GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE
SIMMONS COLLEGE, BOSTON

MCAS AND SCHOOL LIBRARIES:

Making the Connection

A Symposium Sponsored by the
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Simmons College

October 26, 2000

CONTENTS

School Libraries and MCAS Scores

A Paper Presented at a Symposium
Sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Simmons College
Boston, Massachusetts

by

James C. Baughman, Ph. D.

October 26, 2000

© 2000

Preliminary Edition

"What a school thinks about its library is a measure
of what it thinks about education."

--Harold Howe
former U.S. Commissioner of Education

Executive Summary
School Libraries and MCAS Scores

School libraries and student achievement are strongly related. The results of the Simmons Study of school libraries, based on a statewide survey, confirm the value of school libraries. The findings from the Simmons Study can be summarized as follows:

1. At each grade level, schools with library programs have higher MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) scores.
2. At each grade level, students score higher on MCAS tests when there is a higher per pupil book count.
3. At each grade level, schools with increased student use have higher MCAS scores.
4. At each grade level, school libraries with more open hours score higher on the MCAS tests.
5. At the elementary and middle/junior high school levels, students score higher on the MCAS tests when there is a library instruction program.
6. At the elementary and middle/junior high school levels, average MCAS scores are higher in schools with larger per pupil expenditures for school library materials.
7. At the elementary and high school levels, students who are served by a full-time school librarian have higher MCAS scores than those in schools without a full-time librarian.
8. At the elementary and high school levels, library staff assistance (nonprofessional help) makes a positive difference in average MCAS scores.
9. At the elementary level, students score higher on the MCAS tests when the library is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. (This fact is especially true in schools that have a high percentage of free school lunches.)
10. At the high school level, schools with automated collections have higher average MCAS scores.

School Libraries and MCAS Scores

The Setting. Massachusetts does not have a school library recession; we have a school library[*] depression! And that depression has been long and deep. This school library depression has compromised the quality of education in our state, including the full implementation of the state curriculum frameworks and satisfactory results for many children on the MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) tests. The lack of school libraries in our state seriously challenges our system of public education, which has as one of its core features—equalized educational opportunity. Equal educational opportunity lies at the heart of our great educational experiment in this country—a free education for all on equal terms. Horace Mann, the father of modern education, spoke for every child when he called for good schoolhouses, intelligent school boards, competent teachers, and a widespread public commitment to universal education. Every child would have the opportunity to learn, to achieve, to aspire, to become a moral person through the experience of the common school.

How well we are achieving this today in Massachusetts is the topic for our symposium. MCAS test scores weigh on everyone's mind these days. When discussing strategies to improve student performance on MCAS tests, we ask, "Please talk turkey." Today, I am going to talk turkey (to present evidence) of a direct link

---

[*] The term "school library" is used throughout this paper. It is understood that this term includes school library media center, instructional resources center, or any other center that functions as a school library. The term was chosen to be in line with the new Massachusetts state certification regulations, which use the terms "library" and "library teacher."

between MCAS scores and the existence (or quality) of school libraries. A strong body of evidence shows that at all educational levels school libraries directly influence student achievement.

In 1987, School Match, a company that helps businesses to relocate executives, singled out expenditures for school libraries as an area that relates to student achievement. A 1987 news column in *American Libraries* reported the School Match conclusion this way: "Of all the expenditures that influence a school's effectiveness—including those for facilities, teachers, guidance services, and others— the level of expenditures for library and media services has the highest correlation with student achievement." The School Match database consisted of 15,892 public school systems in the U.S., 14,856 private schools, and accredited American schools throughout the world. This was a powerful statement; and when announced on national public radio, it created quite a stir.

U.S. Department of Education Rankings. So where do we in Massachusetts stand in terms of school libraries today? How does Massachusetts compare with other states in providing school libraries? In meeting national standards for staffing levels? In funding for school libraries? In providing materials to children? In circulating materials to children?

Where do we stand? We have nearly hit bottom! According to the most recent figures available from the U.S. Office of Education, of the fifty states, Massachusetts ranks near the bottom on several key characteristics in programming for school libraries:

- Massachusetts ranks only 49th in providing its public schools with school libraries; (See Appendix A.)

- Massachusetts ranks only 41st in teachers who agree that library materials are adequate to support objectives; (See Appendix B.)

- Massachusetts ranks only 38th in providing its public school students with state-certified library media specialists; (See Appendix C.)

- Massachusetts ranks only 47th in providing computers supervised by library media specialists; (See Appendix D.)

- Massachusetts ranks 50th (at the bottom) in mean circulation per pupil per school of all library materials. (See Appendix E.)

These dismal rankings show that our school libraries cry out for improvement. These discouraging rankings should shock us into acting to change this situation. To implement a new paradigm will take a lot of work by us all. Interdependence among all interested parties, not independence, is going to carry the day. The interested parties are the governor, legislators, education department, professional associations, school committee members, superintendents, principals, teachers, librarians, parents, and citizens—everyone.

We in Massachusetts can afford good school libraries. According to the *U.S. Statistical Abstract*, Massachusetts ranks 10th in terms of personal income, out of the fifty states. Parenthetically, the only state to rank below Massachusetts (that is, 50th) in providing for school libraries is West Virginia. But in terms of personal income, West Virginia ranks 37th out of the fifty states. On the other hand, according to figures from the Massachusetts Department of Education (DOE), the state of

Massachusetts provides 38 percent as its share of the education budget, while the national average is 47 percent. Massachusetts again falls quite visibly far below the national average. Our collective wealth indicates that as a state we can do far better—much better. (See DOE WebPages http://www.doe.mass.edu/doedoscfacxts.96html.)

Education Reform. In 1993, the Education Reform Act was passed with the clear intention of raising standards in our schools. The overall objective was a comprehensive reform of public K-12 education that establishes education as the highest priority, both at the state and local levels.

In a press release from the Governor's Office dated June 2, 1992, announcing education reform, then Lieutenant Governor Argeo Paul Celluci said: "None of us wants to see our schools continue to deteriorate. Mediocrity is not an acceptable grade in Massachusetts." Despite this affirmation to reject mediocrity, education reform did not provide funding for school libraries. Why the deplorable condition of school libraries in Massachusetts at that time as compared to other states was not factored into education reform remains a mystery. Educational assessment and reform are far more complex than what the politicians would lead one to believe.

Education reform remains on the front burner. Raising education standards through education reform remains under full heat with the voters this year. People know that we can do far better. The curriculum frameworks, the blueprints matched to MCAS, still are not fully implemented. New certification regulations need to be voted by the state Board of Education. School libraries need to be adequately funded. And, yes, seven years into the process, we scarcely have any plans for improving

school libraries. School libraries are, as you know, the bedrock on which education reform should be built.

The Simmons Study and Pending Legislation. In April 1999, Mary Eldringhoff and I undertook a statewide survey of school libraries (hereafter the Simmons Study) in order to provide baseline data for Massachusetts public school libraries. Some of the results were reported earlier in a Sunday *Boston Globe* article on January 30, 2000.

The Simmons Survey looked at the 1998 MCAS test scores[*] in relation to data on the survey instrument. The results show a strong, consistent, positive relationship between mean (average) MCAS scores and the presence of a school library program.

We mailed out 1,818 questionnaires—one to every public school (elementary, middle, junior high, high, charter, vocational technical, and regional) in the Commonwealth. This mailing included 1,241 elementary schools, 266 middle/junior high schools, and 311 high schools. We wanted everyone to participate. We received 519 survey instruments from the respondents. (See Table 1.) In November 1999, we gave a report at the MSLMA (Massachusetts School Library Media Association) conference held in Worcester. Today, we take the next step and explain to you in detail the relationships between school library program components and MCAS scores.

The U.S. Office rankings indicate that 87 percent of Massachusetts schools have libraries. Our data show 92 percent. (See Table 2.) There is a slight difference in

---

[*] For purposes of research presented in this document, the three MCAS scores for 1998 were added together—mathematics, science, and language arts—to form a combined score. This combined score was used in all statistical analyses.

these percentages. The point, however, is that until Massachusetts ranks with other states that have libraries in 100 percent of their schools--including Vermont, Oregon, Maryland, Georgia, and Arkansas--we cannot realistically talk about education reform, let alone educational quality.

General Survey Results. The Simmons Survey makes the vital connection between student achievement and school library programs in Massachusetts. Mean MCAS scores tend to be higher in schools with school library programs at all levels, as opposed to schools that do not have school library programs. Stated another way: School library programs are a valuable component of a child's education because they help a child achieve. Our research shows that the highest achieving students attend schools with good school libraries. Yet school libraries in Massachusetts, according to our survey data, spend an average of $12 per child for books—less than half the average coast of a hardcover book. We can do better. We must do better for our children.

Let us look more specifically at the findings. The findings from our study can be roughly summarized by educational level as follows:

All Levels—Elementary, Middle/Junior, High School Levels

1. At each grade level school library programs improve MCAS scores.

2. At each grade level students score higher on MCAS tests when there is a higher per pupil book count.

3. At each grade level student use of the library produces higher mean MCAS scores;

4. At each grade level hours open make a difference in MCAS scores.

Elementary and Middle/Junior High School Levels

5. At the elementary and middle/junior high school levels, students score higher on the MCAS tests when there is a library instruction program.

6. At the elementary and middle/junior high school levels, average MCAS scores are higher in schools with larger per pupil expenditures for school library materials.

Elementary and High School Levels

7. At the elementary and high school levels, students who are served by a full-time school librarian have higher MCAS scores than those in schools without a full-time librarian.

8. At the elementary and high school levels, library staff assistance (nonprofessional help) makes a positive difference in average MCAS scores. (See Table 7.)

Elementary Level

9. At the elementary level, students score higher on the MCAS tests when the library is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. (This fact is especially true in schools that have a high percentage of free school lunches—the socioeconomic factor.)

High School Level

10. At the high school level, schools with automated collections have higher average MCAS scores.

These findings are in line with results in other studies, such as the Keith Lance studies of Colorado, Pennsylvania, and Alaska. Parenthetically, I would like to point out that in item 2 above, it is "books per pupil" that is significant, not the number of books in a collection per se. The MSLMA standards are based on books per pupil, so this finding is especially important. This finding justifies the standard of books per pupil as a measure, not only for building library collections but also for evaluation purposes, including accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

A Digression: The Socioeconomic Factor. At this point, we need to digress for a moment to talk about the so-called socioeconomic factor. Evidence from the Simmons Survey indicates that equal educational opportunity comes more within reach for **all** children in the presence of a school library program that supports, extends, and enriches the educational process.

When we break the data out by percentage of free school lunches (the socioeconomic factor used in this study), the socioeconomic factor is powerfully potent. First, let's acknowledge that there is a high degree of correlation between higher MCAS scores and the percentage of free school lunches. (Table 9 shows the correlation between MCAS scores and the percentage of free school lunch students by grade level.)

We can easily see that socioeconomic factors play a large role in MCAS test scores. As the percentage of free school lunches increases, mean MCAS scores decrease; that is, there is an inverse relationship between these two factors.

The issue here is not elitism or superiority or even community rivalry. Contrarily, the issue is that we all need to realize that there are socioeconomic differences in communities. These differences do not suggest, nor do I want to advance the idea in any way, that we formulate different standards for each community. We need to provide the necessary resources for education so that each child can work to his or her maximum potential.

Elementary School Libraries.   We can begin our elementary school library discussion with this well-known statement: "It is a terrible thing to waste the mind of a child."

The survey data reveal at this strategic moment, however, that elementary schools have the greatest need. Educational policy makers should not only see the clear vertical connection between the various levels of education but also act on it. There is a connection from womb to tomb. I do not exclude college and university in this connection. A child denied resources at the first-grade level cannot realistically be expected to perform well at the 10th-grade level. And when that lack is cumulative, it is especially troubling. And we can never forget that what happens in first grade influences what happens in 10th grade and beyond. The MCAS connection starts early.

At the elementary level, fifteen variables have been identified that are statistically significant when I examined mean MCAS scores. Roughly summarized, these variables can be grouped into six general categories. We, therefore, may conclude that elementary schools in Massachusetts need:

1.   Hours of service, including before and after school;

2. Strong library collections--per pupil book count, magazines, and non-print items;

3. High library expenditures per pupil;

4. Library instruction and high student use;

5. Alignment of the library collection with the curriculum frameworks; and

6. Robust staffing, including a full-time librarian, non-professional assistance, and parent volunteers. (Table 10 gives the elementary results.)

These findings provide strong evidence of the value of an elementary school library program. Yet we also find that not all elementary schools have a library and that 37 percent do not employ a full-time librarian.

Equally important in this discussion is the fact that not only do elementary schools fall short of MSLMA standards for per pupil book count but they also fail to meet the MSLMA copyright (recency) standard. Given the evidence from our study, we strongly conclude: Schools that do not provide school libraries are presently damaging the children they exist to help.

Elementary School Libraries and the Socioeconomic Factor. Now let us consider the socioeconomic factor and elementary school libraries. I would be remiss if we did not discuss school libraries in schools with a high percentage of free school lunches. Children in these schools need books, libraries, and librarians as much as, if not more than do other children. The school library, when one exists, is for many disadvantaged children a major source of exposure to books, magazines, and the newer media--learning materials that stimulate their thinking, creativity, learning, reading, and enjoyment. There is a great joy in reading and in school libraries.

Our survey data suggest that children from a lower socioeconomic stratum who have a school library obtain a higher mean MCAS score than do similar children from schools that do not have such a program. For this study, the lower socioeconomic stratum is a school that offers more than 15 percent of its students a free school lunch. (Table 11 gives the 10 variables that are statistically significant at a p-value of .01 to .04 for mean MCAS scores when controlling for the percentage of free school lunches--the socioeconomic factor.) It is more than a curiosity that the three library program variables—books per pupil, percent of the student body visiting the library per week, and a full-time librarian—are all statistically significant at a p-value of .00 or .01. There is a mean difference of 11 points on the MCAS score between books per pupil and full-time librarian and 12 points for the percent of the student body visiting the library per week.

Such evidence shows an unmistakable added advantage for lower socioeconomic children who attend schools with good school library programs. As Jonathan Kozol wrote in *School Library Journal* earlier this year, "Few forms of theft are quite as damaging to inner-city children as the denial of a well-endowed school library." While Mr. Kozol writes about the inner-city child, I point out that cultural deprivation and poverty exist beyond the inner-city school. Such conditions are found in more than a few cities and towns in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, despite these affluent times.

The empirical evidence presented here shows that children from schools with a high free lunch program can learn effectively when we make a serious effort to provide them with school library resources and services. Inherent in this finding is

that less fortunate children must be held to the same high standards as other children; they can learn when given an equal opportunity to do so. And when children become learners, they become self-actualizing and self-confident people. As educators and citizens, we cannot neglect the plight of economically disadvantaged children and their library and reading needs. This is a moral issue. Have we completely lost our moral compass when it comes to children and their basic needs?

Middle Schools. Let's now consider middle/junior high schools. The school library program variables that are statistically significant with MCAS test scores at the middle school exhibit similarities to the other levels, although there also are differences. The middle school program should consider the following aspects of library offerings:

1. Hours of service, including after school service;

2. Books per pupil;

3. Number of periodicals, including periodical databases;

4. Expenditure per pupil for materials;

5. Library instruction program;

6. Participation in the regional library system; and

7. Parent volunteers, including PTO donations. (Table 12 gives the middle/junior high school results.)

High Schools.   At the high school level, the statistically significant mean MCAS test scores and school library variables are

1. After-school hours;

2. Books per pupil;

3. Participation in the regional library system;

4. Percent of the student body visiting the library;

5. Full-time librarian; and

6. Staff assistance. (Table 13 gives the high school results.)

Also important to consider is library automation, especially at the high school level. We have made progress in this area, but we need to do more since only 65 percent of the high schools are automated. This figure should be 100 percent. For any school that does not have an automated system for circulation and collection management, this should be made a priority. While I do not wish to over dramatize the situation, I can add that there is a statistically significant difference in mean MCAS scores, with the highest mean going to high schools that have automated collections. (See Table 8.)

Other Schools. The regional high schools make up most of the schools in this category. We could not find any statistically significant relationships in this category. In a future study, we can look more thoroughly into this situation.

MSLMA Standards and Proposed Legislation. In 1996, MSLMA issued new standards titled "Standards for School Library Media Centers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts." (Table 14 lists selected MSLMA standards.) Senate Bill 2148, filed in the last legislative session, was written to meet MSLMA standards.

As the data suggest, a critical situation exists here in Massachusetts. Why does this problem exist? What can we do about it? Funding at all levels for school libraries is a major problem. Most of the school libraries in the Commonwealth were either built or expanded with federal aid, ESEA-Title II (Elementary and Secondary

Education Act), in the mid-1960s to the early 1970. When the federal government moved from categorical aid for school libraries under the ESEA-Title II to block grant funding in 1974, meaningful school library development ended in many Massachusetts school systems.

State Aid. What is the solution? State aid is the solution. Let me repeat that—state aid is the solution. State aid is a necessary ingredient for achieving equal opportunity for every child. But Massachusetts does **not** provide categorical state aid for school libraries. (See Appendix F.) The funding of adequate school libraries is, or should be, a joint responsibility of the Legislature and local school committees.

A bit of history is important here. Our forefathers determined in a deliberate way how education was to be managed. Education, one area not provided for in the U.S. Constitution, automatically devolves to the states. Therefore, education is a state responsibility, with full legal accountability resting with each state legislature. Although the federal government makes substantial sums of money available for education, the federal government is **not** controlling in terms of governance.

Realizing the fragile nature of education at the local level, state legislatures provided special protection for schools through the instrument of a local school board (or school committee, as they are known here in New England.) This legal convention ideally put the local schools in the hands of public-spirited individuals who would protect the local public schools from the messy side of day-to-day politics.

It is well-settled law in some jurisdictions that school boards are instruments of the state legislature, fulfilling the educational obligations of the legislature to its

citizens. Under this scheme, it is the legislature's responsibility to see that public education is properly funded, including appropriate funding for school libraries.

Accountability for the rather bleak U.S. Office rankings of school libraries in Massachusetts rests not only with the local school committees but also with the state legislature, including its agent--the State Board of Education, which has the obligation to establish and maintain standards for quality education. The State Board of Education needs to reassess its role in allocating and providing leadership for school libraries. The publication *State Department of Education Responsibilities for School Libraries*[1] defines this role for state departments:

> Certain legal responsibilities, such as establishing regulations and standards, promoting research in school programs, providing consultative services, accrediting institutions, and making reports, devolve on State departments of education. School libraries are generally a constituent part of these responsibilities.

The significance of this quote speaks to the deplorable condition of school libraries today. We need the state board to develop policies and work with the legislature to change the situation for the Massachusetts school children. I also point out that the same Office of Education document states: "Increased State aid and higher standards for school libraries are considered essential for school library development."[2]

Massachusetts once stood out in front on school libraries, at least at the state level. At the conclusion of World War II, the legislature provided for a state level

---

[1] U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *State Department of Education Responsibilities for School Libraries,* 1960, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p 31.

supervisory position for school libraries in the DOE. We were one of the first states to move in this direction. It is now time to regain our leadership role in school libraries.

The legislature now needs to review this situation and then take immediate and appropriate action in the following two areas:

1. To fund a state school library supervisory office in the DOE that will carry out responsibilities for that office as espoused in the U.S. Office of Education document cited above; and

2. To provide relief to local school committees in the form of direct categorical aid for school libraries.

The development and revitalization of school libraries begins, as a matter of course, with the legislature, but the advisory educational leadership of DOE is also needed. The fact that Massachusetts ranks 50th out of the fifty states in circulating materials to children is an intolerable condition in a state that prides itself in working towards educational excellence and in a state with state-mandated passing of MCAS tests.

As our research shows, the successful implementation of the curriculum frameworks depends immeasurably on a strong school library program. School libraries are the foundation for resource-based teaching. Achieving good MCAS scores depends precisely on the good working combination of successful administrative leadership, of team building for the implementation of the curriculum frameworks, of excellence in teaching, and of strong school library resources in every school.

Here, I especially want to point out the urgency of the model for elementary school libraries, since this level at this time is in the greatest need, both in suburban and urban school systems in the Commonwealth. It is a terrible thing to waste the mind of a child. And children learn better when their schools have libraries—libraries that are well-stocked and well-staffed. We cannot rest, nor should we, until every school and every school child in the Commonwealth has a school library, a full-time state certified school librarian, and a book collection that meets MSLMA standards. We can afford no less for our children.

Working together, we will accomplish much; working divisively we will accomplish nothing. The future belongs to those of us who can team and build for the children of Massachusetts, the group for which we today—here and now—are advocates. The advocacy is for student achievement. School libraries significantly increase student achievement.

TABLES

Table 1. Response Rate for Questionnaires

	Number Mailed	Number Received	Percent Received
Elementary	1,241	289	23
Middle/Junior	266	89	33
High School	311	108	35
All	1,818	519	29

Table 2. Number and Percentage of Massachusetts Schools with a School Library by Grade Level

	Library		No Library		All	
Grade Level	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Elementary	255	88	34	12	289	100
Middle/Junior	87	98	2	2	89	100
High	108	100	0	0	108	100
Other	28	85	5	15	33	100
All	478	92	41	8	519	100

Table 3. Elementary Level. Regression Analysis of Free Lunch Variable and School Library Program Variables

Predictors	R-Sq	Coefficient	P-Value
Free Lunch	63.3%	- 0.64895	0.00
Free Lunch	70.6%	-0.63658	0.00
Books per Pupil		0.3262	0.00
Full-Time Librarian		5.854	0.00
Automation		3.1103	0.00

Table 4. Middle/Junior High Level. Regression Analysis of Free Lunch Variable and School Library Program Variables

Predictors	R-Sq	Coefficient	P-Value
Free Lunch	75.6%	-0.93111	0.00
Free Lunch	80.1%	-0.95800	0.00
Books per Pupil		0.3305	0.05
Full-Time Librarian		4.727	0.09

Table 5. High School Level. Regression Analysis of Free Lunch Variable and School Library Program Variables

Predictors	R-Sq	Coefficient	P-Value
Free Lunch	58.7%	-1.2337	0.00
Free Lunch	60.2%	-1.3732	0.00
Books per Pupil		0.2973	0.03
Full-Time Librarian		19.428	0.02
Hours of Paid Staff Support		0.15062	0.05

Table 6. MCAS Scores and Books per Pupil

Books per Pupil	Low % of School Lunch			High % of School Lunch			All		
	Mean MCAS	t^*	P-Value	Mean MCAS	t	P-Value	Mean MCAS	t	P-Value
Elementary									
Low**	713			690			699		
High	722	-3.08	0.00	700	-2.38	0.01	714	-4.66	0.00
Middle									
Low	708			670			688		
High	717	-1.99	0.03	680	-1.47	0.07	701	-2.34	0.01
High School	695			661			673		
Low	710	-3.46	0.00	673	-1.59	0.06	698	-4.01	0.00
High									

*In tables 6, 7, 10-13, the t values are interpreted under the null hypothesis as one-tailed tests of significance. One-tailed tests are used in interpreting these data since both empirical evidence and theoretical rationale justify such use.

**For Low and High in each of the tables employing the t-test, the distribution for each variable was divided as closely as possible into two groups. (One cannot have more than two groups to perform the t-test.)

Table 7. MCAS Scores and Library Staff Assistance

	ALL		
	Mean MCAS	*T*	P-Value
Elementary			
Low	705		
High	712	-2.38	0.01
Middle			
Low	690		
High	694	0.73	0.77
High School			
Low	680		
High	694	-2.55	0.01

Table 8. High School Level. A Simple Analysis of Variance of Automation and Mean MCAS Scores

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F*	P-Value
Between groups	3	12367.4	4122.5	5.55	0.00
Within groups	94	69870.0	743.3		
Total	97	82237.4			

The analysis of variance statistical technique allows one to look at the difference between the means of two or more groups; in this instance, the various mean MCAS scores in relation to automated library collections.

Table 9. Free School Lunch and MCAS Test Scores Correlated by Grade Level

	Correlation*	P-Value
Elementary		
4th grade	-0.796	0.000
8th grade	-0.884	0.000
Middle	-0.868	0.000
High School	-0.55	0.000
Other Schools		
8th grade	-0.574	0.002
10th grade	-0.533	0.005

*The minus sign with each correlation coefficient indicates that there is an inverse relationship between the two variables; for example, as the percentage of free school lunch goes up the mean MCAS scores go down.

Table 10. Elementary Level. Mean MCAS Scores and Statistically Significant
School Library Variables

Variable	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean MCAS Score	t	P-Value
Hours Open					
Low	96	21.9	703.1		
High	100	19.0	710.9	-2.67	0.00
Before School					
No	119	21.5	704.6		
Yes	75	18.9	710.5	-1.93	0.03
After School					
No	126	20.0	704.7		
Yes	67	21.5	711.1	-2.06	0.02
Books per Pupil					
Low	77	21.9	699.4		
High	96	18.3	713.9	-4.66	0.00
Periodicals (Hard Copy)					
Low	75	22.9	701.1		
High	87	18.2	711.0	-3.06	0.00
Newer Media					
Low	67	24.0	701.9		
High	74	17.8	711.3	-2.62	0.00
Expenditure per Pupil					
Low	66	23.8	705.4		
High	79	16.8	711.6	-1.86	0.03
Library Instruction					
No	30	19.7	698.3		
Yes	155	20.3	709.5	-2.78	0.00
Student Visits per Week					
Low	93	23.0	704.8		
High	89	17.1	709.7	-1.63	0.05
Percent of Student Body Visiting per Week					
Low	62	24.7	700.1		
High	126	17.3	710.9	-3.08	0.00
Alignment with State Curriculum Frameworks					
No	43	21.5	700.2		
Yes	57	20.6	709.1	-2.09	0.02
Full-Time Librarian					
No	119	20.6	704.8		
Yes	69	20.3	711.6	-2.21	0.02
Staff Assistance					
Low	79	24.7	704.5		
High	81	14.8	712.2	-2.38	0.00
Parent Volunteers					
No	58	22.4	696.7		
Yes	135	18.4	711.8	-4.54	0.00
Technical Support					
No	88	19.5	704.2		
Yes	101	20.9	710.3	-2.05	0.02

Table 11. Elementary Level. Mean MCAS Scores and Statistically Significant
School Library Variables by High Percentage of Free School Lunches

Variable	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean MCAS Score	t	P-Value
Hours Open					
Low	49	21.1	691.5		
High	45	18.4	698.6	-1.74	0.04
Books per Pupil					
Low	44	20.8	689.8		
High	36	19.0	700.4	-2.38	0.01
New Media					
Low	39	20.7	690.1		
High	30	17.7	700.0	-2.14	0.02
Expenditure per Pupil	35				
Low	29	22.3	691.5		
High		17.9	702.7	-2.18	0.02
Student Visits per Week					
Low	51	20.0	691.5		
High	38	19.4	700.5	-2.14	0.02
% of Student Body Visiting per Week					
Low	41	18.8	688.1		
High	49	19.6	700.1	-2.97	0.00
Alignment with State Curriculum Frameworks					
No	23	18.7	686.3		
Yes	26	22.2	697.3	-1.89	0.03
Full-Time Librarian					
No	56	17.8	690.0		
Yes	33	21.2	701.0	-2.52	0.01
Staff Assistance					
No	46	23.1	692.1		
Yes	29	14.5	701.4	-2.14	0.02
Parent Volunteers					
No	41	19.2	689.2		
Yes	45	19.9	699.7	-2.56	0.00

Table 12. Middle/Junior High Level. Mean MCAS Scores and Statistically
Significant School Library Variables

Variable	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean MCAS Score	t	P-Value
Hours Open					
Low	47	25.1	688.5		
High	34	23.2	703.1	-2.68	0.00
Books per Pupil					
Low	39	24.3	687.0		
High	40	25.3	701.0	-2.34	0.01
Periodicals (Hard Copy)					
Low	26	4.7	687.1		
High	54	25.1	698.1	-1.85	0.03
Expenditures per Pupil					
Low	29	24.7	687.5		
High	28	22.0	702.1	-2.31	0.01
Library Instruction					
No	12	25.9	682.9		
Yes	64	24.1	698	-1.97	0.03
Regional System					
No	21	24.3	687		
Yes	57	24.8	698.7	-1.85	0.03
Parent Volunteers					
No	45	24.1	686.9		
Yes	35	22.7	705.5	-3.52	0.00

Table 13. High School Level. Mean MCAS Scores and Statistically Significant
School Library Variables

Variable	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean MCAS Score	t	P-Value
After School Hours					
No	9	23.4	660.3		
Yes	91	27.5	688.2	-2.64	0.00
Books per Pupil					
Low	48	25.2	672.8		
High	49	28.5	694.7	-4.00	0.00
Regional System					
No	16	26.2	672.5		
Yes	82	28.5	686.7	-1.85	0.03
% Student Body Visiting Library Weekly					
Low	37	31.4	676.4		
High	44	26.3	687.1	-1.67	0.05
Full-Time Librarian					
No	7	24.9	665.4		
Yes	91	29.0	685.4	-1.77	0.04
Staff Assistance (Hours)					
Low	45	27.4	679.7		
High	41	24.9	694.1	-2.54	0.00

Table 14. MSLMA Standards for Library Collection for All Levels

Size of School	Library Books*
<400 students	20 print titles per student
401-800 students	22 print titles per student
>801 students	24 print titles per student
	Periodicals
<400 students	Access to 50 full-text titles
401-800 students	Access to 75 full-text titles
>801 students	Access to 100 full-text titles
Non-Print Resources	Total number equal one (1) percent of total collection

*Seventy percent (70%) of the entire print collection will have a copyright date
within ten (10) years of the current year.

15. Elementary Schools. Selected Library Services in Massachusetts by MSLMA
Standards

	<400 Students N*=142 Schools			401-800 Students N=129 Schools			>801 Students N=18 Schools		
	Median			Median			Median		
Books per Pupil	18.4			16.3			11.6		
Magazines per School	4			15			13		
Electronic Periodical Database	0			0			1		
% of Non-Fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	40			50			60		
% of Fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	40			50			41		
		N	%		N	%		N	%
Full-Time Librarian Yes No		21 90	19 81		59 62	49 51		12 6	67 33
Library Yes No		114 28	80 20		123 6	95 5		18 0	100

*N = Number

Table 16. Middle/Junior Schools. Selected Library Services in Massachusetts by MSLMA Standards

	<400 Students N*=12 Schools			401-800 Students N=53 Schools			>801 Students N=24 Schools		
	Median			Median			Median		
Books per Pupil	19.7			14.1			10.8		
Magazines per School	17.5			24.5			19		
Electronic Periodical Database	1			1			1		
% of Non-Fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	27.5			27.5			40		
% of Fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	50			30			32.5		
		N	%		N	%		N	%

Full-Time Librarian
  Yes
  No
		6
		5
			55
			45
					36
					15
						71
						29
								19
								4
									83
									17

Library
  Yes
  No
		11
		1
			92
			8
					53
					0
						100
						0
								24
								0
									100
									0

*N = Number

30

Table 17. High Schools. Selected Library Services in Massachusetts by MSLMA
Standards

	<400 Students N*=6 Schools			401-800 Students N=40 Schools			>801 Students N=62 Schools		
	Median			Median			Median		
Books per Pupil	17.8			19.3			14.6		
Magazines per School	60			48			50		
Electronic Periodical Database	1			1			1		
% of Non-Fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	90			25			25		
% of Fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	80			20			21.5		
		N	%		N	%		N	%
Full-Time Librarian Yes No		3 2	60 40		38 1	97 3		57 4	93 7
Library Yes No		5 1	83 17		40 0	100		62 0	100

*N = Number

Table 18. Other Schools. Selected Library Services in Massachusetts by MSLMA Standards

	<400 Students N*=7 Schools			401-800 Students N=12 Schools			>801 Students N=13 Schools		
	Median			Median			Median		
Books per Pupil	22.8			20			11.2		
Magazines per School	30			41			60		
Electronic Periodical Database	0			1			1		
% of Non-fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	61.5			31			30		
% of Fiction Collection Less than 10 Years Old	66			40			40		
		N	%		N	%		N	%
Full-time Librarian									
Yes		1	33		12	100		13	100
No		2	67		0			0	
Library									
Yes		3	43		12	100		13	100
No		4	57		0			0	

*N = Number

Building Elementary School Libraries:
An Essential Element for Education Reform

A Paper Presented at a Symposium
Sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Simmons College
Boston, Massachusetts

by
Mary S. Eldringhoff, M.Ed., M.S.

October 26, 2000

"…the library media center should become
a magnet for teacher and student alike."
                                        --Alliance for Excellence

Massachusetts Elementary School Libraries: An Overview. The Simmons' Survey conducted during the spring of 1999 produced significant data pointing toward glaring discrepancies in the elementary school library media programs being offered by school districts across Massachusetts. According to this information, it is at the elementary level that the presence of a library media program demonstrates the strongest connection to increased MCAS scores, and yet in Massachusetts it is at the elementary level that there exists a most intolerable situation of school "haves" and "have nots."

A careful study of the school library collections, their instructional programs, and the level of staffing available to the schools that responded to our survey observe this inequity.

Looking at the survey statistics, we can see that half of the elementary schools reporting, *the haves*, had a nonfiction collection with copyright date of 1989 or later, but the other half of our schools, the *have nots,* are training the students of the Information Age in research skills by using nonfiction collections that are older than 1989.

Half our elementary schools are teaching students search techniques for automated collections; but the other half of our schools are only planning to automate their collections in some distant future, or have not even begun to discuss automating their collection, and automation can be a three-year process!

Instructional programs offer some consistency to public elementary school libraries in Massachusetts. Instructional programs of some type are available in 85

percent of our elementary schools, and 84 percent of the personnel in charge of those programs target the statewide curriculum frameworks whenever they find the time to collaborate with classroom teachers. Despite this Herculean effort to teach and to teach to the frameworks, only one third of the respondent schools has a space dedicated as an instructional area.

However dismal the status of the collection and the facility, what is most disconcerting about *have* and *have not* students in Massachusetts is survey information that more than three-quarters of all elementary schools reporting do not employ a full-time, certified school library media specialist. In fact, even support staff at the elementary level is among the missing. Only one median hour of clerical or technical support is available to elementary school librarians surveyed in this state. An examination of staffing practices in the elementary school library media centers of Massachusetts reveals that inequity is the order of the day.

Expectations for a School Library Media Program. There is deep understanding within the school library community about what school librarians do and about the value of our profession as an integral component in a multifaceted approach to the education of young people. Lucille Fargo published an articulation of our mission. She spoke of acquiring books in line with the demands of the curriculum, of guiding children in their choice of books, of developing in students the habit of personal investigation as well as a wide range of interests. Ms. Fargo spoke of working cooperatively with teachers and administrative staff. She set as an aim of the school library the encouragement of students toward lifelong education through the use of library resources. She made her statement in 1947.

A commitment to this type of quality program has developed and evolved throughout the last century. In 1988, the following statement of purpose and goals was written for *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* and it remained word for word as the statement of purpose for *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* in 1998.

Mission and Goals of the School Library Media Program

The Mission of the library media program is to ensure that students and staff are effective users of ideas and information. This mission is accomplished:

- by providing intellectual and physical access to materials in all formats

- by providing instruction to foster competence and stimulate interest in reading, viewing and using information and ideas

- by working with other educators to design learning strategies to meet the needs of individual students.

-Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning (1998), p.6

However, if within the profession we are aware of the contribution we make in education, we seem to be unable to articulate this idea to the educational community as a whole.

This disconnect appears as far back as 1984. At that time, librarians across the country were shouting to be heard as a nation wide debate was held in the wake of a publication called *A Nation at Risk*. Under the leadership of Terrel H. Bell, then U.S. Department of Education Secretary, the librarians' response was recorded in *Alliance for Excellence*: *Librarians Respond to* A Nation at Risk. At that time,

thirteen recommendations were carefully crafted. However, the Simmons' survey documents that in 1999 most of those recommendations remained as an unfulfilled wish list in most Massachusetts elementary schools.

The American Library Association through its American Association of School Libraries division in conjunction with the Association for Educational Communications and Technology published the following national standards for student learning:

<div align="center">

The Nine Information Literacy Standards

for Student Learning

</div>

Information Literacy

Standard 1: The student who is information literate accesses information efficiently and effectively.

Standard 2: The student who is information literate evaluates information critically and competently.

Standard 3: The student who is information literate uses information accurately and creatively.

Independent Learning

Standard 4: The student who is an independent learner is information literate and pursues information related to personal interests.

Standard 5: The student who is an independent learner is information literate and appreciates literature and other creative expressions of information.

Standard 6: The student who is an independent learner is information literate and strives for excellence in information seeking and knowledge generation.

Social Responsibility

Standard 7: The student who contributes positively to the learning community and to society is information literate and recognizes the importance of information to a democratic society.

Standard 8: The student who contributes positively to the learning community and to society is information literate and practices ethical behavior in regard to information and information technology.

Standard 9: The student who contributes positively to the learning community and to society is information literate and participates effectively in groups to pursue and generate information.

-Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning (1998), p.8-9

These goals seem logical and admirable. Why, therefore, are they absent from so many Massachusetts' elementary schools? Are educators even aware of these building blocks of education for the 21st century?

Perhaps it is a failure of our profession that the school librarians' ability to contribute to the education process remains unseen and under appreciated. If that is the case, then let us state our value clearly with the results of this survey. Only through the efforts of enlightened administrators will viable school library media programs be established and maintained in a manner that maximizes their impact on student achievement.

We offer a simple premise:

That the hiring of a trained and certified school library media specialist who performs the following functions in each of your elementary schools is dollar-for-dollar an investment in personnel that cannot be beaten if student achievement in the 21st century is your bottom line.

For the cost of one classroom teacher, a school librarian would:

- Acquire quality materials for your school libraries that support and enrich the curriculum.

- Develop in students the habit of personal investigation.

- Teach critical research skills for both print and electronic material formats.

- Teach the importance of research evaluation and documentation.

- Guide students, in developing of a love for reading.

- Help students to establish a wide range of interests.

- Encourage in students a desire for lifelong education.

- Work cooperatively with classroom teachers to advance their curriculum goals.

- Work constructively with administrators to advance the technology and literacy components of the mission of the district.

Dollars allocated to a school library media program will directly benefit every single student and every single faculty member. While the skills taught in a comprehensive school library media program benefit all students, they certainly provide the basis for lifelong learning for those students who will enter the workforce after high school graduation. Those students may never acquire an associate or

undergraduate degree, but they will need to access information in order to locate the most appropriate nursing home for their parents. They will need to evaluate the kind of information in found in car insurance policies. They will need to find a way to keep up in the Age of Information as it continues to emerge as a dominant factor in their lives. Those students may not be able to afford the luxury of higher education, but they will always need to access information. If they possess strong information literacy skills and can visit a local library, they will have the ability to acquire the knowledge they need to succeed.

Dollars expended on school library media programs have immediate impact and remain highly accountable over time. A well-run school library media program will provide a vehicle that will advance school district curriculum goals on a regular basis. That most desirable bump in MCAS scores documented by the Simmons' survey at all grade levels is not the only reason to invest in a school library media program. It is simply one more great reason to do so.

Four Steps Toward Change: A Call to Action. Basic questions about the status of a school district's individual library media program must be asked before any meaningful change can take place.

- Do the school librarians in your system have detailed job descriptions?
- Are librarians evaluated by the exact same assessment tool as the teachers in your school district?
- Are principals expected to meet regularly with their school librarian?
- Do librarians participate in grade-level meetings?

- Are your classroom/academic teachers expected to collaborate with the school librarians?

- Are your school librarians required to produce an annual report for their administrators?

- Are school librarians invited to sit on district wide curriculum committees?

- Do your school librarians make presentations at faculty meetings, in-service, or staff development programs?

- Has your school district developed a five-year plan for improving the situation of your school libraries?

The answers to these questions could provide the basis for an attitude change toward school librarians that would in turn present educators with a positive growth position for Massachusetts. Students, teachers, and administrators can take part in this constructive change if they follow these four steps:

1. **Realizing the Need for Change.**

    It is hoped that the MCAS implications at the elementary level as documented in the Simmons Survey will serve as a springboard to the realization that school library programs benefit all students in our schools, K-12.

2. **Becoming Acquainted with State and National Standards.**

As a first step toward action, school superintendents should investigate and understand the state and national standards available that outline the contribution of Information Literacy education.

3. **Providing District Wide Program Assessment.**

   Within each district, a systematic assessment rubric is developed and implemented. It will offer specific guidance and direction to the staff responsible for this change.

4. **Committing to a Planning and Implementation Process.**

   Each district will develop a five-year plan based on the district wide assessment that moves all of their schools toward Information Literacy in the 21st century, and that adequate funding for these programs be allocated and maintained.

Your response to the Simmons survey results and the assessment suggestions made today will dictate the future of school library media centers in Massachusetts. Let us hope that those who follow us will not conclude that the concept of fully funded school libraries was an idea that everybody believed in, but that only some chose to provide.

"Between stimulus and response, one has the freedom to choose."
                                                            -- Covey, p.71

Appendix

AIMS of the SCHOOL LIBRARY*

1. To acquire books and other materials in line with the demands of the curriculum and the needs of boys and girls to organize these materials for effective use.

2. To guide pupils in their choice of books and other materials of learning desired both for personal and curricular purposes.

3. To develop in pupils skill and resourcefulness in their use of books and libraries to encourage the habit of personal investigation.

4. To help pupils establish a wide range of significant interests.

5. To provide aesthetic experience and develop appreciation of the arts.

6. To encourage lifelong education throughout the use of library resources.

7. To encourage social attitudes and provide experience in social and democratic living.

8. To work cooperatively and constructively with instruction and administrative staffs of the school.

*From: Lucille F. Fargo, *The Library in the School* (Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association) 1947, p.22.

Selected Bibliography

Alliance for Excellence: *Librarians Respond to* A Nation at Risk. United States Department of Education, 1984.

Covey, Stephen R. *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. New York: Fireside, 1989.

Fargo, Lucille. *The Library in the School*. 2d ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1947.

Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning. Chicago and London: American
       Library Association, 1998.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Table 1. Public Schools with
Library Media Centers

Rank	State	Percent
3.0	Arkansas	100
3.0	Georgia	100
3.0	Maryland	100
3.0	Oregon	100
3.0	Vermont	100
6.5	Nebraska	99
6.5	Wisconsin	99
13.0	Arizona	98
13.0	Colorado	98
13.0	Hawaii	98
13.0	Indiana	98
13.0	Iowa	98
13.0	Kentucky	98
13.0	Missouri	98
13.0	Montana	98
13.0	North Carolina	98
13.0	Ohio	98
13.0	South Dakota	98
22.5	Alabama	97
22.5	Florida	97
22.5	Kansas	97
22.5	Minnesota	97
22.5	Nevada	97
22.5	South Carolina	97
22.5	Tennessee	97
22.5	Utah	97
28.0	Oklahoma	96
28.0	Virginia	96
28.0	Wyoming	96
32.5	Connecticut	95
32.5	Idaho	95
32.5	Louisiana	95
32.5	New Mexico	95
32.5	New York	95
32.5	Texas	95
39.5	California	94
39.5	Delaware	94
39.5	Illinois	94
39.5	Mississippi	94
39.5	New Jersey	94
39.5	Pennsylvania	94
39.5	Rhode Island	94
39.5	Washington	94
45.0	Maine	92
45.0	New Hampshire	92
45.0	North Dakota	92
47.0	Michigan	91
48.0	Alaska	90
49.0	**MASSACHUSETTS**	87
50.0	West Virginia	86
	National Total	96

Massachusetts ranks only 49th out of the fifty states in terms of providing its public schools with library media centers.

Table 2. Teachers Who Agree That Library
Materials Are Adequate to Support Objectives

Rank	State	Percent
1.0	Georgia	32
2.0	Wisconsin	30
4.5	Maine	29
4.5	Mississippi	29
4.5	South Carolina	29
4.5	Tennessee	29
8.5	Kansas	28
8.5	Louisiana	28
8.5	Nevada	28
8.5	Virginia	28
12.0	Kentucky	27
12.0	Pennsylvania	27
12.0	Texas	27
17.5	Alabama	26
17.5	Arkansas	26
17.5	Colorado	26
17.5	Illinois	26
17.5	New Jersey	26
17.5	Oklahoma	26
17.5	Vermont	26
17.5	Wyoming	26
22.0	Nebraska	25
23.5	Alaska	24
23.5	Missouri	24
27.5	Arizona	23
27.5	Indiana	23
27.5	Iowa	23
27.5	Montana	23
27.5	New York	23
27.5	North Carolina	23
32.5	Connecticut	22
32.5	Florida	22
32.5	New Hampshire	22
32.5	South Dakota	22
36.0	Ohio	21
36.0	Oregon	21
36.0	West Virginia	21
38.5	Maryland	20
38.5	New Mexico	20
41.0	**MASSACHUSETTS**	19
41.0	Michigan	19
41.0	North Dakota	19
44.0	Hawaii	18
44.0	Minnesota	18
44.0	Utah	18
46.0	California	17
48.0	Delaware	16
48.0	Idaho	16
48.0	Washington	16
50.0	Rhode Island	15
	National Total	24

Massachusetts ranks only 41st in teachers who agree that library materials are adequate to support objectives.

Appendix C

Table 3. Public School Students with
State-Certified Library Media Specialists

Rank	State	Percent
2.0	Georgia	100
2.0	North Carolina	100
2.0	South Carolina	100
4.0	New Jersey	99
5.0	Virginia	98
7.0	Kansas	97
7.0	Kentucky	97
7.0	Maryland	97
9.5	Missouri	96
9.5	Montana	96
11.0	Arkansas	95
12.5	New York	94
12.5	Rhode Island	94
14.5	Alabama	93
14.5	Minnesota	93
16.5	Florida	92
16.5	Wisconsin	92
18.0	Pennsylvania	91
19.5	Tennessee	90
19.5	Texas	90
21.0	Hawaii	89
22.0	Delaware	88
24.0	Iowa	87
24.0	Louisiana	87
24.0	South Dakota	87
26.0	North Dakota	85
27.0	Vermont	84
28.5	Mississippi	82
28.5	Oklahoma	82
30.0	Nevada	79
31.0	Arizona	77
32.0	Washington	76
34.0	Indiana	75
34.0	Nebraska	75
34.0	West Virginia	75
36.0	Illinois	74
38.0	Connecticut	72
38.0	**MASSACHUSETTS**	72
38.0	Wyoming	72
40.5	New Hampshire	67
40.5	Oregon	67
42.0	Ohio	66
43.0	Utah	60
44.5	Maine	59
44.5	Michigan	59
46.5	Colorado	57
46.5	Idaho	57
48.0	Alaska	56
49.0	New Mexico	54
50.0	California	35
	National Total	79

Massachusetts ranks only 38th in providing Public School Students with State-Certified Library Media Specialists.

Appendix D

Table 4. Public Schools Having Computers
Supervised by Library Media Specialists

Rank	State	Percent
1.0	North Carolina	96
2.0	Virginia	95
3.0	Minnesota	93
4.0	Florida	90
5.0	Iowa	89
7.0	Hawaii	87
7.0	New Hampshire	87
7.0	South Carolina	87
9.0	Missouri	85
10.0	Georgia	84
11.5	Indiana	83
11.5	Oregon	83
14.5	Colorado	82
14.5	Nebraska	82
14.5	Nevada	82
14.5	Washington	82
17.0	Montana	81
20.0	Connecticut	80
20.0	Kentucky	80
20.0	Maryland	80
20.0	Vermont	80
20.0	Wisconsin	80
23.5	Kansas	77
23.5	Oklahoma	77
25.5	Alabama	75
25.5	Arizona	75
27.0	Delaware	74
28.5	Michigan	73
28.5	Ohio	73
30.5	New York	71
30.5	Wyoming	71
33.0	Alaska	70
33.0	Idaho	70
33.0	New Mexico	70
35.0	Pennsylvania	69
36.0	New Jersey	68
37.5	Arkansas	67
37.5	Illinois	67
39.5	Tennessee	66
39.5	Utah	66
42.5	California	62
42.5	Louisiana	62
42.5	South Dakota	62
42.5	Texas	62
45.0	North Dakota	61
46.0	Maine	60
47.0	**MASSACHUSETTS**	**59**
48.0	Rhode Island	58
49.0	West Virginia	53
50.0	Mississippi	49
	National Total	74

Massachusetts ranks 47th out of the fifty states in terms of computers supervised by library media specialists.

Table 5. Mean Circulation per Pupil
per School per Week

Rank	State	Mean
1.0	Wyoming	3.2
2.0	North Dakota	2.6
3.0	Montana	2.3
4.0	Hawaii	1.9
5.5	Iowa	1.8
5.5	Vermont	1.8
9.0	Indiana	1.7
9.0	Kansas	1.7
9.0	New Mexico	1.7
9.0	South Dakota	1.7
9.0	Wisconsin	1.7
13.0	Minnesota	1.6
13.0	Nebraska	1.6
13.0	Pennsylvania	1.6
15.5	Alaska	1.5
15.5	Missouri	1.5
19.0	Illinois	1.4
19.0	Oklahoma	1.4
19.0	Rhode Island	1.4
19.0	Virginia	1.4
19.0	Washington	1.4
24.5	Idaho	1.3
24.5	Kentucky	1.3
24.5	Maine	1.3
24.5	Oregon	1.3
24.5	South Carolina	1.3
24.5	Texas	1.3
29.0	Colorado	1.2
29.0	New Hampshire	1.2
29.0	North Carolina	1.2
33.5	Arizona	1.1
33.5	California	1.1
33.5	Maryland	1.1
33.5	New Jersey	1.1
33.5	New York	1.1
33.5	Utah	1.1
42.0	Arkansas	1.0
42.0	Connecticut	1.0
42.0	Delaware	1.0
42.0	Georgia	1.0
42.0	Louisiana	1.0
42.0	Michigan	1.0
42.0	Mississippi	1.0
42.0	Nevada	1.0
42.0	Ohio	1.0
42.0	Tennessee	1.0
42.0	West Virginia	1.0
48.5	Alabama	0.9
48.5	Florida	0.9
50.0	**MASSACHUSETTS**	**0.8**
	National Total	1.3

Massachusetts ranks 50th out of the fifty states in terms of mean circulation per pupil per school per week.

Appendix F.
State Aid for School Libraries by State, 1998-99

State	School Library Funding		School Technology Funding	
	Categorical Aid	Other	Categorical Aid	Other
1. ALABAMA	YES		YES	
2. ALASKA	NO		NO	
3. ARIZONA	NO		NO	
4. ARKANSAS	NO		NO	
5. CALIFORNIA	YES		YES	
6. COLORADO	NO		NO	
7. CONNECTICUT	NO	YES	Neither	
8. DELAWARE	NO		Neither	
9. FLORIDA	YES		YES	
10. GEORGIA	YES		YES	
11. HAWAII	YES		NO	
12. IDAHO	NO		YES	
13. ILLINOIS	NO		YES	
14. INDIANA	YES		YES	
15. IOWA	NO		YES	
16. KANSAS	NO		YES	
17. KENTUCKY	NO		Neither	
18. LOUISIANA	NO		YES	
19. *MAINE*	*No response*		*No response*	
20. MARYLAND	YES		YES	
21. MASSACHUSETTS	**NO**		**NO**	**YES**
22. MIGHIGAN	NO		NO	
23. MINNESOTA	NO		YES	
24. MISSOURI	NO		YES	
25. MISSISSIPPI	NO	YES	NO	YES
26. MONTANA	NO	NO	NO	NO
27. NEBRASKA	NO		YES	
28. NEVADA	NO		NO	NO
29. NEW HAMPSHIRE	NO		NO	
30. NEW JERSEY	NO		Neither	
31. *NEW MEXICO*	*No response*		*No response*	
32. NEW YORK	YES		YES	
33. NORTH CAROLINA	NO		YES	
34. NORTH DAKOTA	NO	YES	YES	
35. OHIO	NO	NO	YES	
36. *OKLAHOMA*	*No response*		*No response*	
37. OREGON	NO		NO	
38. PENNSYLVANIA	NO		YES	
39. RHODE ISLAND	NO		YES	
40. SOUTH CAROLINA	NO	YES	YES	
41. SOUTH DAKOTA	NO		YES	
42. TENNESSEE	NO		NO	
43. TEXAS	NO		YES	
44. UTAH	NO	YES?	YES	
45. VERMONT	NO	NO	NO	NO
46. VIRGINIA	NO		Neither	
47. WASHINGTON	NO		Neither	
48. WISCONSIN	YES		YES	
49. WEST VIRGINA	NO		Neither	
50. WYOMING	NO	NO	YES	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3" align="center">SIMMONS COLLEGE
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY and INFORMATION SCIENCE</td></tr>
</table>

A Survey **Of** **Library Media Centers** **in** **Massachusetts Public Schools** **1999** ©	**Return completed surveys to:** **Dr. James C. Baughman,** **Director** **School Library Media Programs** **Simmons College GSLIS** **300 The Fenway** **Boston, MA 02115-5898** **Return on or before:** **April 16, 1999**
1. Name of respondent:	
2. Title:	
3. Telephone #:	
4. E-mail address:	

LMC refers to Library Media Center   /   LMS refers to Library Media Specialist

LMC BACKGROUND INFORMATION

If your response to question #7 is no, please return this survey and consider it completed. If the LMS is responsible for more than one school, please use one survey to respond for each school. Please circle Yes or No for questions: #7, 10 and 11.

5. What grade configuration does this school serve?	**Grades**	
6. How many students attend this school?	**#**	
7. Does the school have a School Library Media Center?	**Yes**	**No**
8. How many days a week is the LMC open?		**days**
9. How many hours per week is the LMC open?		**Hours**
10. Is the LMC open before school hours?	**Yes**	**No**
11. Is the LMC open after school hours?	**Yes**	**No**

LMC COLLECTION INFORMATION
Please estimate a number for entries that require a number or circle unknown if you do not know or cannot obtain the information requested.

Collection: Print Resources

12. How many books?	**#**	
13. How many hard copy periodicals?	**#**	
14. Does the LMC have access to a periodical database?	**Yes**	**No**
15. Estimate what percentage of the non-fiction print collection is less than ten years old.	**%**	**Unknown**
16. Estimate what percentage of the fiction print collection is less than ten years old.	**%**	**Unknown**

Collection: Non-Print Resources

17. How many videos?	**#**
18. How many laser discs?	**#**
19. How many CD-ROMs?	**#**

Collection: Technology Resources

20. Can computers located in areas of the school outside the LMC access the LMC Collection?	**Yes**	**No**
21. Can the LMC Collection be accessed via the WWW?	**Yes**	**No**
22. How many workstations does the LMC provide?	**#**	**Unknown**
23. Is technology a part of the budget plans for:		
a. the school district?	**Yes**	**No**
b. the school improvement plan?	**Yes**	**No**
c. the library media center?	**Yes**	**No**
24. Is technology training provided for the LMS?	**Yes**	**No**
25. The LMC Collection is: **(Check the appropriate box.)** □ a. automated □ c. planning for automation □ b. partially automated □ d. not planning for automation		
26. How many computers does the LMC provide for student use?	**#**	
27. Is the space allocated per computer terminal adequate?	**Yes**	**No**

LMC FACILITIES INFORMATION

Please circle either Yes of No to respond to questions #28, 29 and 30.

28. Does the LMS have a separate office space?	**Yes**	**No**
29. Is there adequate and convenient storage space in the LMC?	**Yes**	**No**
30. Is there a separate space for instructional classes in the LMC?	**Yes**	**No**

LMC BUDGET INFORMATION

Please estimate a number or percentage when those items are requested. Circle Yes or No when appropriate.

31. Exclusive of salaries, discuss the LMC budget for FY 1998/99.
     a. What is the amount budgeted for the collection and supplies? $_____
     b. What is the amount budgeted for equipment? $_____
     c. What amount is budgeted for computer programs?
          (software or district licenses) $_____
 	
     d. What was the total amount budgeted for the LMC? $_____
     e. What was the total amount spent for the LMC during FY 98/99? $_____		

32. Does your LMC receive funds from a parent/teacher organization?	**Yes**	**No**
33. Approximately what amount is funded by the parent /teacher Organization at the school?	**$**	
34. Has your LMC won any grants or been awarded special funding During FY 98/99?	**Yes**	**No**
35. If so, what amount of money was awarded?	**$**	
36. Please describe the source of this funding on a separate sheet of paper.		

LMC CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION INFORMATION

Please respond by circling Yes, No or NA (Not Applicable).
For questions #42-44, please estimate your response, if necessary.

37. Does the LMS provide a library instruction program?	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**

38. How is student visitation to the LMC arranged?   (Check appropriate box.)
     □ a. Teacher preparation.   □ c. Teacher accompanies on a fixed schedule.
     □ b. Partial flexible schedule. □ d. Fully implemented flexible schedule.			

39. If implementing a flexible schedule, how many units or projects does the LMS support requiring whole class instruction per week?	**#**		**NA**
40. Is the LMC a member of a Regional Library System?	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**
41. Does the LMC offer formal workshops for faculty?	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**

42. On average, how many students a week visit the LMC?	#	NA
43. What percent of the student body visit the LMC each week?	%	NA
44. What percent of the LMC collection is aligned with the State curriculum frameworks?	%	NA
45. Does the LMS target the state curriculum frameworks in planning with teachers?	Yes	No
46. Does the LMC target budget dollars to address the state Curriculum frameworks?	Yes	No

LMC PERSONNEL INFORMATION
Please respond by circling Yes, No or NA (Not Applicable).

District-Wide:

47. Does the school district employ a full-time, system wide Technology Coordinator?	Yes	No
48. If not, does the school district employ a part-time, system wide Technology Coordinator?	Yes	No
49. Does the school district employ a full-time, system-wide professional certified School Library Media Director?	Yes	No
50. If not, does the school district employ a part-time, system-wide Professional, certified School Library Media Director?	Yes	No

Individual School:

51. Does the school employ a full-time individual who is certified by the Massachusetts Department of Education as an LMS?	Yes	No
52. If not, does the school employ a part-time individual who is certified by the Massachusetts Department of Education as an LMS?	Yes	No
53. If part-time, what percentage of LMS time is spent at this school?	%	NA
54. How many hour of paid support staff assistance does the school Provide each week?		hours
55. Are parent volunteers a staffing component of the LMC?	Yes	No
56. Approximately, how many hours of parent volunteer help does the LMC use each week?		hours
57. Are student volunteers a staffing component of the LMC?	Yes	No
58. Approximately, how many hours of student volunteer help does the LMC use each week?		hours
59. Is technical support available to the LMS within a 24-hour response time?	Yes	No

MCAS AND SCHOOL LIBRARIES: MAKING THE CONNECTION

A Symposium Sponsored by
Simmons College
Graduate School of Library and Information Science

Program

9:30 a.m.	Registration The Conference Center
10:00 a.m.	Welcome and Remarks 　　Dr. Daniel S. Cheever 　　President, Simmons College 　　Dr. James M. Matarazzo 　　Dean, GSLIS 　　Ms. Joan Gallagher 　　President MSLMA
10:20 a.m.	"MCAS and School Libraries: Making the Connection" 　　Dr. James C. Baughman, Director, School Library Media Program 　　Simmons College
10:50 a.m.	Discussion
11:00 a.m.	Break
11:15 a.m.	"Building Elementary School Libraries: An Essential Element for Education Reform" 　　Ms. Mary Eldringhoff, Library Media Specialist 　　Tewksbury Public Schools
11:30 a.m.	Discussion
12:00 p.m.	Luncheon
12:30 p.m.	"Bringing Our Schools into the Information Age" 　　Senator Susan C. Tucker, Massachusetts Legislature
1:00 p.m.	Break

1:15 p.m.   Reactor Panel
>Dr. Christopher Martes, Executive Director
>Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents
>Panel Chair
>
>Ms. Juliette Johnson, Deputy Superintendent
>Boston Public Schools
>
>Dr. James M. Matarazzo, Dean, GSLIS
>Simmons College
>
>Dr. Gus Sayers, Superintendent
>Amherst Public Schools

1:45 p.m.   "Pathfinder: Developing a Web Resource Model for a Secondary School Library"
>Ms. Cheryl C. Chase, Library Media Specialist
>Dover Public Schools