Heights School and suggestions for collaborative projects. Coffee, cake and juice were available for the subjects.

**Conclusions**

The researcher concluded that there did not appear to be one type of public relations methods, of the three that were tested, that informed and influenced classroom teachers to actively search out educational collaborative activities with the library media specialist for the benefit of the students. This research did not produce the major findings the researcher had hoped for when the experiment began. There were no teachers who, in the post-experimental observation phase, approached the researcher to collaborate or even to talk more about collaboration and the research that points out how important it is. The interactions between the classroom teachers and the library media specialist after the treatment were "business as usual" interactions, such as borrowing books and videos, and asking for information.

The researcher concluded that more and constant information and encouragement was needed to motivate the subjects to work collaboratively with the library media specialist in the school. The total number of treatment days did not provide adequate time in which to share the information in a way to make it fully understood and acted upon.
The researcher concluded that, even though no formal observation was made of a teacher-library media specialist collaborative project being planned, there was an interest by the subjects in collaborative projects in the future. The most exciting observation came after the 15 day post-experimental observation period ended. Experimental Teacher 1D approached the LMS and not only proposed a topic for a lesson, but stated, “I think it is something we could work on together.” The subject and the LMS had lunch that day to begin planning a cumulative lesson to a unit about writing letters. Interestingly enough, the subject had, during the post-experimental observation period, come to the LMC and requested books about letter writing and postcards, and author addresses to use in that same unit.

During every encounter, except those where the subjects were not at all interested in the topic of collaboration, the problem of time arose. Many subjects were concerned about when in the day they could work collaboratively with the LMS. Others were concerned about when the two parties could plan the projects. These sorts of comments took place during both Coffee and Cake Connection and Casual Face-to-face Contact classroom visits. So, the researcher concluded that scheduling that allows for time to create, plan and share collaborative activities and successes is equally important in encouraging teachers to collaborate with the library media specialist. Wilson and Blake (1993) conducted a national survey to discover principals’ knowledge of the roles of library media specialists and their perceptions of those roles. They found that by better understanding the roles of a library media specialist, principals would become more aware of the need for flexible scheduling. Wilson and Blake stated, “With this in mind, principals and teacher-librarians must work together to develop flexible scheduling so
that teachers can schedule classes according to project and unit needs rather than the availability of the teacher-librarian" (p. 4). This will be a major hurdle to overcome in order for teachers and the LMS to collaborate.

Recommendations

This experimental study results proved inconclusive, yet the researcher recognized its importance to library media specialists, educators, principals, and most importantly to students. The researcher recommends the study be conducted again.

1. An experimental study of this sort should be conducted over a longer time period. Increasing the length of the study could provide the time for the constant systematic messages regarding the work of the library media center and the roles of the library media specialist needed to reach the teachers. Therefore, the researcher would recommend that the study be redone in the time span of a school year. That way the impact of the three public relations methods may be better understood. The school year following the treatment could be monitored to observe any noticeable increases of collaborative activities between the teaching subjects and the library media specialist.

2. This study should be redone employing different public relations methods. Possibly more personalized contacts would make a longer lasting and stronger impression. The library media specialist might provide professional development courses on collaboration as well as continued personal contact with the subjects by follow-up face-to-face classroom visits. Small constant reminders, such as examples of successful collaboration projects, could be noted in a monthly
newsletter or dropped into teachers' mailboxes occasionally. There is a myriad of public relations methods to choose from for this experimental study.

3. This study should be redone using more simplified information on the research and success of collaboration. The information distributed or shared with the teaching subjects needs to be easily digested. Therefore, the information given out by the library media specialist needs to be in smaller packets, simplified for easy reading, and easily understood.

This study provided a glimmer of hope that there is an interest, albeit ever so small in some instances, in working together collaboratively for the sake of the students. The recommendation is made to never give up on teacher-library media specialist collaboration in the future.

Library media specialist Virginia Wallace (2004) stated, "Advocacy requires vigilant contact with the library media center's stakeholders. Advocacy is a regular, ongoing process that takes planning" (p. 49). No matter what one calls it, advocacy or advertisement, public relations or promotion, the fact remains, in order for educational collaborative activities to become reality, the roles of the library media specialist, the work of the library media center, and the research that states how important these activities are for students must be brought to the attention of classroom teachers throughout all grade levels. The information needs to be repeatedly championed and shared with all who deal with our students.
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APPENDIX A

Casual Face-to-Face Contact Research Handout
“Library media specialists cannot do their jobs effectively unless they have support staff who free them from routine tasks and enable them to participate in a variety of one-to-one and group meetings outside the library media centre.”

“Library media specialists have a twofold teaching role. They are teachers of students, facilitating the development of information literacy skills necessary for success in all content areas, and they are in-service trainers of teachers, keeping abreast of the latest information resources and technology.”

Studies have found...

**“Credentialed school library media specialists do make a difference that affects student performance on achievement tests.”**

**“In order for library media specialists to make this difference, collaboration with teachers is essential.”**

APPENDIX B

Coffee and Cake Connection Handout-“The Essential Link”
"A strong library program would be like an octopus. It would work its way into every classroom, and if you tried to cut off the tentacles you couldn't because it was so interwoven into the fabric of the school."

-Kelly Kuntz, Past President Oregon Educational Media Association

Growing up in the southern Oregon town of Medford, little Steve Wisely wasn’t much of a reader. His elementary school library was just a sort of warehouse—a place where classroom teachers helped students check out books, mainly to meet book report requirements. He read a Jack London classic or two, but he never got the reading bug. No one clued him in that he could flop on the sofa with a really good book and become an astronaut (or a pioneer or a basketball star) for an afternoon.

Many years later this hometown boy, armed with a Ph.D. from the University of Oregon and a hefty résumé, came back to run the district. By then, the libraries had slipped even further. Classified staff "with no formal training in instruction, no child development background, no knowledge of reading levels of students, and no coursework in libraries," had taken over the job of ordering books and staffing the checkout desk, Wisely told
participants at the White House Conference on School Libraries in 2002. In short, Medford's school libraries of the 1980s were not even holding steady. They had sunk below the minimal levels of Wisely's 1950s boyhood.

Alarmed, the new superintendent launched a total revamp. First, he hired certified library media specialists to run each of the district's 13 elementary schools, two middle schools, and two high schools. Next, existing library staff members were trained to support the work of the professional librarians. Then the new crew of librarians hunkered down to write a district media guide. Adopted by the school board in 1993, the guide spelled out the many-layered roles and far-reaching goals of an effective school library program. It talked about an "information skills curriculum" that begins in kindergarten and continues through 12th grade. It talked about inquiry and investigation. Literature appreciation and reading guidance. Collaboration among librarians and classroom teachers. The librarians spoke of enriching lives and feeding minds far beyond the halls of academia—about laying the groundwork for nothing less than an entire lifetime of learning.

Under Wisely's leadership (and with an influx of voter-approved funds from several local bond measures), Medford's school libraries have emerged as some of the region's best—"beautiful, vibrant places of learning," to use Wisely's words. It's no coincidence, he says, that Medford's students are also among the Northwest's best. "In comparison with national and state scores," Wisely told the White House conference, "Medford School District's graduating seniors exceed both the state and national averages" on the Scholastic Aptitude Test.

"School libraries constitute an indispensable introduction to literacy and learning about the world and the universe. They are pathways to self-discovery. They are instruments for progress and autonomy."

—Dr. Vartan Gregorian
Carnegie Corporation

**GOOD LIBRARIES, GOOD READERS**

Far from being "extras"—nice if you can afford them but not really necessary—libraries are tightly linked to the academic mission of schools. Steve Wisely's belief that top-notch school libraries can—and do—boost student achievement is backed by a compelling body of research that has arisen in recent years. Keith Curry Lance, leading a team of researchers
affiliated with the University of Denver and the Library Research Service of the Colorado State Library, has become legendary among school library advocates for his rigorous studies showing powerful links between good libraries and good student performance.

Lance's studies—including two conducted in the Northwest states of Alaska and Oregon—have established that kids are better readers in schools whose libraries meet certain levels of staffing and service. His recent Alaska study, Information Empowered: The School Librarian as an Agent of Academic Achievement in Alaska, found that the percentage of students scoring proficient or above on reading tests was higher for schools with:

- More hours per typical week of professional library staffing
- More time spent weekly delivering information literacy instruction to students, planning cooperatively with teachers, and providing inservice training to teachers
- Computers with modem capability to access the Internet
- A relationship—formal or informal—with the public library
- Collection development policies that address the issue of challenges to library materials

To make sure the higher reading scores could really be credited to libraries—and not to other factors such as school affluence or parents' educational levels—Lance and his colleagues were careful to account for "the considerable impact on academic achievement of community socioeconomic conditions." In his 2001 publication Proof of the Power, in which Lance summarizes these and other findings, he is careful to note that "the distinguishing feature" of his team's research model in Alaska, Oregon, and several other states is "controlling for school and community differences." All things being equal, what Lance found is that library media factors "almost always outperformed other school characteristics, such as teacher-pupil ratio and per-pupil expenditures."

Lance's Oregon study helps shed light on what a really good school library looks like. In the 2001 study findings, Good Schools Have Good Librarians: Oregon School Librarians Collaborate To Improve Academic Achievement, the researcher reports that a "strong and successful" library program is one:

- That is adequately staffed, stocked, and funded. Test scores rise with the size of the library media staff, collection, and budget.
- Whose staff members are actively involved as leaders in their school's teaching and learning enterprise. As in other states, meeting with the principal, serving on key school committees, and holding library media staff meetings help to create a collaborative environment. Where the library media staff spends more time in these
activities, students perform better.

- **Whose staff provides access to and delivers materials and information that support the enterprise.** When the library media staff spends more time developing local collections and when library media programs exploit the collections of other libraries via interlibrary loan, test scores improve.

- **Whose staff has collegial, collaborative relationships with classroom teachers.** The more time library media specialists spend identifying useful materials and information for teachers, planning and delivering instruction with them, and providing inservice training to teachers, the higher the level of academic achievement by students.

- **That embraces networked information technology.** Where networked computers are more widely available and where library media specialists are more involved in managing school networks, test scores are higher.

"The library media centers are truly the 'hub' of the school. It is the one place in school where all students go at some time and the welcome mat is always out."

—Dr. Steve Wisely
Medford, Oregon

**BEYOND THE STATS**

The studies, of course, tell only part of the story. In all human endeavors, the intangibles—the personalities, motivations, and relationships of the individuals involved—are at least as weighty as the things you can count, like books and computers and dollars and FTEs. School libraries are no exception. Their strengths and impacts are enhanced (or limited) by the library media specialists who run them, the classroom teachers who use them, and the administrators who oversee them. Professor Gary Hartzell of the University of Nebraska told the White House conference that a "dynamic librarian" and a "committed principal" together form the nucleus of a first-rate library program. During his three years with the national Library Power program, funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, Hartzell traveled the country, visiting innovative library programs in big-city schools and one-horse towns. All the great programs, he says, have two key assets: "a librarian who not only has the technical skills but an enterprising attitude," along with a principal who gives the librarian time, resources, and encouragement to collaborate with other teachers, attend curriculum committees, and provide staff development.
"You might have the very best librarian you could ever get on your staff, but being ready, willing, and able represents only three-quarters of what it takes to make significant contributions," Hartzell says. "The fourth part is opportunity. And opportunity rests in the principal's hands."

Many principals, however, hold old-fashioned notions about librarians' role. "There's an immense gulf between how high school principals see school librarians and how the latter view themselves," Renee Olson and Randy Meyer write in a 1996 article in School Library Journal. That old idea, nailed succinctly in the words of Larry Dorrell of Central Missouri State University, is "keeper of the books"—a stunning contrast to the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) vision of librarians as nothing less than the "the essential link" among students, teachers, and other sources of resources. In its recently updated "bible," Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning, the AASL argues that the library media specialist "plays a unique and pivotal role in the learning community." In setting out its information literacy standards for student learning, the association defines the school librarian as a "teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator" (notice the order in which the hats are listed) whose mission is "to ensure that students and staff are effective users of ideas and information." That mission, it says, is accomplished by:

- Providing intellectual and physical access to materials in all formats
- Providing instruction to foster competence and stimulate interest in reading, viewing, and using information and ideas
- Working with other educators to design learning strategies to meet the needs of individual students

"The principal is an absolutely essential element in maximizing the return on library investment."

—Gary Hartzell
University of Nebraska

"KNOWLEDGE SPACES"

Libraries are critical partners with schools in shaping readers and thinkers, scholars and inventors, good citizens and productive workers, safe and vibrant communities, a viable planet, a peaceful world. To ignite the powerful engines for learning that libraries can be, Keith Curry Lance offers the following research-based "call to action" in Proof of the Power:
• School library media programs should be funded sufficiently to employ both professional and support staff and to have both information resources in a variety of formats and the technology necessary to extend the library media program beyond the walls of the library media center.

• Library media specialists should be recognized and utilized by principals and teachers as professional colleagues in the teaching and learning enterprise. Where such recognition and the collaboration to which it leads do not exist, the library media specialist must exercise some leadership in changing the environment.

• Technology is an essential part of a successful library media program. Information resources, including licensed databases, should be available throughout the school via networked computers in classrooms, labs, and offices.

Libraries should be thought of as "knowledge spaces" rather than "information places," argues Ross Todd, a professor from Australia who recently spent a year at Princeton. That's because a student's ability to locate the most arcane or germane information in the universe is worth little more than a dime novel if he can't synthesize it, shape it, wrestle it, analyze it, appreciate it, contextualize it, use it, own it.

In Medford, the 600 students at Abraham Lincoln Elementary School took out no fewer than 46,000 books from their state-of-the-art library in 2001-2002. Steve Wisely, recently retired from his 25-year stint as Medford superintendent, sums up the value of a well-stocked, well-staffed, well-run library this way: "It allows students to do some dreaming."
APPENDIX C

The Holly Herald Special Limited Edition
Dr. Keith Curry Lance and What He Has Learned About School Libraries
(Or What You Should Be Aware Of As Classroom Teachers)

Dr. K. C. Lance is a researcher and director of the Library Research Service based at the Colorado State Library. Since the early 1990s, Dr. Lance and his associates have conducted research on the impact of school libraries and librarians on student performance. Their studies have included elementary, middle and high schools throughout the country including Oregon, Alaska, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Colorado, and New Mexico.

In his 2002 address to the White House Conference on School Libraries, Dr. Lance highlighted three sets of findings which figured prominently in his most recent research. They were:

- the level of development of the school library;
- the extent to which school librarians engage in leadership and collaboration activities that foster information literacy; and
- the extent to which instructional technology is utilized to extend the reach of the library program beyond the walls of the school library” (Lance, 2002).

The development of the library includes the ratio of staff to student, per student spending, and ratio of books to student. The instructional technology is being extended in our library in one way by the creation of a library web site to be up and running by September. But the second major finding by Dr. Lance, including leadership and collaboration, is a two way street in the elementary schools. Teacher-librarians, like myself, need to work together with you, the classroom teachers, to “instill a love of reading and information literacy skills in their students” (2002).

Collaboration activities include:

- identifying useful material and information for teachers;
- planning instruction cooperatively with teachers;
- providing in-service training to teachers; and
- teaching students both with classroom teachers and independently.

It is these types of collaboration between librarians and teachers that are linked directly with higher reading scores” (2002).

So, you may be asking yourself, what can she do for me? Instead, how about asking, “How can we collaborate?”

One simple way is for all classroom teachers to use me. Yes, use me! I have a relationship with some of you that does include the simplest kind of collaboration. You begin to teach a unit, you contact me, and I check out books for your students to use within the classroom. That's great! But we need to go deeper into that collaboration, if possible.

If you let me know your units ahead of time, for example, you teach life cycles in the spring in second grade, from April 1 to April 25, then I can prepare more information for you, possibly find you fresh lessons to incorporate, and even block out time for your class to come to work in the library with you and me as teaching partners, or I can block out time for me to become a teaching partner inside your classroom! The possibilities are endless, but it is a two way street. Let me know if I can help!

Below find some great websites that are of interest to all grade levels. We can collaborate inside the computer lab, too!

http://www.figurethis.org
This site focuses on middle school math for kids, parents, and teachers and is sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Challenges include “Basketball Picks” which focuses on analyzing and organizing information; “Fractals” which involves repeating patterns in nature; “Mirror, Mirror” which involves angles and reflection; “Number Tricks” which focuses on algebra; and “Soda” which focuses on graphs and scatter plots, to name just a few. Each challenge has a section for hints if the student is stumped. The challenges have printer friendly versions and are printed in sets of four. There is a family corner and the site is in Spanish and English. There is a teacher’s corner with suggestions on how to incorporate math into everyday lessons, etc.

http://dinodictionary.com
This site is for 2nd through 5th grade students. It is a great site, which has lots of audio, so your computer must have Windows Media Player or an equivalent. One section is a dino dictionary where the pronunciations of those hard names are given to the student. In another section called “If Dinosaurs could talk,” the dinosaur you click on talks about itself. There is a dino identifying game, but it did not work well on my slow computer at home. This might be something to try as a whole group.

http://www.50states.com
This awesome site would work well with 2nd grades and above. Just click on a state and locate all the info that is needed for a super report, poster, etc. This site provides info on the state flag, bird, nicknames, mottoes, songs and teams. It will provide the license plate history in the state and even all the zip codes. You can find the symbols of the state, famous people who were born there, and info about the office of governor of each state. This is a fascinating site to visit for quick info and lots of facts.

http://pbskids.org/lions/
This is a great site for kindergarten through second graders. You need to have Shockwave for audio/video because of the games, but it is truly worth it for these games. One game is “Watch the Words”. The student clicks on a word and watches it do what it means and hears the word aloud. For example, leap actually leaps, and vanish actually vanishes in front of your eyes. “A.B. Cow” is an alphabet game in which kids need to find the missing letter. There are stories, too, and things to print, and a message for parents and teachers. This is a terrific site for the young ones!
Student Learning Through Ohio School Libraries
(Or More Facts You Should Know!)

Drs. Ross Todd and Carol Kuhlthau of Rutgers University and the Center for International Scholarship in School Libraries conducted a study from October, 2002 through December, 2003 in conjunction with the Ohio Educational Library Media Association. According to The Ohio Research Study Fact Sheet of December 15, 2003, (http://www.oelma.org/studentlearning.htm) researchers were looking to find “how students benefit from school libraries.” 13,123 students in Grades 3 to 12 were surveyed. 99.44% of the sample (13,050 students) “indicated the school library and its services, including roles of school librarians, have helped them in some way, regardless of how much, with their learning.”

At the Educational Media Association of New Jersey Conference, where I heard Drs. Todd and Kuhlthau address a leadership breakfast on December 3, 2004, Dr. Todd said that good school librarians do 3 things. They make a difference, provide intervention, and help make transformations. Information makes a difference in students’ learning. To make a difference in their learning, we need to make kids effective researchers. To show transformation we need to have learning outcomes. Through these 3 steps, children become engaged and build new knowledge. They learn to convert information into knowledge.

Drs. Todd and Kuhlthau provided recommendations as a result of the Ohio research study:

~ “All school libraries, including elementary schools, be staffed with credentialed school librarians who have educational certification and who engage in collaborative instructional initiatives to help students learn and achieve.

~all school librarians have a clearly defined role as information-learning specialists, with expertise...as an educational partner-leader who mutually collaborates, negotiates, and plans with school administrators, teachers, students, and parents to implement information literacy instruction in the curriculum.”
Why Do You Need To Know This?

You need to know about this study, primarily because of its recommendations. Even elementary students need to learn how to become effective researchers. But they need to be engaged and observe that their research is pertinent to what they are learning inside of your classroom. The library cannot exist in a vacuum.

This is where we need to work together. I am available to work with you as a collaborative partner. Use me! Planning together on a lesson or unit, teaching together (in or out of the classroom or library) as equal partners, and developing learning outcomes is the best way to help our students become lifelong learners, effective researchers, and informed adults.

I know I am your “special” or “encore” or “break” (I hate those words), but we can figure out a way to work together. Maybe we’ll have to come in early, stay late, or hold a day for collaboration and planning. No matter, if there is a will, there is a way, and we will find it together.

Ideas are always welcome.

If you are interested in collaboration, talk to me. Visit me. (I’m usually in the library.) Email me at work or at home. (kathleen.galarza@millville.org or kgalarza@mindspring.com). Drop me a note. (Use my mailbox or send to PO Box 178, Port Elizabeth, NJ 08348). Call me at work or home (856-327-6118 or 856-327-2663).

We will find a way together
for the sake of the children.
Collaboration is the road less traveled by. We, as teachers, feel we have to be self-contained and autonomous. Why that is, I don’t know, but it is a feeling that exists. We need to change that for the sake of the children. We need to collaborate for the children.

In the past two Special Limited Editions of the Holly Herald, I have presented well-known researchers and their studies, conclusions, and recommendations. I have tried to give ideas and examples of how we can collaborate. Yet, maybe I started backward. Maybe the idea of collaboration is difficult since no one ever informed you of how important it is. So, I thought I’d end the Special Editions with a look at some terms and an important taxonomy.

Toni Buzzeo, an author and library media specialist, defines collaborative planning on her web site http://www.tonibuzzeo.com/collaboratingtomctstandards.htm. She states, “Collaborative planning is two or more equal partners who set out to create a unit of study based on content standards in one or more content areas plus information literacy standards, a unit that will be team-designed, team-taught, and team-evaluated.” She believes there are three stages of growth. Buzzeo says that in cooperation “the teacher and library media specialist work independently but come together briefly for mutual benefit, their relationship is loose.” She continues to say that coordination “means there is a more formal working relationship and an understanding of shared missions. The teacher and library media specialist do some planning and communicate more.” But in collaboration “the two partners have a prolonged and interdependent relationship. They share goals, have carefully defined roles in the process, and plan much more comprehensively.”

David Loertscher, a professor in the School Library and Information Services at San Jose State University, the President of Hi Willow Research and Publishing, and a past president of American Association of School Librarians, is well-known for his research and writing about school libraries. He is highly revered for his Collaborative Planning Taxonomy. Think about where we are in this taxonomy here at Holly Heights School and where we should be.

1. Self-contained teaching – there is “no perceived need for the library as a resource.”
2. Teaching with a borrowed collection – “The teacher plans the unit and checks out books.”
3. Use the Library Media Center (LMC) as enrichment – the librarian is “used for reading a book, book talks, and check out.”
4. Utilizing librarian or library resources out of context – for example, using the librarian to show children where all books on frogs are in the library if you are teaching a unit on frogs.
5. Use library media resources as part of a unit—the teacher plans everything and the librarian is the servant

6. Collaborative planning for instruction—“Teacher and library media specialist identify skills and objectives to be taught and resources needed. Together, the responsibilities of the teacher, students, and library media specialist are clearly delineated.”

7. Collaborative planning for curriculum development—“Teacher and library media specialist work as a team to develop a curriculum, make decisions for acquiring resources, plan activities, and strategies to facilitate successful implementation.”

Loertscher believes the last step is a “win, win, win situation” for teachers, students and librarians and states, “Performance, process, and product improve” at this stage.

So, did you figure out where you are on the taxonomy? Did you figure out where we, at Holly Heights, should be on the taxonomy?

Change does not happen overnight. It may not even occur this year. But things have to change for the good of the children. Loertscher says that to make any impact on student learning we should be operating in step five through step 7.

Hmmm...It gives us something to think about, doesn’t it?

Information about Loertscher and his taxonomy was taken from 2 websites you are encouraged to check out:
http://www.davidvl.org/ and
http://www.cdcollab.org/LibraryMedia/Collaboration/tsld006.htm

Thanks!

Kathy Galarza
Hi. This is the first way in which you can help me with completing my Masters in Librarianship. There will be 3 Special Limited Editions of The Holly Herald delivered to your mailbox. Please read them as they appear in your boxes. Thanks in advance for your help.

Kathy G.
WEEK ONE

Jan.21, Friday
Consent/info letter put in all mailboxes of 18 subjects-classroom teachers grades 1 through 5.
Teacher 1A came into library and asked where the survey was for librarianship that she should fill out.

Jan. 24th, Monday Snow Day

Jan. 25, Tuesday
All 18 subjects received a copy of the Holly Herald Special Limited Edition Vo. 1 in their mailboxes w/ notes telling “this is the first way to help me with my Master thesis; when you get these, just read them.”

Invitations were put into mailboxes of first and second classroom teachers invited to the first Coffee and Cake Connection in library with coffee and cake.

Jan. 26, Wednesday
Classroom visit to 3rd grade teachers in experiment group
Teacher 3C-Met privately with 3C inside her classroom with no children. Handout discussed briefly and then I told her that working collaboratively is possible, beyond what she already does with me-lowest level-asking for books/videos, etc. I knew she taught about the capital in social studies and used that for an example of how we could collaborate. Setting up centers in the library, some children on US government website, others in group with books about symbols of the US, still others work on an art project, etc. We would work as collaborative partners. She liked the idea, but said she had already taught that lesson because of the elections. She suggested maybe something with the Anasazi Indians in social studies or even in language arts. “Ramona” piece being read soon. Then she usually read an entire Ramona book. She has a week of activities dealing with “Ramona,” such as puzzles, shadow boxes depicting a scene, etc. I told her I could help, bring in new ideas such as pop-ups which she didn’t know how to do. Feb. 23rd the class goes to see a “Ramona” play.
I left uplifted and excited.

Teacher 3B-Had to meet with her in the library due to Spanish class being held in classroom. Delivered page on research and discussed collaboration. Even though I am “special” we do have time on Mondays to work together. I explained again about working in library or classroom with her as a partner, bringing in my expertise and working with students on a collaborative lesson, unit. She is overwhelmed now but stated that she has, in the past at another school, worked on state books with her classes. She is appalled at the lack of geography skills the students have. She focuses in on certain states, surrounding NJ, and spends week on them. Later tries to get in 2 states at a
time to organize a state book on all fifty states. We left meeting believing we could work together next year, possibly on state books.

*I also had questions from some teachers-1C, 1A, 5A, 3A, 2D- who got the informational bulletin. They wanted to know what they should do-write anything? Do a report? They were very worried about having to make some response. All 5 who responded in that way were in the control group. Interesting!

*I had two control group teachers-1A and 1C-come into the library and ask again what they needed to do for me. I explained that unless I came to them or asked them to do something through their email or mailbox, they just had to read and relax.

Jan. 27 Thursday Make-up day
Put reminder notices in mailboxes of 1st and 2nd grade experimental subjects about coffee and cake connection in AM on Friday.

Jan. 28th, Friday
I arrived at school at 8:00 to begin set up for coffee and cake connection. Coffee, juice, pound cake and condiments were prepared. Handouts were placed at seats for the 2 first grade experimental subjects and the 2 second grade experimental subjects.

8:30-No one arrived. I got up from table and felt like the person who gives parties and no one comes. At 8:34, teacher 1D enters the library and asks if she is late. I tell her no and welcome her. I praised her for participating in the (lowest) form of collaboration already-asking for books, videos for her classroom. We decide to begin the connection despite her being the only one to show up. I go over the handout, called “The Essential Link” and explain the librarian’s role in the school. I quickly pointed out research by K. C. Lance, and Gary Hartzell. I explained that I was prepared to advertise myself and my roles in order to work more collaboratively with teachers for sake of children. I had pulled books off of the shelves that will match the new science curriculum that the teachers will begin to pilot this spring.

8:45-Teacher 2C arrived late. She got coffee, apologized for being late and sat down. I continued and explained how we could work together in science centers in the library—web site, activity with solids and liquids, poster making center, etc. I explained it wouldn’t have to be in library and not a lesson I planned—it would be done collaboratively.

Teacher 2C wanted to know if the paper I was referring to was really the new topics in science. When told yes, she proceeded to write them down, complained, and said it was another reason to retire. She talked about her “work stations” instead of “centers” she sets up in her room. She asked about the pound cake, and even after I returned to subject she continued on a tangent. Teacher 2C, when she heard I had talked to a Teacher 3C about collaboratively teaching in language arts centers, and teaching the kids to make pop-up books, said that I could come to her room to teach that, too. Then she left.

Teacher 1D thought maybe she would use me for poetry in her classroom this year because I sponsored National Poetry Month last year and volunteered to help out in classrooms where teachers were writing with their students. (I did not get to help in her room or any room last year.)
Overall Impressions of the cake/coffee connection
I was glad to see the Teacher 1D finally come in at 8:34. I went right to socializing and explaining what this connection was about. I will check on sign in sheet in front office to see if other two experimental group teachers-1B and 2B- were in school today. I had left reminder invitations in their mailboxes before I left yesterday. It was not a great response. 2 out of four teachers invited and one showed up late and did not seem to get the idea of collaboration. Am I explaining it well enough?

I again had a control group teacher 2D come to me and actually apologize for not coming to the meeting this morning. I had to explain it was okay because I had not invited her and she revealed that she thought she missed it because she hadn’t read the first informational bulletin I placed in her mailbox on Monday.

Teachers 1B and 2B were in the building today. They did not contact me in any way.

WEEK TWO
Jan. 31 Monday
All 18 subjects get a new Holly Herald special edition in their mailboxes. Invitation put into experimental 3rd grade teachers’ mailboxes about coffee and cake connection.

Feb. 1 Tuesday
Class visit to 4th and 5th grade teachers in experimental groups.
It was hard getting in touch with these teachers. They arrived later to school than 8:30.

When I finally met with 4A in her classroom, she continued working on preparing for the morning lesson while saying she was listening to me. They was a student teacher at the computer. I said I could speak to her too and she immediately got off the computer and came to me to hear what I had to say. I explained the handout and informed both of them how important collaboration was between teachers and librarians and how it raised test scores. It was difficult to plan a unit because of scheduling but there would be a way around it if they were interested in the future in collaborative activities. Teacher 4A asked about when is a good time to meet or have children come into library when I wasn’t a “special” and I informed her that Mondays were made for that purpose. I told them to let me know. I was not particularly looking to set up anything at the moment but that I was advertising what I could do. Overall, I felt fair about this encounter, but not hopeful, except when I thought that maybe the student teacher would be interested in collaboration.

5th grade meeting
I met with Teacher 5B in her classroom. I reviewed the research that has been done and highlighted the information on this morning’s handouts. I volunteered to help with research, projects, etc. She interrupted me—plenty of times—and stated that Teacher 5C worked on research. (This 5th grade team shares subjects—Teacher 5B teaches lang. arts, Teacher 5C, she was referring to, teaches social studies/writing, and the Teacher 5A...
teaches math and science.) Teacher 5B recommended that I talk to 5C. 5B also said that she has worked with me and was referring to when she asked me to have the students visualize the story when I read to them in the library. I tried to explain that that is not collaborating. She returned to her list. She has also borrowed books from the library for matching to the stories she is teaching in the reading book. I praised her about collaborating on lowest level and explained that but she said that it is difficult because I am her special. I told her if collaboration was a real wish the scheduling could be worked out somehow. Overall, I left feeling like I lost this battle.

The next visit was to another Teacher 4B. She was late, but had time to talk. She listened intently to the synopsis of the study findings by K. C. Lance and said that this time of year was a very bad time to be thinking of these things because she was so focused on the upcoming standardized test. I explained that I understood and that she needed to look at collaboration as a help, not another chore. I explained that it involved planning and development but that it would be worth it. She said there will be, in the future, projects on animals. I asked her to come and see me as that time approached and we could maybe work collaboratively on it. I thanked her and she thanked me and went off to be with her children. Overall, I thought she was interested in finding out more, but felt like she might be under some stress. She had related it had been a bad night for her the night before.

*Control group teacher 1C came to me after the 2nd newsletter went out and wanted to let me know she had figured out what is going on. She said she knows I want them to use the library more. She wanted to know if I could help her first graders find information about G. Washington and A. Lincoln. I told her I could and I would be glad to. Teacher 1A across the hall from her asked if I would do the same thing with her class (after she told her what she had done). I believe that think they have to respond to each newsletter.

Feb. 2 Wednesday
Make-up day
Not needed
Put reminders in mailboxes of 3rd grade teachers about Thursday’s coffee and cake connection.

Feb. 3 Thursday
Grade three teachers will meet for Cake and coffee Connection in Library

Both teachers were late in coming to the library. Actually Teacher 3B had come to the library earlier to see if I could use some old dictionaries that were too old for her third grade class. She stayed to choose deleted materials from my shelf for her room and left saying she had a lot to do and didn’t know if she’d get back. I told her I had coffee, cake and juice for them and I would be in the library if she decided to come back. So by the time they both get there, they were already looking at the clock so they would get back to class on time. I took a few minutes and told them about the print out and stressed some points in the article by K.C. Lance and Gary Hartzell. I again was asked about time because that was a blockage to time to come to the library for research, etc. and we
discussed the Monday schedule again. Teacher 3C said Mondays from 2:30-3:20 was the best time for her. (This is a favorite time because of other specials and Spanish which is not a “special”.) I informed them that I had just ordered new atlases, dictionaries, and thesauruses, etc. and they would be available in the library in the future for collaborative projects if we found we needed them. They kept looking at the clock and finally said they had to go. Overall, it was probably not a great informational session. I felt okay about it.

WEEK THREE
Monday, February 7
Invitations put in 4th and 5th grade teachers’ mailboxes for Fri, coffee and cake connection.

**Tuesday, Feb. 8
I’m out of the building at a workshop.

Wednesday, Feb. 9
All 18 subjects are given the last Special Edition of the Holly Heights Herald in their mailboxes.
Class visit to 1st grade classroom
Teacher 1B sat and listened to me talk about handout while she worked on preparing a project for her class. (Note: She is one teacher that did not show up for cake and coffee connection.) She did not respond to anything I said and kept looking away from me. I explained handout – broad generalization by K.C. Lance. She said thank you and took the paper handout from me.

Thursday, Feb. 10
Make-up day
Reminders put in 4th and 5th grade experimental teachers’ mailboxes about coffee and cake connection tomorrow.
Class visit to 1st grade teacher
Teacher 1D was very welcoming and stood next to me the entire time, listening attentively. I went over handout and discussed concept of collaborative teaching from planning to ending of project. She understood the concept and thought it was a good idea.

Class visit to 2nd grade classrooms
I was able to accomplish this in one visit because both teachers-2B and 2C- were together in one classroom when I approached. They were discussing word walls. I was welcomed in and explained the handout and collaborative planning from beginning to end. They realized that they would need to contact me and I volunteered to set up a time with principal approval if they were interested at any time. Teacher 2C said, “...but it’s so hard—we’ll have to meet before or after school.” She seemed to have a difficult time understanding the concept that I could schedule during the day planning if she was seriously interested. Teacher 2B asked about Mondays being a good day to work together. I explained yes, it would be and we could plan around that if it was best for her.
Friday, Feb. 11

Grade 4 and 5 teachers meet in Library for cake and coffee connection

Teacher 5B and Teacher 4B arrived late, but did show up. We had coffee and cake and went through the article “Essential Link” –parts that were highlighted and were important to me to be discussed. I discussed advertisement ideas (explaining about this coffee and cake connection) and garnered questions and ideas. They were concerned about time – again, this is a big problem-but they were congenial and sat and listened. They both hoped to be able to work with me next year; Teacher 5B on biographies and the Teacher 4B on a science unit-probably animals.

After these 2 teachers left, Teacher 1C came in and asked if the meeting was over and she was sorry she was late. I realized then that the reminder note for coffee and cake connection was put in the wrong teacher’s mailbox. She had a piece of cake and left. I went to the correct teacher’s room-Teacher 4A- and explained what had happened. She had a student teacher so she was able to leave the children and come to the library for coffee and cake at that time. We talked and went over the “Essential Link” and talked about how the collaborative project could work. She began to talk about how overwhelmed she was in the classroom and I said I hoped I could help remove that feeling, by working together with her on a unit of study. She stated that she was responsible beginning this marking period for health. It didn’t matter what topics, but she was hoping to focus on the body systems. She wondered if I could do something with her class, about health, since I was beginning to work with her children on using encyclopedias. I told her I’d see what I could do.

Note: All teachers were given the female gender to mask identity.

This is the end of my 15 days of applying a treatment to my 9 subjects in my experimental group. I have not given any treatment to the control group of 9 teachers. All 18 subjects did receive the special editions of the Holly Herald-3 total.
APPENDIX E

Letter of Consent
Dear ________________________________,

(Teacher’s name)

This is a request for your participation in a research project focusing on public relations methods school librarians may use with classroom teachers. This study is part of the requirements for my Master of Arts degree in School and Public Librarianship from Rowan University.

For your contribution you may be asked to answer questions or discuss various school library related topics. Please know that your participation is completely voluntary and will result in no risk to yourself or others. While you may choose not to participate, the results of this research will help school library media specialists learn how to work with classroom teachers for the benefit of all students. I hope you will participate, but it is up to you, and you may, at any time, feel free to withdraw from participation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions you may have. You may also contact Dr. Marilyn Shontz (856.256.3400 x3858), my Rowan University faculty advisor. Your participation does not imply an employer-employee relationship exists between you and the state of New Jersey, Rowan University, or me.

Thank you in advance for your participation and patience.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Galarza
APPENDIX F

Coffee and Cake Connection Invitations and Reminders
An Invitation Is Extended To You

For a Morning Coffee/Juice and Cake Connection

In the Holly Heights Library

On Friday, January 28, 2005

At 8:30 am.

Please come to learn about how I may be of assistance to you by making education more of a partnership between teachers and therefore a better experience for the students.

I hope to see you there!

Any questions, please feel free to ask! I’m always open.

Kathy Galarza