

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 986

IR 005 686

AUTHOR Aaron, Shirley L.; Smith, Sue O.
TITLE A Study of the Combined School Public Library. Phase I.
INSTITUTION Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. School of Library Science.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 103p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Cooperative Programs; Library Cooperation; *Library Programs; Library Research; *Program Evaluation; *Public Libraries; *School Libraries

ABSTRACT

The State Library of Florida funded a year-long project to examine the concept of cooperative/combined programs between school and public libraries to determine their potential for improving library services and reducing expenditures. Phase I involved development of an interview schedule and evaluation instruments, and visitation of the seven selected sites, to investigate the factors contributing to program success or failure. Interview questions were formulated to obtain information in 16 areas, including community characteristics, library cooperation, planning, financial data, collection development, library operation and programming, site characteristics, and staffing. Evaluation criteria developed by the research team determined two of the selected sites to be successful, four unsuccessful, and one (not yet completed) successful in planning efforts. Within the 16 interview areas, findings were reported in terms of success and failures for comparison purposes. The two major conclusions were (1) it is unlikely that a community able to support separate school and public libraries would provide better service through a combined program, and (2) the combined program does present a possible alternative for communities with limited or non-existent library services.
(Author/JAB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED150986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF THE COMBINED SCHOOL PUBLIC LIBRARY

Phase I

Shirley L. Aaron

Sue O. Smith

with assistance from
Judith F. Davie

School of Library Science
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shirley L. Aaron

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

prepared for

The State Library of Florida

005686

This publication has been funded under provisions of the
Library Services and Construction Act, as amended by
Public Law 91-600.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

ABSTRACT 1

INTRODUCTION 1

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 4

METHODOLOGY 10

DESCRIPTION OF INDIVIDUAL SITES 17

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING SUCCESS AND FAILURE 25

FINDINGS 26

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS RELATING TO SUCCESSFUL COMBINED PROGRAMS . . . 58

CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY 63

RECOMMENDATIONS 65

NOTES 66

APPENDIX

 A. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 69

 B. BOOKS USUALLY FOUND IN A PUBLIC LIBRARY WHICH HAVE CAUSED CONTROVERSY 88

 C. CHECKLIST OF PERIODICALS 90

 D. STATUS OF FLINT, MICHIGAN COMMUNITY LIBRARIES 92

SELECTED REFERENCES 95

ABSTRACT

TITLE: A Study of the Combined School Public Library: Phase I

AUTHOR: Shirley L. Aaron and Sue O. Smith

DATE: 1977

SPONSORING AGENCY: The State Library of Florida

SOURCE OF COPIES: The State Library of Florida

R.A. Gray Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

NUMBER OF PAGES: 96

ABSTRACT:

In Florida, an increasing number of people are proposing the merger of public and school libraries as a logical way to improve services offered to users of all ages and to reduce expenditures. At this time concrete data on past and present attempts at consolidation in the state are not available to support or deny these contentions. Further, there are few guidelines available which can be followed by communities that are attempting to establish the feasibility of this organizational plan for their particular needs. These factors have prompted the State Library of Florida to fund a study which systematically examines the concepts of cooperative ventures and combination libraries to determine their potential for improving school and public library services in the state.

This year-long study was begun in June, 1977 and is divided into three phases. Phase I, which has just been completed, involved: 1) the development of an interview schedule and other evaluative instruments to gather relevant information about combination programs; and, 2) the visitation of selected sites to investigate the factors which brought about the success or failure of this type of program. Phase II, beginning in October, 1977, will analyze past and present merger attempts in Florida to assess the present status of combinations in the state. Finally, in Phase III, a model procedure will be developed to help a community decide whether a combined library or another alternative will offer the best library services in its particular locality.

Seven libraries were selected for visitation during Phase I from a comprehensive list of combined programs compiled by the research team. The availability of information about the program, the present existence of the program, and the size of the community in which the program was located were factors which were given primary consideration in the selection process. The seven sites chosen represented diverse locations in the United States and Canada including both large and small populations.

The case study method was employed to obtain in depth, objective data which would bring to light the factors involved in the success or failure of the programs. An interview schedule was developed to structure this data which was collected during the on-site visits to allow comparisons.

The questions within the interview schedule were divided into sixteen sections. Three of these sections sought to obtain information external to the library program, one explored cooperation between libraries, and the remaining twelve addressed the various facets of the combined program, such as: planning procedures; financial data; governance; collection development;

and, staffing.) At each site, a member of the research team completed the instrument by means of analysis of relevant documents, direct observation and interviews with various people connected with the program.

Due to the lack of standards or performance measures for combined libraries, the research team developed its own criteria for evaluating the programs. When applied to the sites visited, two were judged successful and four unsuccessful. The remaining program, not having been fully implemented, was judged a success in the areas relating to planning and preliminary evaluation.

The findings reported in this study were grouped according to the divisions used in the interview schedule, which included: general information; planning; legal jurisdiction; financial data; purchasing, processing and organization of materials; selection of materials; circulation of materials; collection; operation and programming; personnel; site characteristics; cooperation; and, opinions and evaluation. Within each division findings were reported in terms of successes and failures for the sake of comparison.

Based on findings from the study, there were two major conclusions. First, it is unlikely that a community able to support or now supporting separate types of libraries will offer better school and public library service through a combined program. This is because the combination of factors required to promote a successful program seldom occurs.

Second, when a community is unable to provide minimum library services through separate facilities and no option for improved services through system membership exists, the combined program presents a possible alternative to limited or non-existent services under certain conditions. However, communities seeking a cheaper way to provide better library service should be aware that there is no documented evidence that economy results from combining school and public library programs. Therefore, communities with limited resources should not select the combined program unless the implementation of the concept: (1) allows the hiring of professional personnel where none previously were employed; (2) provides a means for strengthening resources; (3) offers an adequately planned program to meet the needs of all community members; and, (4) utilizes a systematic evaluative procedure to assess the status of the program and provide future direction.

Several recommendations based on the findings were offered for those considering this organizational pattern.

INTRODUCTION

The question of whether to offer a combined program of school and public library services in a single facility has received renewed attention in many localities. According to Woolard, there are presently 84 of these combined programs or combinations as confirmed by her survey in 1976.¹ In 1972, only 46 school-public library combinations were identified by the American Library Association.²

The renewed interest in this concept in recent years appears to be largely the result of five major factors. First, there is an increasing amount of pressure on public institutions from many segments of the population to make better use of tax monies. Taxpayers are unwilling to put greater amounts of money into programs which cannot maintain cost effective operations.

Second, with the broader acceptance of the community school concept which envisions the school as the central institution for the education of all community members, school libraries (professionally called school library media programs) are being urged in many cases to serve as community libraries during and after school hours. This expanded program is often viewed as a means to demonstrate to the community more efficient utilization of existing educational facilities.

The third factor is that the fiscal resources which were available for funding library programs have decreased. Consequently, school and public libraries have had to explore alternative ways of offering adequate services with less money in many cases.

Fourth, the public has become aware of "the importance of the library as a learning resource center for life-long education opportunities."³ Consequently, the roles of the public and school library more closely parallel each other as the public library assumes additional responsibility for the education of community members.

And, fifth, there is a growing trend toward access to information regardless of format. In many instances the public library is just beginning to acquire non-print materials, while the school library media center has purchased these resources for many years.

Further impetus has been given to the movement to investigate combination libraries by a conference on total community library services sponsored by a joint committee of the American Library Association and the National Education Association in 1972. People attending this conference agreed "that there is an urgent need for coordination of all library services and resources at the community level in order to provide maximum service to users."⁴ Although they advocated no single format for the coordination of community library service, they did recommend that the multi-agency library be submitted to carefully planned and objective evaluation in various settings.⁵

In Florida, an increasing number of people are proposing the merger of public and school libraries as a logical way to improve services offered to users of all ages and to reduce expenditures. At this time concrete data on past and present attempts at consolidation in the state are not available to support or deny these contentions. Further, there are few guidelines available which can be followed by communities that are attempting to establish the feasibility of this organizational plan for their particular needs. These factors have prompted the decision by the State Library of Florida to fund a study which systematically examines the concepts of cooperative ventures

and combination libraries to determine which has the most potential for improving school and public library services in the state.

This year long study was begun in June, 1977, and is divided into three phases. Phase I, which has just been completed, involved: 1) the development of an interview schedule and other evaluative instruments to gather relevant information about combination programs; and, 2) the visitation of selected sites throughout the United States and Canada to investigate the factors which brought about the success or failure of this type of program. Phase II, beginning in October, 1977, will analyze past and present merger attempts in Florida to assess the present status of combinations in the state. In Phase III a model procedure will be developed to help a community decide whether a combined library or another alternative will offer the best library services in its particular locality.

The information generated during Phase I of the study provides a foundation for analyzing past and present merger attempts in Florida and for indicating the extent to which combination libraries may be practical. This report is divided into the following sections:

1. Review of the literature on combined libraries;
2. Identification of the methodology used to perform the study;
3. Findings emerging from site visits;
4. Conclusions and recommendations of the study.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Examination of the literature relating to school-public library combinations reveals that discussion of the concept began before the turn of the century.⁶ Since that time various agencies and individuals have periodically reexamined the concept. Professional library and education associations, state library agencies, and state departments of education have issued position papers and other documents indicating their attitudes toward this organizational pattern. In the majority of cases they have felt that combination libraries inhibit the development of school and public library service. However, state library agencies such as those in South Dakota,⁷ New Hampshire,⁸ Vermont,⁹ North Dakota,¹⁰ and Montana¹¹ have expressed a need to reevaluate this concept as a possible way of improving library service in selected schools and communities in their states.

Investigation of combination libraries has not been limited to state library and other governmental agencies. Professional journals, conference proceedings, and reports from research and demonstration projects offer further insights into this type of program.

Categories of the Literature

The literature on combination libraries can be divided into four categories. The first one includes information pertaining to a specific site or sites in a particular geographical area. In some instances these are federally funded pilot or model projects such as Olney, Texas.¹² In other cases, they are strictly local endeavors such as the combination library in Divide, North Dakota.¹³ Often articles which describe these programs also include the author's assessment of reasons for success or failure of the project and an account of his or her role in the program.

The next category contains information which deals generally with the concept of combination libraries and often discusses advantages, disadvantages and other facets of the program on a broader scale. Ken Haycock's pamphlet entitled The School Media Centre and the Public Library: Combination or Co-operation?¹⁴ is an example of this kind of approach. Also included are materials which explore combined library services to a particular portion of the community such as children or young adults. Burke and Shields' book, Children's Library Services: School or Public,¹⁵ investigates the implications of the concept for children's services in New York.

The third category deals with research studies which have examined combination libraries. Ruth White's study on school-housed public libraries, performed under the auspices of the Public Library Association is an example of the type of research study found here.

The remaining category of literature includes materials which report proceedings from conferences, institutes and other meetings relating to combination libraries. In these reports, generally a problem is defined and discussed, then recommendations are made to provide direction in solving the problem. Total Library Service edited by Guy Garrison, fits into this category since it reports a conference in which conferees examined the feasibility of combination libraries as they considered how to develop community based library service.¹⁶

Non-Research Based Documents

Many articles have been written on the subject of combined libraries. However, in most cases those that have discussed advantages and disadvantages of the concept essentially reiterate the same basic arguments. Those advantages most often cited by proponents of the concept are: 1) savings resulting from the elimination of unnecessary duplication of materials in the

collection, and the sharing of the costs of construction, personnel, maintenance services and utilities; 2) the convenience to community members of having the library open longer hours and on weekends; 3) the addition of professional personnel to a program otherwise unable to afford qualified staff members; 4) the availability of information in a broader range of formats through the combination of the materials in both programs; and, 5) the offering of library services to community members of small communities not able to generate sufficient funds to support an independent public library.¹⁷ In addition, Lange and Hug have recommended a coordinated media services program as a means of reestablishing the school as the center of the community.¹⁸

Unsuccessful attempts to implement combination libraries in many large and small cities have resulted in much greater attention being focused on disadvantages of the concept. Those most frequently discussed include:

- 1) the inability of a limited professional and clerical staff to adequately meet the great variety of needs of students and other community members through one program;
- 2) the reluctance of adults to use the library in a school building during school hours;
- 3) the difference in site requirements for the public library and the school;
- 4) hinderance of the development of adequate school and public library programs by offering a single program of limited services to all community members;
- 5) the reluctance of students from other schools to use a public library housed in another school;
- 6) disturbance of school activities by patrons such as preschool children visiting the library during school hours;
- 7) the censorship of adult materials which are considered unsuitable for the school library; and,
- 8) the limited ability of the combined program to offer the range of public library services needed to make youth aware of the lifelong value of using the public library.¹⁹

Research Based Documents

The research studies on combination libraries have chiefly been initiated by local, state or federal agencies, or by individuals attempting to complete the requirements for a degree. In most instances, individuals or groups performing these studies have sought to determine at least some of the following: the status of presently existing combined programs; information about past merger attempts; opinions relating to various facets of the program; advantages and disadvantages; reasons for success or failure; and techniques for planning, implementing and evaluating the program. Frequently these studies are unpublished and are not reported in the literature. Other reports, surveys and studies on combination libraries are only one part of a document dealing with broader concerns so they also fail to be indexed and identified.

In 1963 White performed a landmark study of the school-housed public library.²⁰ This investigation was based on questionnaires sent to 154 public libraries located in schools. This study made no recommendations but summarized the replies of librarians who had first hand experience with the combined program. She found that:

1. 72 per cent of the people questioned opposed placing public library branches in schools; 14 per cent thought the location was possible under certain conditions; 7½ per cent were noncommittal; and 6½ per cent were in favor.
2. Library literature of the past twenty years has been almost unanimously opposed to the combination.
3. Combining school and public libraries is not new. It was tried more than a hundred years ago and is now outmoded. The trend for years has been away from this combination.²¹

In 1975 Unger resurveyed White's respondents to determine if any of the originally identified school-housed public libraries had discontinued the combined program and to determine the current status of those which had re-

mained combined. Twenty-five school-housed public libraries in White's survey had relocated in separate facilities. Unger was unable to discern any trends responsible for these changes. However, she found that adult use of those public libraries which continued as school-housed facilities was handicapped by the location in the school. She concluded that the major users of the library were students of the school in which the library was located.²²

A more recent study was performed by Woolard. She sent questionnaires to a sampling of libraries which resulted in the identification of 55 combined facilities. Personnel in these programs were asked to provide specific information relating to governance, staffing and management procedures. The questionnaires also gave respondents an opportunity to identify other information they considered pertinent.

Woolard concluded that "it would appear to be possible for school and public libraries to combine under certain conditions and circumstances. The optimum environment would be communities with 10,000 residents or less, and which need a school and/or public library facility and/or professional staff."²³

Amey and Smith's study differs in its approach from the four preceding investigations, but also deals on a broader scale with the concept of combined programs. This study was designed to discover whether school librarians and public librarians differed in their attitudes toward combining school and public libraries. The response indicated substantial difference of opinion between the two groups of librarians in areas such as circulation of materials, sharing of tasks and perception of roles. Areas of agreement concerned economy, provision of controversial materials and the basic purpose of the libraries. The findings suggested the need for an objective evaluation of the total library needs of a community for the present and future before any commitment should be made to plan a combination library.²⁴

States in which studies of combined libraries existed include Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and North Dakota. The major conclusion in these studies was that this type of program usually results in inadequate public library service and suffers from the lack of money and personnel. However, in the North Dakota study the investigator found "that the advisability of locating a public library in a school must depend on a particular community and the type of library service they want. If the concern is for better public library services, then the move might be to larger systems and networks such as a county or regional library."²⁵

On the local level studies such as "The School-Housed Public Library Committee Report" developed in Fairfax, Virginia in 1973 existed but they were difficult to identify since they often were not indexed. The study which led to this report was initiated to consider the feasibility of providing community library service in a high school in Fairfax. Actual case studies, laws, regulations, standards, and other research techniques were used to gather data. It was found that the case studies revealed that none of the 14 library systems trying this approach were considered a complete success. Further, 57% eventually closed their school-housed public library. On the basis of this and other findings the committee recommended that the joint facility was not feasible for a growing community such as Fairfax.²⁶

The review of the literature appears to indicate that there is some possibility that combined programs may be successful under certain conditions. However, until there is more research done in this area, it will be difficult to reach a final conclusion about the feasibility of this type of program even in selected situations.

METHODOLOGY

The steps in the methodology for Phase I of this study included a review of the literature, selection of the sites, visits to the sites, and preparation of the written report. To insure a balanced treatment of both types of libraries, the State Library of Florida appointed a committee to advise the research team during Phase I. The advisory committee met at the end of the literature search stage to react to the instrument developed by the team and to approve selection of sites visited. The committee reviewed the initial draft of the report of Phase I and made recommendations related to content and format. Members of the committee were:

Anne Boegen
Coordinator of Children/Young Adult Services
Miami Dade Public Library
Miami, Florida

Harry Brinton
Director
Jacksonville Public Library
Jacksonville, Florida

Eloise Groover
Administrator, School Library Media Services
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Betty Miller
Public Library Consultant
State Library of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

Janice Sly
Public Library Consultant
State Library of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

Elizabeth Stephens
Director of Educational Materials
School Board of Pinellas County
Clearwater, Florida

To achieve the project objectives, a thorough investigation of the literature dealing with school-public library combinations and related coop-

erative programs was performed. Emphasis was placed on identification of:

1. The American, and in some instances, the Canadian experience with these types of programs;
2. Factors contributing to the success or failure of these programs;
3. Basic procedures employed in accomplishing cooperative ventures; and,
4. Sites where combined school-public library programs presently exist or have existed in the past.

Published sources used to identify pertinent information in these areas were Library Literature, Education Index, Library and Information Science Abstracts, Education Resources Information Clearinghouse, and Dissertation Abstracts. The State Library of Florida made available its professional resource file which provided a number of the unpublished sources for this review. These sources included a 1971 survey of state library agencies which sought to identify joint school-public library ventures²⁷ and a 1976 survey which assessed the involvement of public libraries in community education.²⁸ Both surveys provided additional information on sites already identified and added to the number of combined school-public library programs known to exist.

Federally funded Library Service and Construction Act (LSCA) projects were also identified, and a copy of each report was requested from the sponsoring state library agency. Another source checked for information was the Monthly Catalog of U. S. Government Publications. According to this listing, none of the school-public library combinations had a report published as a government document.

Bibliographies used for identification of possible sources of information and for the identification of sites were:

Burke, J. Gordon, and Shields, Gerald R. Children's Library Service: School or Public? Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow, 1974.

Stenstrom, Ralph H. Cooperation Between Types of Libraries 1940-1968: An

Annotated Bibliography. Chicago: American Library Association, 1970.

Babcock, Julie. "Cooperation Between Types of Libraries, 1968- July 1971: An Annotated Bibliography." Philadelphia: Drexel University, Graduate School of Library Science, 1971. ED 057 879.

Gilluly, Maureen E., and Wert, Lucille M. "Cooperation Between Types of Libraries; An Annotated Bibliography: 1968-1971 Supplement." Illinois Libraries 54 (May 1972):385-400.

Palmini, Cathleen. "Cooperation Between Types of Libraries; An Annotated Bibliography: 1971-1972 Supplement." Illinois Libraries 55 (May 1973): 358-369.

Kleiman, J. and Costello, C. "Cooperation Between Types of Libraries; An Annotated Bibliography: 1973 Supplement." Illinois Libraries 56 (March, 1974):250-258.

White, Ruth M. The School Housed Public Library. Chicago: American Library Association, 1970.

The case study method was used to obtain detailed, objective data about the sites included in this study. This type of data was required to form the basis for developing a model procedure to evaluate the combined library's potential for offering adequate school and public library service in a particular community. Previous surveys and other documents provided sufficient background information to indicate areas which should be investigated, but they did not present an unbiased assessment of the program nor did they contain an indepth analysis of various aspects of the program. For these reasons, a sample of school-public library combinations was selected for on-site visits by the research team.

Identification of School-Public Library Combined Programs

The identification of past and present school-public library combinations resulted in the development of a comprehensive list of school-public library programs containing 125 sites. The basic list was compiled primarily from Multi-Purpose or Multi-Agency Libraries,²⁹ White's The School-Housed Public Library,³⁰ the Brevard County survey,³¹ the Fleming survey³² and a committee

report from Fairfax County, Virginia, "The School Housed Public Library."³³

Other sites were identified throughout Phase I as further information was gathered from library and education related literature.

To begin to place the libraries in a framework within their communities, demographic data by location supplemented information gathered from the literature. Factors considered for inclusion were size of population, composition of the population by ethnic and age groups, major occupations and industries represented in the community, median income and education levels. Other descriptive information relating to the community was included when available. The U. S. Census,³⁴ Webster's New Geographical Dictionary,³⁵ Rand McNally's Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide,³⁶ Editor and Publisher Market Guide,³⁷ and the Encyclopedia Americana were used to gather this data.

Criteria for selection of those libraries for on-site visits by the research team were:

1. AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE SITE.

To meet project objectives, certain kinds of data were required at the time of the site visit. Information which appeared in the literature and inquiries about the sites enabled the research team to determine the availability of these materials.

2. EXISTENCE OF THE PROGRAM.

To obtain data which were comparable for evaluations and recommendations, those combined facilities which were no longer in existence were eliminated from consideration.

3. SIZE OF COMMUNITY.

To investigate the conclusion reached by Woolard that the "optimum environment (for combined libraries) would be communities with 10,000 people or less"³⁸ the research team determined the sample should include sites which contained populations of less than or greater than 10,000 people.

Based on these criteria and on limitations imposed by funding and time constraints, the research team recommended eleven sites to the Advisory Committee. Consultation with the committee, state library agencies, and the

sites resulted in the selection of seven school-public library combinations for on-site visits. These sites were visited during the summer of 1977 by Shirley L. Aaron and Sue O. Smith.

Development of the Instrument

The data needed in Phase I necessitated the development of an instrument to structure the information collected during the on-site visits. To meet project objectives, data were gathered on:

1. Characteristics of the community in which the combined program is located;
2. Procedures used to plan and implement the combined program;
3. Relationship of the combined program to other libraries;
4. Relationship of the combined program to the government of the community;
5. Advantages and disadvantages resulting from the combined program;
6. Techniques for evaluating the combined program.

Specific items in the questionnaire pertaining to these areas were developed from library and education related literature and the published standards for both school and public library programs. Instead of developing a series of instruments to collect these kinds of data, the project research team unified these questions into a single format. The resulting instrument, included in Appendix A, was then completed during the on-site visit through observation, interviews, and the analysis of relevant documents.

The questions within the instrument were divided into sixteen sections. Three of these sections sought to obtain information external to the library program, one explored cooperation between libraries, and the remaining twelve addressed the various facets of the combined program, such as: planning procedures, financial data, governance, collection development and staffing.

The instrument also included several lists to determine if the collection served the needs of students and other community members. These lists included a sample of controversial titles (Appendix B) identified in the Office of Intellectual Freedom Newsletter, periodicals selected from recommended lists (Appendix C), and selected reference works and collection development tools.

The instrument developed by the research team was evaluated and pre-tested. Informal assessment was given by personnel in the Institute for Social Research at the Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida. Further evaluation was performed by:

Harold Goldstein
Professor and Dean
School of Library Science
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Elizabeth B. Mann
Library Consultant
Gainesville, Florida

The pre-test was conducted at Florida State University on Marvin Mounce, former director of a school-housed public library. Suggestions from the evaluations, the pre-test, and the advisory committee were used to finalize the content and format of the instrument.

The documents requested by the research team at each site were annual reports, budget statements, auditor's reports, policy and procedure manuals, purpose and goals statements, organization charts, job descriptions, library surveys, user studies, floor plans, contracts or agreements, constitutions and by-laws, and feasibility or other planning documents. In instances where they were available, documents from systems' headquarters or state library agencies were also obtained.

Additional information was acquired through observation during the on-site visits. Through this means the project researcher was able to assess the location of the facility within the community, accessibility of the library to users (especially the elderly or handicapped), spatial arrangement of the library and organization of the collection.

The information gathered from direct observation of the facility and analysis of the documents was incorporated into the instrument before the interviews were conducted. Individuals asked to participate in the interviews at each site were directors of combined facilities, school principals, district media supervisors, public library system directors, board members and other appropriate members of the teaching and library staff. These individuals provided information on procedures for planning and implementing the combined program, opinions of advantages and disadvantages of the program, and an assessment of the success or failure of the program. Not every individual was asked all questions; each interview was structured to include only those items pertaining to areas with which the interviewee was most familiar.

Individuals in the same positions were not interviewed at each site since it was impossible to secure appointments with all individuals indicated on the cover sheet of the instrument. However, every attempt was made to be as consistent as possible.

The sites included in the study were:

Baden Branch
Prince George's County
Memorial Library System,
Brandywine, Maryland

Bala School
Bala Cynwyd Library
Lower Merion Township, Pennsylvania

Britannia Library
Britannia Community Services Center
Vancouver, British Columbia

Olney Community Library
Olney, Texas

Sheridan Library
Arapahoe Regional Library District
Sheridan, Colorado

Van Horn Branch
Kansas City (MO.) Public Library
Kansas City, Missouri

Wendell Smith Branch
Chicago Public Library
Chicago, Illinois

DESCRIPTION OF INDIVIDUAL SITES

Baden Branch
Prince George's County Memorial Library System
Route 3 Box 460
Brandywine, Maryland 20613

Dorothy Carlson, Librarian

Baden Branch of the Prince George's County Memorial Library System shares quarters with the Baden Elementary School, and both are part of a community services complex opened in 1970. Located in Brandywine, Maryland, the center was designed to provide educational, medical, and recreational services in a geographically remote area of the county.

There are 3600 residents in the service area of the library. The area is economically deprived and sparsely populated. Major sources of employment are tenant farming and unskilled labor jobs in the area.

The school library and the public library have separate programs, although they are physically housed in the same room. Responsibility for the public library program rests with a seven member board appointed by the County Executive with Council approval. The school library is part of the county school system, and there is a district supervisor of media services. Some school-public library cooperation occurs at the district level, but cooperation within the combined program is unplanned and primarily results from close proximity of the individuals working in the program.

Bala School/Bala Cynwyd Library
Old Lancaster Road and North Highland Avenue
Lower Merion Township, Pennsylvania 19004

Jean Knapp, Director

The Bala School/Bala Cynwyd Library is a completely coordinated school public library program which opened in 1974 in a school designed for this type of library. The library, located in a suburb of Philadelphia, serves as a school media center, a public library for local residents, and as a resource center of a public library system.

There are 5029 residents in the immediate service area. The population of the community has a median educational level of 15.2 years and a median income of \$30,900.³⁹ Employment is primarily in professional or administrative occupations.

In this program the public library shares space, personnel, materials, etc. with an open-concept elementary school (K-6). As a result of the legal arrangement with the school district, the Bala Cynwyd (Public) Library Board, a self-perpetuating, eighteen member board, is the governing authority for the combined library. Administratively, the Bala Cynwyd Library is part of the Lower Merion Township Library Association, a federated system. There are no district level library services.

Britannia Library
Britannia Community Services Center
1661 Napier Street
Vancouver, British Columbia V5L 4X4

Thora Howell, Director

The Britannia Library which opened in 1975 is part of the Britannia Community Center complex in Vancouver, British Columbia. The complex, cooperatively planned and operated by citizens and civic agencies, offers a wide variety of educational, social and recreational services to the area's 36,000 residents. A large number of these residents are new Canadians of Anglo-Saxon, Chinese and Italian descent. Approximately one-half of the families living in this area earn less than \$7000 per year.

In addition to serving these community members the library also serves 400 students in an open classroom elementary school and 1400 high school students attending Britannia High School. The joint planning of this combined program has resulted in a facility twice the size of other branches in the Vancouver Public Library System (BCLA). Since Britannia is a branch in the system, the Vancouver Public Library employs the librarian-in-charge and two other librarians for the program. Policy for the library is established by a six-member committee comprised of school and public library officials and interested community members. Teachers and students may attend meetings, but do not have voting rights.

7



Olney Community Library
Olney, Texas 76374

Jana Knezek, Director

Olney, Texas, a town of approximately 4000 people, has been the focal point of an experiment in school-public library combination.⁴⁰ This idea was given its original impetus in 1970 when Olney was selected as a pilot project in the Texas Small Development Program. Citizens identified improved library service as a top priority goal for the community.

This library does not yet exist as one school-public library combination but the children's services are merged and housed in the elementary school library, and the public can use all of the school libraries as well as the public library. Upon completion of a new building, planned for 1979, the Olney Community Library will be a combination serving the elementary, junior high, senior high school and public user.

Among the first steps taken to work toward the merger of school and public libraries were the creation of one board of trustees and the unification of the administrative structure of all the libraries. The board consists of nine members, appointed by the Olney School Board and the City Council. The representation is equally divided between the two governing authorities plus one jointly approved rural member. The Library Coordinator, appointed by the board, is responsible for the administration of the Olney Community Library.

Sheridan Public-School Library
Sheridan High School
Sheridan, Colorado 80110

Vickie Hopfenberg, Branch Librarian
Anne Mack, School Librarian

The Sheridan Public-School Library is a combined library cooperatively planned by the Arapahoe Regional Library District and the Sheridan School District #2. Library facilities were included in a newly constructed high school (1972) and replaced bookmobile services which had been provided from district library headquarters.

Sheridan, Colorado, has a population of 5000 and is a part of the greater Denver metropolitan area. "Sheridan has developed basically as a residential community (and) major economic activity has been characterized by convenience type retail trade and services interspersed with some light industrial development."⁴¹ The median income is approximately \$9500 and the median educational level of persons over 25 years old is 11.7 years of schooling completed. Nearly one-quarter of the population is Mexican-American.

The combined facilities are shared by the high school library and the public library, the collections are integrated, but each agency employs its own professional librarian for its part of the program. The school program is governed by the school board, and the public library program by the Board for the Arapahoe Regional Library District, an appointed, five-member board representing the county. In addition, there is an advisory committee composed of school officials, librarians, and concerned local citizens.

Van Horn Branch
Kansas City (Missouri) Public Library
311 East 12th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Mary C. Cofer, Branch Librarian

The Van Horn branch of the Kansas City (Mo.) Public Library is located in the corporate limits of Independence, but within the taxing authority of the Kansas City (Mo.) School District. The branch is part of one of the oldest school-public library programs in the nation.

The public service area for the Van Horn Branch is a blue collar, predominately white neighborhood of 39,000 persons. Population shifts of young people to the suburbs have resulted in a declining school age population. The median age of neighborhood residents is increasing.

The Kansas City School District Board governs both the public library and the schools within its taxing district. Although the school board is also the public library board, the public library administration is separate from the school administration and has separate taxing authority. Total responsibility for the operation of the library is assumed by the public library. The only contribution made by the school administration is the provision of space within the Van Horn High School. The school was constructed with the space designed for the public library branch.

Wendell Smith Branch
Chicago Public Library
722 E. 103rd Street
Chicago, Illinois 60628

Mrs. Lawrence, Branch Librarian
Ms. Gloria Middleton, School Librarian

The Wendell Smith Branch of the Chicago Public Library is a combination library planned cooperatively with the Chicago Board of Education. The branch opened in 1974 as part of the Wendell Smith Elementary School.

The branch serves an industrial community of approximately 72,000 people in southeast Chicago. According to the 1974 annual report, Wendell Smith Library users are characterized as living within one mile of the branch, and are predominately young Black families with several children of school age.⁴² These people are generally employed in the inner city of downtown Chicago rather than in local businesses.

The combined library physically shares quarters, but there are two separate programs. Each agency employs the staff for its own program. Books purchased through the Chicago Public Library are classified by the Library of Congress classification scheme; the Board of Education classifies by the Dewey Decimal Classification. The books are shelved separately, but the catalog is combined and circulation is through the public library system.

Flint, Michigan.

The combined school public libraries of Flint, Michigan were also investigated by one of the members of the research team as a part of a community education workshop activity during the early summer of 1977 before the interview schedule was developed. Because Flint has had such an impact on community education, a description of the status of these libraries is included in Appendix D.

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

Because of the lack of standards and performance measures for these libraries, the research team developed its own criteria to differentiate successful school-public libraries from those which were failures. These criteria were based on extensive review of the literature, expert opinion and observation. The sites were evaluated on the basis of the following questions:

1. Did the persons representing the public library system headquarters and/or the district media program or its substitute describe the site as a failure?
2. Did the program fail to offer comparable services to meet the needs of students and other community members during the hours that the library was open?
3. Has the combined program experienced a decrease in circulation as compared to previous years?
4. Have the larger organizational units failed to recognize the differing requirements of the combined program and not modified their operations to meet those needs?
5. Has there been a lack of on-going commitment by the policy making body(ies) to support the combined program?

If the answer to at least three of these questions was positive, the site was identified as unsuccessful. When these criteria were applied to the sites visited, it was determined that there were two successful combined school-public libraries and four failures. The Olney program has not been fully implemented but it progressed through an extensive planning period as part of a model project with many positive results, so it was considered a successful program in areas relating to planning and preliminary evaluation.

FINDINGS

The findings obtained from the site visits in Phase I are grouped according to the divisions used in the interview schedule. These divisions include: general information; planning; legal jurisdiction; financial data; purchasing, processing, and organizing materials; selecting materials; circulation of materials; collection; operation and programming; personnel; site characteristics; cooperation; and, opinions and evaluation. Within these categories information pertaining to successes and failures were compared. In some cases, though, it was not possible to get answers to all questions, so comparisons among sites vary based on available data.

General Information.

The classification and location of the program, the types of patrons served and the presence of written purposes, goals and objectives for the library were examined in the first category. It was found that two of the successful programs were branch libraries serving school and community members. One of these was housed in a separate building with connecting corridors to the elementary and high school. The other was in a two-story elementary school building. Portions of the ground floor of this school were used for the self contained adult library, workrooms, meeting and fine arts rooms. The children's library, which served elementary school students and other children in the community, occupied part of the second floor where all of the classrooms were located. At the third program site which was in the final stage prior to implementation on a full scale, there were plans to construct a separate library building on the edge of the school campus to serve the elementary, junior and senior high school students as well as other community members.

The four unsuccessful sites were school-housed public library branches serving school and community members. In these programs the libraries were physically a part of the school, and school and public library services were generally offered in a shared space.

All of the successful programs and two of the failures had written purposes, goals and objectives for their library. These documents differed in their treatment and analysis of the combined program.

Planning

Information obtained about planning for combined programs focused on reasons for establishing this type of program, people and procedures involved in planning, problems encountered during this period of time, and an indication of whether this organizational pattern was an intermediate step in library development or a permanent arrangement.

In two of the successful programs members of the community originated the idea of having a combined program because they saw a need for a community library and pursued the idea. In the third case the idea was supported by the community as a means of saving money and conserving land in the area.

Outside funds also had an influence in two of the successful library programs. One community received Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) money while another received urban renewal funds to construct a community center complex in which the library was located.

A number of reasons were given for initiating the combined library at unsuccessful sites. In one instance the community was interested in having a public and a school library, so an influential local official suggested the combined program as a model for the community. In another case a school official approached the state library agency for funds since it was felt that

it would not be possible to have the type of school library service desired without having the public library in the school building. In the third unsuccessful program the public library was attempting to provide services to rural areas which were comparable to those available to urban residents. A decision was made at this site to cluster government services to save money. At the fourth site the public library has historically been administered by the district school board, so the combined library was the result of this organizational pattern.

Two of the unsuccessful sites were the recipients of outside funding. One received an LSCA grant from the state library agency and the other was given urban renewal funds as a part of a newly constructed school.

Preliminary studies were conducted to determine if this organizational pattern was suitable in two of the three successful programs. In one situation the study was conducted by outside investigators as a result of an HEW grant. In the other case social planners surveyed the community to ascertain their feelings about library services. The remaining sites did not conduct formal preliminary studies prior to implementation of the combined library program.

Involvement by various groups in preliminary planning varied according to the site. Citizens, the public library board, the school board, and other elected government officials participated during this phase in the three successful programs, while only one of the unsuccessful sites included all of these groups. The only group excluded in three of the four unsuccessful programs was community members.

When formal authority was given to the planning body, it was delegated by local government officials and obtained in some cases by legal incorporation. In each of the three successful programs a single board was established

which represented the concerned groups and acted on their behalf to make planning decisions relating to the library. Three of the unsuccessful sites had informal committees or advisory boards which were not empowered to make final decisions related to the combined program. Because of the organizational pattern of the seventh site only one board governed both school and public libraries so there was no choice between single or joint planning boards.

When asked what the optimum composition of this planning body should be, people in all of the successful and two of the unsuccessful sites strongly suggested community involvement as a top priority. Other groups identified were members of the school board, library board and other elected government officials who possessed decision making authority.

According to people in two of the successful programs, one of the most important decisions made during the planning phase was to have a common board to govern the combined library. Another important decision mentioned at three sites was to formally agree upon responsibilities assumed and funds committed by each participating group. Further decisions made during this time in successful programs were to fit the architecture to the concept envisioned; to form a library committee of school and public library people to solve problems and maintain consistency when the concept was implemented; to institute a collection development policy geared to the needs of school and community members; and to decide the location of the library.

As respondents reassessed the planning phase, a number of steps were deemed essential by people in two of the successful programs. These were: (1) adoption of a formal written agreement between parties involved which carefully defines responsibilities of each party; (2) selection of a head librarian with the needed expertise and commitment to the concept of combined library services; (3) provision for community involvement; (4) selection of

the proper location for the library; and, (5) planning with the architect throughout the development and construction of the facility.

In most situations people interviewed indicated that they experienced no major problems during the planning phase. However, the director of one of the successful programs identified the problem of getting the staff and others to think of the program as an integrated whole rather than as a school library media program and a public library program functioning in the same building. Another problem voiced by a person connected with an unsuccessful program was that no guidelines were established and verbal agreements were not fully worked out. Consequently, basic problems were not dealt with and solved before the program became operational.

All of the successful programs envisioned this organizational pattern as a permanent arrangement. In the other programs, though, there were mixed feelings about its future status. School people at the building at which the program was located most often tended to support the combined program as a permanent arrangement while others generally viewed it as an intermediate step to better library service.

The planning phase lasted three or more years in the successful programs. In the unsuccessful programs less time was spent during this period of development.

Legal Jurisdiction

In the third category there are three sections relating to legal jurisdiction. They are the legal basis for combining libraries, the provisions of the contract, and the duties of the board(s) responsible for the organization and operation of the library. In all of the sites visited general library laws or legal rulings allowing exemptions to existing state statutes provided the legal basis for combining libraries.

Formal written agreements by the groups involved in the combination were adopted in two of the successful and one of the unsuccessful programs. A common area dealt with in both contracts for successful programs was responsibility for purchasing furnishings, equipment and materials for the library. In the first contract the community was entirely responsible for purchasing these items. In the second contract it was stated that the school and library boards both must contribute to the purchase of this property to the degree that they supported other comparable school libraries and public library branches. Stipulations were made in both cases that the ownership of these items must reside with the particular purchasing entity in the event that the library programs were separated.

The second common area in both contracts related to the provision and funding of personnel. In the first contract, the community assumed responsibility for the salaries of all library employees. However, the school board agreed to supply its own professional personnel to handle school classes using the library and to supply other personnel needed for school related library activities taking place when the library would not otherwise be open. In the second contract the educational requirements, work experience and certification needed by the professional staff were specified. In addition, the general duties of the staff were outlined with an emphasis on all professional staff personnel sharing service responsibilities for school and community members.

The staffing pattern was also identified in the second contract. It called for a senior librarian in charge, at least two certified teacher librarians, and two librarians with degrees in library science. The librarian in charge and the second librarian with a library science degree were employees of the library board. The two teacher librarians were employed by

the school board and were considered members of the school staff. The clerical and paraprofessional staff were all employed by the library board but the school board reimbursed the library board for the salaries of two of these library assistants. Provision was also made in the contract for the librarian in charge to participate in the selection, training and professional development of librarians employed in the program.

Building maintenance was another common area dealt with in both contracts. In the first contract the portion of operating costs including fuel, electricity and janitorial service and of maintenance costs were pro-rated according to the same ratio as the square footage of the library to the square footage of the school with the community paying the library's portion. In the second contract the cost of heating, lighting, cleaning and maintaining the library was shared by the school board and the management board of the community services complex.

Both contracts contained provisions for terminating the program. They also included procedures for modifying the contract.

Financial Data

The section dealing with financial data focused on findings related to the amount budgeted for library operation, the restrictions placed on funds and the economies resulting from combining school and public library services. (Specific budget figures were not available for one of the successful sites.)

Examination of budget figures for the sites visited indicated that in all but one case both school and public library boards contributed to the combined program. In the exceptional case the school board, which acted as the public library board, contributed the whole amount placed in the budget for library operations. Budgetary information on items other than materials;

supplies and equipment was unavailable in most instances and no estimates could be obtained for the value of services-in-kind, so comparisons of amounts spent by the school board and the public library board were not possible except in the three categories mentioned above. In those areas it appeared that the public library funding sources accounted for at least one-third more than school sources. However, the opposite was true at the site which had not fully implemented its program. There the school contributed three-quarters of the funds.

In four cases the amount budgeted decreased from the amount spent in the previous year. In the fifth case it stayed the same or increased slightly and in the sixth case, a successful program, it increased significantly.

The amount budgeted for combined programs was comparable to the amount budgeted for other school and public libraries in the community. At three of the sites the amount received from the school board was determined by a district formula based on the number of students in the school. This amount ranged from \$1.50 per pupil at one site to \$3.30 at another. There were no restrictions on the use of these funds except in one program. There materials purchased with Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title II funds were stamped "student use only".

In the two successful programs no documented evidence was presented that demonstrated that this organizational pattern was more economical than separate programs. In fact, in one of these programs they stated that they had documented that it was more expensive and required much more staff time than other branches; however, the documented evidence was not available to the research team. The director and others associated with the program stated that those who assume economy will result from this type of organizational pattern if adequate services are provided will be very disappointed.

In the second successful program staff members appeared to feel that economies were counteracted by additional expenses such as those that resulted in the maintenance area.

At the other sites it seemed that economy was achieved at the expense of adequate service to the community. For instance, in one program the public library staff said the school was saving money because for the last three years the school librarian has been reduced to one-half time employment. This meant that public library staff gave less service to the community because they had to spend more time serving the school population. Even in three of the unsuccessful programs the economies were not really evident to the library staff. It was indicated at one of these sites that savings were possible if library staff members responsible for school and public library services planned together. At another of these sites the director referred to the advantages of additions brought by a combined program rather than to economies. She did add that she thought it was more economical to build one building than two. Personnel at the third unsuccessful site were divided about whether or not economy resulted from a combined program. The director of the library felt that it did not while the principal of the school was of the opinion that it was more economical. He said that the quality of the library was better and there was less duplication of materials. Other economies mentioned in various interviews were savings in energy consumption and custodial staff, although, in one case, when the school was closed, the public library paid overtime for the services of the janitorial staff.

Purchasing, Processing and Organizing Materials

Materials for all but one of the combined programs were purchased centrally through the public library or the school purchasing department depend-

ing on the source of funding. At the site which was the exception materials were purchased solely through the public library.

Materials in five of the six sites were processed by two different centers. Those acquired with school funds were processed by the central school library processing center while materials purchased with public library funds were processed through the public library processing center. This created problems in at least two cases because of inconsistent subject headings and classification numbers and because of the use of different classification systems by the two centers.

Catalogs which indicated the location of the materials in the library were divided at four of the sites. The basis for division in three of these was by age of user. In the fourth, type of program (school or public) determined the location of the entry. In the other programs, all of the cards were filed in a single catalog.

Selecting Materials

In the section on selecting materials emphasis was placed on findings relating to five areas. They were tools used to select materials, the methods of collection development, the examination of the selection policy, the procedures for involving people in materials selection, and the restrictions placed on materials selected.

All of the successful programs owned the following selection tools: ALA Booklist, Library Journal, School Library Journal, and various books in the standard catalog series. In addition, through systems membership most of the sites had access to other selection tools and reference materials.

In two of the successful programs there was much emphasis on working systematically towards achieving a well balanced collection to support school and public library use. Through an HEW grant one of the sites employed an

evaluation team to assess the collections of all of the libraries in the community prior to combining their collections. The team identified gaps, suggested materials which should be discarded and indicated a systematic direction for future collection development. At the second site each librarian was responsible for a section of the collection and they were actively working to achieve standards pertaining to collections in the print and audiovisual areas. The other programs visited were doing little on a systematic basis to develop a well balanced collection.

Examination of the selection policy gave a further indication of attention to collection development. Five of the sites had separate selection policies formulated for school and for public library collections at the system level. None of these combined programs had developed their own selection policy. The sixth site developed a detailed selection policy as the result of involvement in an HEW project. Staff members at the seventh site drafted a selection policy for the children's library which identified characteristics of the collection required to meet the needs of children in the community. In all cases except one the selection policies were officially adopted by the board or boards governing the library. The library staff in the majority of sites felt that the main strength of the selection policy was the procedure for handling complaints about materials. Other strengths mentioned at least one time were the extending of final authority for selection to the librarian, the method of handling gifts, and the elimination of visits to the library by sales personnel. People in two of the successful sites saw no weaknesses in their selection policy. At other sites the vagueness of the policy and the lack of attention to audiovisual materials were identified as weak areas.

In the two successful programs the library staff involved anyone who desired to participate in selection of materials. However, the major portion of the materials selected in one of these programs was from a selection list prepared by the main library, but community ethnic groups played a large part in choosing ethnic materials for the combined program and teachers offered many suggestions for materials they needed. The final authority for selecting materials at each of these sites was held by the library staff.

In two of the unsuccessful sites the library staff selected materials from a list developed at the system level, but they accepted recommendations from the teaching staff. In these programs final authority for selection of school materials not included on the approved list was given to the principal. For public library materials system level public library personnel retained the final authority. In the other two unsuccessful sites the library staff was largely responsible for selecting the materials they felt should be added to the collection. In one case the branch director retained final authority, while in the other it was divided between the principal for school library materials, and the library system director for public library materials.

Staff members in the successful programs felt that they had involved everyone who needed to be included in the selection process. Those in the other programs mentioned at least once the need to involve parents, the community library committee and the teaching staff.

According to the library staffs no restrictions were placed on materials selected in the successful programs. In the unsuccessful programs two sites identified restrictions. In the first instance library materials purchased with school funds had to be contained on an approved list which was composed of books that had received three positive reviews. In the second program the li-

brary staff alerted the head librarian to possible problem materials which were then placed on a shelf set aside to house those materials

When the list of "Books Usually Found in a Public Library which have Caused Controversy" (Appendix B) was checked against the collection at the sites visited, it was found that there was no significant difference in the number of materials owned by successful and unsuccessful sites. Six of the books were not purchased by two of the successful programs and three were unavailable at the third site. In two of the unsuccessful programs, ten of these books could not be located. In another, three were unavailable and at the final site all of the books on the list were owned by the library. In five cases members of the library staff stated that books which were not located at the site could be obtained from the system level or other sources.

Circulation of Materials

Three topics are discussed in the section on circulation. They are access to materials, circulation procedures and circulation figures.

Materials for children and adults were shelved in separate areas in all of the combined library programs, but young adult materials were treated in a variety of ways. At three sites all adult and young adult materials were shelved together. At another site some young adult materials were shelved with children's materials and others were housed with adult materials. At the fifth site adult and young adult non-fiction were shelved together, but the fiction was shelved separately. There were no formal complaints at any of the sites because of access by children to the adult collection. Nor have there been complaints resulting from allowing adults to have access to children and young adult collections.

Definite steps were taken to prevent problems of this nature from arising in two of the unsuccessful programs. In the first case library cards

were marked to indicate materials that children and young adults could check out. In the second program the library staff attempted to cope with the potential problem by guiding the children to other materials.

Five of the six combined programs placed no restrictions on materials that children, young adults and adults could check out or examine in the library. The sixth site, an unsuccessful program, required that parents specify the degree of access that they allowed their children to have to the collection. The card was then marked and placed in a file which was examined when the child was checking out materials.

Audiovisual materials were circulated only to teachers or other employees in two successful and one unsuccessful program. Two other unsuccessful programs had a policy which allowed public library films and other audiovisual materials to circulate to the public but school audiovisual equipment and materials were not circulated to community members outside the school. The last site permitted no one to check out audiovisual materials since the library lacked the multi-media resources or personnel to support this service.

If a book which was on reserve for a school class was requested by a community member, the library staff in two successful and one unsuccessful program would ask this person to wait until the book was released from its reserve status. In another successful program the library staff would check the book out to the community member overnight. In the fifth program the public library did not reserve materials for the school, and at the final site the problem had not occurred so no policy existed. However, staff members stated that they could get the material elsewhere in the system if it was needed.

Analysis of circulation figures indicated that there was an increase in each of the successful programs this year. In one case the increase was

28.71% while in the other it was 9.5%. In the unsuccessful programs there was a corresponding decrease from 4% in one program to 7.46% in another. The program with the 7% decrease circulated one-half as many materials as it did when the community was provided with bookmobile service.

Collection

The section on collection deals with four major areas. They are the number of materials available, the optimum size of the collection, the methods of obtaining materials, and the extent of duplication of materials.

In the successful programs the total number of volumes owned by the library ranged from approximately 34,000 to 43,600 or approximately 1 book per person to 8.7 books per person. The number added in one program in 1976 was 6047 and the number withdrawn was 2370. Figures for the other site were unavailable. In the unsuccessful programs the total number of volumes owned extended from 10,447 to approximately 25,000 volumes or 0.3 books per person to 3 books per person and the volumes added averaged about 110 per month at sites where the information was available. The number of volumes withdrawn in 1976 in the unsuccessful programs ranged from a "small amount" to approximately 2300. All of the sites involved in the study provided interlibrary loan services for materials not located in their collection. In one instance, though, postage was charged to patrons who obtained materials through this method.

Exact figures on audiovisual materials were unavailable in the majority of programs but it appeared that the school oriented audiovisual materials far outweighed the public library materials except in the case of recordings in some situations. Another exception was in a successful program where they had developed many different types of audiovisual materials for their English-as-a-Second-Language collection.

The successful programs subscribed to over 160 magazines and at least ten newspapers. The "Checklist of Periodicals" (Appendix C) used to analyze the scope of magazines present in a program indicated that many periodicals of interest to all age groups were available at the successful sites. In the unsuccessful programs the selection was much more limited. Backfiles of selected periodicals such as National Geographic were kept in successful and unsuccessful programs for three to five years. Staff in the successful programs stated that there was little need to keep an extensive backfile of periodicals since these materials could readily be obtained from the main public library.

Different methods were used by the directors of the sites visited to determine the optimum size of the collection for their programs. In four of the programs an estimate of the optimum size was based on the number of volumes which could be housed in the library. At the remaining sites the directors were unsure of the optimum size because no systematic analysis had taken place to determine this number; however, personnel in both of these situations considered the school media standards as a guide for indicating the number of school oriented materials. Two volumes per capita was used as a system-wide goal in the final program to determine the optimum collection size.

All of the sites visited added duplicate copies to their collections as they were needed. In some instances they purchased these materials. At other times two of the successful and two of the unsuccessful sites rented books from a rental agency to secure a sufficient number of popular adult materials on a continuing basis. Another way of securing needed materials utilized by all six programs was borrowing films from a centralized film collection.

When asked about duplication in the school and public library collection, library directors at every site indicated that there was little especially in view of the different materials required by school and community users. The only area which was named specifically was children's books. Even in that instance the library staff observed a minimum amount of duplication. However, it was suggested that funds expended for the collection were stretched further at two of the sites because of the combined program. According to persons interviewed this was not the case at two other sites. One realized no savings in the collection as a result of the combined program, and the other was spending more. In the last site no evaluation had taken place in this area.

At one successful site a savings was said to result from access by other community members to audiovisual materials which were part of the school collection. However, staff members pointed out that these materials were not appropriate nor suitable in many cases for the needs of other patrons.

Operation and Programming

In the two successful programs the hours of operation differed. The first program was open 69 hours per week and the second 52 hours per week to all community members. The hours of operation of the unsuccessful programs ranged from 32 hours per week at one site to 68½ hours per week at another. Access to the library was limited from eight to nine in the morning each school day to students at one of the sites. Another combined library was open ten hours less each week during the summer.

Children and Young Adult Services

Programming for children and young adults was a major focus in most of the combined programs. Six of the programs offered readers' advisory ser-

vices, materials for students, bibliographies, library skills instruction, displays, reserve shelves, and in one instance, photographic services to school students at the site. At four of the unsuccessful sites it was estimated that from 60 to 80% of the staff's time was spent working with students while approximately 30% of the staff's time was spent performing these functions in the successful programs. Much less time was spent helping teachers plan and implement their instructional units and an even smaller amount of time was allotted to helping teachers and students create their own curricular materials. In two of the unsuccessful programs members of the library staff were required to teach at least one class during the day.

Classes were scheduled into the library at all of the sites. However, in two unsuccessful and one successful program every class was scheduled to come at least once a week at a specific time. At the other sites they came as the need arose. The number of classes allowed in the library at one time varied according to the site, but they ranged from one to three during a class period with additional students coming on an individual basis from other classes.

In one of the successful programs members of the library staff stated that they had encountered no problems in meeting the needs of students and teachers at the site. In the other, according to the staff, teachers did not take advantage of all services available and there was not enough staff to provide the range of services needed by users. Further, the director felt that it was difficult to allow library staff members to work in the schools a sufficient amount of time because of the way in which shifts were set up to operate the library. Staff members in unsuccessful programs identified the following as problems in at least one site: additional teaching and other duties for the librarians; no facilities for curricular materials; students

coming to the library to socialize; insufficient number of staff members to offer an adequate program to school and community members; little space for programming for children and young adults; and no advanced knowledge in many cases of large class assignments.

The advantages of the combined library in meeting the needs of students and teachers at the site appeared to be approximately the same at all sites. Those mentioned most often were more resources, more services and an increased number of professional staff members.

Groups from other schools visited the library programs infrequently, although in two of the unsuccessful programs children in day care centers and elementary school children from other schools were scheduled on a regular basis. Further, the library staff from the combined facility made infrequent visits to other schools to make teachers and students aware of services available to them except at one successful site.

Other types of programming for children and young adults which were often provided by successful programs were elementary school story hours, film programs for children, preschool story hours, puppet shows in the park and other places and summer reading programs. In the unsuccessful programs the most frequently offered types of programming for these groups were the summer reading program and the preschool story hour.

Getting teachers from other schools to alert the library staff to class assignments was mentioned as a problem in one successful program. At the other successful site no problems were indicated. In two of the unsuccessful programs problems were also identified. Busing of students limited visits to the library from other schools at one site. Lack of time and space to provide these students with services was cited in the second program. Special emphasis was placed on the absence of programming for young adults.

Adult Services

In five of the sites visited there was very little programming for adults. The sixth program, a successful one, allocated about 30% of its staff time not including time spent on readers' advisory and reference services to programming for this group. Their library activities ranged from the English-as-a-Second-Language program to a law program for citizens. This site was the only one which had increased the time spent during the last year on adult programming. All others had devoted a smaller amount of time to this area.

The adult services offered most frequently in the two successful programs included activities such as information referral, reference services to the business community, opportunities for continuing education and activities for the aging. The unsuccessful programs offered at least one-third fewer services. Those used most frequently by adults in the two successful programs were readers' advisory services and the newspaper, magazine and paperback collections. The English-as-a-Second-Language collection was also heavily utilized in one of the successful programs. Those services used least frequently by adults in these programs were films, musical scores, and, in one case, large print materials.

In the unsuccessful programs the most frequently used services were borrowing materials and utilizing reference services. Least used services appeared to be those related to serious research. The three reasons given most often by library staff for adults not using these services were lack of familiarity with the services, disinterest in them, or lack of time to take advantage of services that did not meet specific immediate needs.

The successful programs offered outreach services for adults through activities for the elderly, cultural days, homebound services and book drops

in different places. Three of the four unsuccessful programs either offered no outreach services or geared them to students and other children in the community. The other unsuccessful program provided homebound service through volunteers every two weeks. In general the outreach programs which were offered were based on the library staff's assessment of what people in the community needed.

Staff members in both successful and two unsuccessful programs agreed that the advantages offered to adults through the combined program were extended hours and a wider range of materials. Additional advantages mentioned in one successful program were the chance for young and old people to have contact with each other and the opportunity to add teaching expertise to the library staff. In two of the unsuccessful programs the library staff could see no advantages to adults offered by the combined program. Staff members at all sites felt that no major problems in serving adults had arisen as a result of the combined program.

Personnel

The section on personnel deals with professional and clerical staff members in the combined programs. Findings focus on the number, education and specialization of professional staff members; their job responsibilities; their staffing patterns; their working conditions; their salaries; and their relationship to the principal of the school(s) connected with the site. Comparable information was examined for clerical personnel.

In the first successful program there were five professional staff members, five full-time clerical personnel and some part-time manpower employees for a service area of 36,000. The other successful program employed two professionals, two full-time clerical personnel, four part-time clerical personnel and two pages for a service area of 5029. The unsuccessful programs

employed the following professional and clerical staff: one and one-half professionals and one clerical person for a service area of 3600; two professionals, one clerk and one audiovisual technician for a service area of 5000; no professionals and two full-time library assistants for a service area of 39,000; and four professionals and seven clerks for a service area of 72,000.

Two of the five professional staff members in the first successful program had Master of Library Science (M.L.S.) degrees, previous experience in library work, and one had an academic library specialization while the other had a specialization in public libraries. Another professional staff member had a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree with library certification and much teaching experience. The other two staff members who were classified as professional had B.A. degrees in education with no library certification. At the second successful site both professionals had M.L.S. degrees and had previously worked in other libraries.

At the first unsuccessful site both professionals had M.L.S. degrees and library experience. The branch librarian had a general preference for young adult services and the school library specialist specialized in the school library media area. At the second site the public library specialist had a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in chemistry and seven years of library experience while the school librarian had an M.L.S., thirteen years of experience and a specialization in the school media area. At the last site the two school media professionals had M.L.S. degrees, library experience, and specializations in the school library media area. One of the public library professionals had an M.L.S., library experience and a specialization in both the school library media and the public library areas. The other professional had a B.A. degree and many years of library experience

Table I offers a graphic representation of the qualifications, education and certification of professional staff members at the sites visited.

Table I: -- Qualifications, Education and Certification of Professional Staff

	Successful Sites		Unsuccessful Sites			
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	36,000	5029	3600	5000	39,000	72,000
Total number of professional staff	5	2	1½	2	0	4
Number of staff with M.L.S.	2	2	1½	1		3
Number of staff with M.L.S. and library certification.	1	1	1	1		3
Number of staff with Bachelor degree and library certification	1					
Number of staff with other educational degree	2			1		1
Number of staff with teaching experience	1					
Number of staff with library experience	2	2	1½	2		4

The responsibilities of the professional staff were divided differently in various programs. In the first successful program the director carried out administrative and supervisory responsibilities for the total program in addition to her other duties. She strongly felt that although various staff members undertook major responsibilities for certain parts of the program, school and public library services must not be the basis for separate programs in the same facility. Thus, the emphasis was on everyone being able to do everyone else's job with each assuming service responsibilities to the total program. In the second successful program the head librarian assumed administrative and supervisory duties as well as offering services to adults. The children's librarian was responsible for services to students in the school and for any other services given to children and young adults but both staff members served everyone.

In three of the unsuccessful programs the public library professional(s) was responsible for administering, supervising and carrying on the public library part of the program while the school library professional(s) was responsible for administering, supervising and implementing the school library part of the program. However, in two of these programs the public library professional served students also.

In three of the unsuccessful programs the school media professional worked only during school hours on the days that school was open. The public library staff alternated its hours to cover all of the hours of operation of the program, but there were hours and in some cases days when the library was staffed only by nonprofessionals. In the successful program where this information was available staff members with major responsibilities for school services worked during school hours, one night per week and once every five weekends. Professional public library specialists worked in

shifts all hours that the library was open, so the library was always staffed with professionals.

In the successful programs one person was designated as head of the library program. Each director was hired specifically by the library board for that position because of educational qualifications, past experience and commitment to the concept of combined libraries.

There were two directors who held co-equal status in each unsuccessful program that had professional personnel. One, who was responsible for the public library part of the program, was hired by the library board and the other, who was responsible for the school library media program, was employed by the school board. A majority of these people were moved from another library position in the system to the combined program or were hired for reasons other than their commitment to the concept or their experience and training.

In one successful program all professional librarians were paid from the same source, were on the same salary schedule and got the same number of holidays, annual leave and sick days. In the other programs professional personnel on the same staff were paid either by the library board or the school board based on different salary schedules. Their holidays, sick leave and annual leave days also differed depending on whether they were classified as school board or public library employees.

The principal of the school(s) with which the combined program was associated generally included the school library media professionals as part of his staff. Consequently, these staff members attended faculty meetings and other school functions.

Clerical personnel employed in the combined program assumed duties usually associated with this library position. The one exception was the audio-

visual technician who maintained the audiovisual equipment and helped teachers utilize it correctly. All clerical personnel in the unsuccessful programs were responsible to the public library director of the branch program since public library funds were used to finance the positions. The audiovisual technician was paid through school funds so he was responsible to the school media specialist. In the successful programs clerical personnel were responsible to the director of the program. They were also paid through public library funds, but in one of the programs the school board reimbursed the public library for two of these positions.

Four problems related to personnel were identified in at least one site. They were the difficulties caused by staff members receiving different salaries, vacation times and working a different number of hours. The fourth problem cited was the misunderstanding among clerks paid with public library funds about the duties they were to perform for the school library media personnel. People who identified these problems attributed them to this organizational pattern.

Site Characteristics

Five of the combined programs were not situated in a heavily populated area. The sixth site, a successful program, was located in a community services complex which drew many community members each day.

At all but one site the facility was planned and designed to accommodate the combined program. The size of the facility in the successful programs ranged from 10,000 to 15,000 square feet. In the unsuccessful programs it ranged from 5000 to 8000 square feet. In both successful and unsuccessful programs staff members felt that the library should be enlarged to carry on the type of program required by community members especially in view of the fact that whole classes were regularly scheduled into the library at some sites.

In three of the unsuccessful programs the physical areas in the library were shared by students and other community members. In one of the successful programs the fireside lounge was set aside exclusively for adults. In the other successful program, the children's library was upstairs and the self contained adult library with workrooms, meeting and art rooms was located on the lower floor. All of the other sites also had a meeting room which could be scheduled for community use to provide for the library's public. However, in one instance the meeting room was occupied with school activities during the day and in another it was being used to house materials. Five of the sites had separate restroom facilities for the non-school population.

Separate entrances to the library with no steps, except in one case, were available for adults and students at all of the sites visited. There were also close and adequate parking areas in all but two of the sites where school traffic made parking difficult. At five of the sites the building was well marked as a public library with a sign which was visible from the street. However, in four cases the library was not well lighted after dark.

Cooperation

Questions in the section on cooperation were designed to identify the status, scope and types of cooperative activities taking place at each site visited. These questions focused on: the areas in which cooperation occurred; the degree of need expressed by professional library personnel for additional cooperative activities to strengthen services; instances in which cooperative efforts failed; and the effect of this organizational pattern on the development of cooperation.

Every site engaged in some types of public library initiated cooperative activities and in three programs the services of a district media cen-

ter were also available. Nevertheless, all of those interviewed in the successful programs indicated the need to be involved in more cooperative activities as a means of developing wider access to resources and programming ideas. A similar reaction was expressed by people at three of the unsuccessful sites.

Cooperative services which were most frequently used in the combined programs included interlibrary loan, shared use of non-print collections, reference or resource center services, reciprocal use of other types of libraries in the area, union catalogs, rotating collections and materials evaluation. In addition, centralized processing of materials was obtained by one successful program from the public library processing center. At the second successful site materials for both school and public library service were acquired and processed at the building level. In the remaining programs the responsibility for these technical functions was assumed by the school or public library agency depending on which provided the funds to purchase the materials. Services least often available were advanced notice of school assignments, sharing of locally produced materials, information about holdings in other libraries and staff or program exchange.

The services offered by the combined programs to other libraries centered around sharing their collections and programming ideas. Generally, these cooperative activities as well as those obtained by the combined programs were the result of informal agreements between the participants, although some were established on a contractual basis.

Two of the unsuccessful programs had experienced failures in some of their efforts to develop better service through cooperative activities. Even so, these as well as the other combined programs felt that cooperative efforts were not hampered by this organizational pattern, and that in most

cases the relationship of the merged program to other programs was essentially the same as relationships between other libraries in the system.

The patterns of cooperation which emerged in the sites visited paralleled those generally identified in library literature. They were patterns which sought to share existing resources more effectively and efficiently, those which strengthened resources to be shared, and those which enlarged the population of users who benefit from the resources. 43

Opinions and Evaluation

The library staff and others interviewed at the two successful sites stated that the library program had reached its expected level of use, although one director commented that the program could always be improved. In the four unsuccessful programs staff members felt that the program had failed to achieve its potential. At one site after four years of operation they were circulating one-half as many materials as they had when they offered bookmobile service to the community. Another director estimated that her program had not even reached half of its expected level of use.

Five common elements found in the successful programs were emphasis on publicity, community involvement and interest, personality and level of commitment of the head librarian, adequate funding and the ability of the school and library boards to work closely together. Other factors identified in at least one successful program were; (1) the close proximity of the schools to the combined facility; (2) the interest of the school and library boards in the concept; (3) the limited size of the community; (4) the desire of certain ethnic groups to educate themselves; (5) the relevance of the library services offered; (6) the development of a systematic procedure to deal with library problems; (7) the integration of public and school library services into a single program; (8) the flexibility of staff; and, (9) the attention given

to location of the facility in the most advantageous place for both school and public library users.

Problems with the combined program appeared in successful and unsuccessful sites. In two of the successful programs the lack of adequate staff time to provide needed services created a problem. One staff member observed that the demand for services by students and other community members placed extra pressure on the library staff because the quiet times which occurred in other libraries never happened in the combined program.

Another problem identified in three of the unsuccessful programs was the community's perception of the scope and focus of the program. Many adults seemed to regard the combined site as a school library program and they hesitated to use the library for that reason. This problem was compounded by the fact that four of the unsuccessful sites actually did offer a larger amount of juvenile programming and other services.

Administrative problems were a further concern. Staff members complained of inadequate maintenance services from the school janitorial staff and difficulty in obtaining delivery of materials when the school was closed. The difference in salary structure of school and public librarians in one successful site was also a source of resentment. Public library personnel who generally worked a greater number of hours than school personnel were not compensated on an equitable basis.

Other problems mentioned in at least one site dealt with the lack of communications between different groups such as the school and library boards or the principal and the library staff; the limited perceptions existing among various user groups about the librarian's role and expertise; the minimum degree of commitment to and familiarity with the operation of the combined program by some library personnel; and the conflicting nature of the

allegiance required to the site and to the library system.

Library personnel and other community members at four of the sites were committed to the concept of combined programs as a way of offering adequate library services. At the other sites they were either ambivalent about or uncommitted to the concept.

However, at all of the unsuccessful sites the combined program tended to have more school than community related activities. Even so, in three of these programs the majority of persons interviewed felt that this organizational pattern discouraged the development of adequate school library media programs. In the successful programs those interviewed stated that the activities offered were more evenly divided between students and community members.

Advice was solicited at all sites about how others who are considering this organizational pattern should proceed in their own community. In the successful programs the following were stressed:

1. Obtain community involvement throughout the development of the project;
2. Anticipate paying a greater amount for the same level of library services provided in separate school and public library programs;
3. Explore all options before deciding upon the combined library program;
4. Engage in an adequate planning period before the facility is constructed;
5. Establish continuing communications between the school and library boards;
6. Develop a written contract outlining the responsibilities of parties participating in the program;
7. Involve the library staff from the beginning of the project;
8. Locate the facility in a place which will be advantageous to both school and community members;

9. Obtain commitment to the concept by library and school personnel as well as community members;
10. Evaluate carefully the effect of the size of the community in solving problems related to the development and implementation of the program;
11. Hire personnel committed to the concept.

In the unsuccessful programs many of the same considerations were stressed.

However, others mentioned at least once were:

1. "Don't do it";
2. Try the concept in a more book minded rather than a disadvantaged community;
3. Define goals, objectives, guidelines, methods of evaluating the program and job descriptions;
4. Establish a problem solving committee;
5. Proceed in a cautious manner carefully examining areas before making decisions relating to them;
6. Be aware that in a larger system it is more difficult to obtain a response;
7. Promote inservice training opportunities for those working in the combined program;
8. Identify and communicate expectations by system level people and others to staff members working in the program.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS RELATING TO SUCCESSFUL COMBINED PROGRAMS

General Information

In the successful programs:

1. A separate area was set aside in the library exclusively for adult use.

Planning

In the successful programs:

1. There was much community involvement in and commitment to the decision to have a combined school public library.
2. Citizens, the public library board, the school board and other elected governmental officials participated in the planning of the program.
3. A single board representing the concerned groups was established and assumed the responsibility for governing the library.
4. A formal written agreement was adopted between the parties involved which carefully defined the duties of each party.
5. A head librarian with the required expertise and commitment to the concept was selected.
6. A location advantageous to both school and public libraries was chosen.
7. Professional library personnel and others planned with the architect throughout the development and construction of the facility.
8. A continuing effort was made to get people to consider the combined program as an integrated whole rather than as separate school and public library programs operating in the same facility.
9. The planning phase lasted three or more years.

Legal Jurisdiction

1. General library laws or legal rulings allowing exemptions to existing state statutes provided the legal basis for combining libraries.
2. Formal written agreements dealing with funds, materials, equipment, program, personnel, facility construction, maintenance

and provisions for terminating the contract were developed in the successful programs.

Financial Data

1. Both school boards and public library boards contributed funds to the successful combined programs.
2. There was no documented evidence that this organizational pattern was more economical than separate programs.

Purchasing, Processing and Organizing Materials

1. Materials were purchased centrally through the public library or the school purchasing department depending on the source of funding.
2. In one successful and most unsuccessful programs materials were processed by two different centers causing inconsistent subject headings and classification numbers.

Selecting Materials

In the successful programs:

1. There was much emphasis on working systematically towards achieving a well balanced collection to support school and public library use.
2. A selection policy had not been developed specifically for the combined programs.
3. Anyone who desired to participate in the selection of materials could recommend titles to members of the library staff.
4. The final authority for selection of materials was held by the library staff.
5. No restrictions were placed on materials selection.

Circulation of Materials

In the successful programs:

1. Materials for children and adults were shelved in separate areas but young adult materials were treated in a variety of ways.
2. There were no restrictions on materials that children, young adults and adults could check out or examine in the library.

3. Circulation procedures relating to audiovisual materials varied.
4. Analysis of circulation figures indicated that there was an increase in the number of materials circulated in successful programs, but there was a corresponding decrease in unsuccessful programs.

Collection

In the successful programs:

1. The total number of volumes owned by the library ranged from approximately 1 to 8.7 books per person compared to 0.3 to 3 books per person in the unsuccessful programs.
2. The combined program subscribed to over 160 magazines and at least ten newspapers of interest to various age groups.
3. There was little duplication of materials because of the different requirements of school and community users.
4. Savings were said to result from access by other community members to audiovisual materials which were part of the school collection. However, materials were not appropriate for the adult user in many cases.

Operation and Programming

1. Access to the combined program was provided to community users at all times that the library was open in successful programs.
2. At the successful sites approximately 30% of staff time was spent working with students. In the unsuccessful programs this figure rose to 60 to 80%.
3. The advantages of the combined program to students and teachers were more resources, more services and an increased number of professional staff members.
4. Groups from other schools visited the library programs infrequently.
5. There was a lack of programming for young adults.
6. In one successful program approximately 30% of the staff time was spent on adult programming exclusive of time spent on readers' advisory and reference service. However, in all other sites very little time was spent on programming for adults.
7. One successful program increased the time spent on adult programming. All others devoted a smaller amount of staff time than in the previous year.

8. Advantages offered to adults in successful programs were extended hours and a wider range of materials.

Personnel

1. There were more professional and clerical library personnel to serve community members in the successful programs.
2. A professional librarian was employed to direct and supervise each of the successful programs. She was hired specifically for that position because of her expertise and commitment to the concept.
3. Professional librarians in the successful programs served both students and community members.
4. Problems resulted in programs where professional school and public library personnel had different salary schedules, holidays, annual leave days and vacation. Clerical personnel in these programs experienced the same problems.

Site Characteristics

1. The size of the facility in the successful programs was at least 2000 square feet larger than in the unsuccessful programs.
2. Separate entrances to the library were available for adults and students.

Cooperation

1. Successful programs relied extensively on cooperative services to strengthen their libraries. These services were obtained in large part from system level centers.

Opinions and Evaluation

1. Unlike the unsuccessful sites, the personnel in the successful programs felt that the library had reached its expected level of use.
2. Five common elements found in the successful programs were emphasis on publicity, community involvement and interest, personality and level of commitment of the head librarian, adequate funding and the ability of the school and public library boards to work closely together.
3. Personnel in successful programs stated that the lack of adequate staff time to provide needed services hindered the ability of the library to serve community members and students ef-

fectively.

4. Another problem identified in successful programs was the continuing intense pressure on the library staff to provide the broad range of services needed by school and other community members.
5. In the unsuccessful programs adults seemed to regard the combined program as a school library program and they hesitated to use the library for that reason.
6. Library personnel and other community members in the successful programs were committed to the concept of combined programs.
7. All of the unsuccessful sites tended to have more school than community related programs. Even so, persons interviewed in three of the programs felt that this organizational pattern discouraged the development of adequate school library media programs.
8. In the successful programs the activities offered were more evenly divided between students and community members.
9. In the successful programs library personnel anticipated spending a greater amount of money for the same level of library services provided in separate school and public library programs.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

Careful analysis of the data gathered from the study led to two major conclusions. These conclusions were based on an evaluation of the ability of the combined program to provide improved library service in various settings with different levels of library resources available.

First, it is unlikely that a community able to support or now supporting separate types of libraries will offer better school and public library service through a combined program. This is because the combination of factors required to promote a successful combined program seldom occurs. Even when many of these factors are present, it appears more difficult to provide adequate services through this organizational pattern because of the additional demands on the library staff, the need for more staff and resources, the differing program and service needs of various segments of the population, the political obstacles of dealing with different governmental entities and the dissimilar physical requirements for the location and construction of the facility.

Second, when a community is unable to provide minimum library services through separate facilities and no option for improved services through system membership exists, the combined program presents a possible alternative to limited or non-existent services under certain conditions. However, communities searching for a cheaper way to provide better library service should be aware of data relating to finances gathered in this study. These indicate that there is no documented evidence that economy results from this organizational pattern. Further, there was a definite feeling among many of the professional library personnel interviewed that a combined program which offered adequate library service generally costs more than the same level of service in separate types of library programs and is more difficult to imple-

ment successfully. Some of the major reasons for the additional costs may be: the reduced level of use of library services by community members and students from other schools resulting from the location of the combined program; the need expressed by adults to have an area exclusively their own in the library which means the cost of additional space; and, the nonduplicative nature of the programming for students and other community members which eliminates the possibility of cutting staff and collection since little duplication occurs. Therefore, communities with limited resources who are considering this approach should not select the combined program to improve library services except under the following circumstances: first, that implementation of the concept allows the hiring of professional library personnel where no such position previously existed; second, that this alternative provides a means of strengthening resources available in the community; third, that an adequately planned program of services to meet both public and school needs is developed and implemented; and, fourth, that a systematic evaluative procedure is used on a regular basis to determine the status of the program and provide for future direction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following are recommended:

1. Planning for library services ideally should take place within the context of planning for total community services.
2. Communities should seek to provide improved public library service through public library system membership. School library service should be strengthened through the establishment of district media services to support library media programs in individual schools. In communities where this is not possible, consideration of combining small independent public and school libraries should occur only if the conditions given in the conclusions of this report are met.
3. Governance should be legally defined by formal contracts among the involved organizations. These contracts should clearly identify the responsibilities of each organization and provide for equitable division of property should dissolution occur.
4. A combined program should be an integrated program instead of two separate programs housed in the same facility.
5. Increased attempts should be made to promote meaningful cooperative activities between school and public libraries.
6. Objective criteria should be developed to provide a means of evaluating the success or failure of the combined program.

Further research studies focusing on evaluation of combined programs should lead to improved library services in communities considering this concept.

NOTES

1. Wilma Lee Broughton Woolard, "The Combined School/Public Library Concept: Will It Work?" (Master of Science Thesis, University of Chicago, 1977), p. 90.

2. Library Administration Division, Multi-Purpose or Multi-Agency Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1972), p. [5]. (Typewritten).

3. Ibid., p. 87.

4. Guy Garrison, ed., Total Community Library Service (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973), p. 94.

5. Ibid., p. 95-96.

6. Woolard, p. 91.

7. Herschel V. Anderson, ed., South Dakota State Library Newsletter 3 (June 1976):1-11.

8. The Working Committee on School and Public Library Cooperation in the State of New Hampshire, A Statewide Program for School and Public Library Cooperation (Concord, 1976), p. 1-10.

9. Vermont, Department of Libraries, A Long Range Program for Library Development in Vermont, 1972, p. 10.

10. Ronald Rudser, "A Study of Combination School/Public Libraries in North Dakota," prepared for North Dakota Governor's Council on Libraries, [1976?], p. 2.

11. Montana State Library, Long Range Program for Library Development, 1972.

12. James A. Kitchens, The Olney Venture: An Experiment in Coordination and Merger of School and Public Libraries, Community Service Report No. 4 (Denton: North Texas State University, 1975).

13. Rudser, p. 10.

14. Ken Haycock, The School Media Centre and the Public Library: Combination or Cooperation. (Toronto: Ontario Library Association, 1974).

15. J. Gordon Burke and Gerald R. Shields, Children's Library Service: School or Public? (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974).

16. Garrison.

17. Frederick Wezeman, Combination School and Public Libraries in Pennsylvania (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Library, 1965), p. 8.

18. Phil Lange and William E. Hug, "The School, the Community, and the Media," The National Elementary Principal 54 (1975):51.
19. Wezeman, p. 8-10 and Harry N. Peterson, "Public Library Branches in School Buildings," ALA Bulletin 54 (March 1960):215-18.
20. Ruth M. White, The School-Housed Public Library-- A Survey, Public Library Reporter, No. 11 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1963).
21. White, p. 1-4.
22. Carol Payne Unger, "The School-Housed Public Library, Revisited," (Master of Arts Thesis, University of Chicago, 1975).
23. Woolard, P. 100.
24. L. J. Amey and R. J. Smith, "Combination School and Public Libraries, and Attitudinal Study," Canadian Library Journal 33 (June 1976): p. 259.
25. Rudser, p. 78.
26. Committee Report, Fairfax County (Va.) Public Library, Fairfax County Public Schools, "School-Housed Public Library," 1973.
27. A. M. Lovechuk, Chairman, Brevard County (Fla.) Library Board, "A Survey of State Library Agencies Regarding School-Community Cooperative Services," 1977. (Unpublished).
28. Lois D. Fleming, "State Libraries-- A Survey on Community Education," 1976.
29. Library Administration Division.
30. White.
31. Lovechuk.
32. Fleming.
33. Committee Report, Fairfax County.
34. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of the Population, vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population (1973).
35. Webster's New Geographical Dictionary (1972).
36. Rand McNally Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide (1977).
37. Editor and Publisher Market Guide, 1977 (New York: Editor and Publisher, 1977).
38. Woolard, P. 100,

39. U. S., 1970 Census.

40. Kitchens.

41. Sheridan Planning Commission, "Sheridan, Colorado, Population and Economic Studies," Planning Consultants, Parker and Associates, Denver, Colorado, n. d.

42. Chicago Public Library, "Annual Report, Wendall Smith Branch," 1974.

43. One of the best summaries of the literature on library cooperation is by Joe W. Kraus, "Prologue to Library Cooperation," Library Trends 24 (October 1975):169-81. This issue, edited by Pearce S. Grove, is a state-of-the-art review on library cooperation.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

SCHOOL-PUBLIC LIBRARY COMBINED FACILITY

Interview Schedule

Abbreviations

- (d) Documents are expected to be the primary source for responses to questions marked with a (d). An alternative source is marked with the preferred interviewee.
- (o) Observation is expected to be the primary source for responses to questions marked with an (o).

The following codes indicated preferred interviewee for the questions. In some instances the same questions will be asked of several interviewees.

dr Director of the combined facility

MLdr Main library director or supervisor of extension

MSup District level media supervisor

pr Principal of school housing the combined facility

ls Library staff

ts Teaching staff

bd Board member

off Elected official

Interview Schedule

SCHOOL-PUBLIC LIBRARY COMBINED FACILITY

Florida State Library
Tallahassee, Florida

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

- A. Name of Library (d)
- B. Location (d)
- C. Name of person being interviewed (d)
- D. Position title (d)
- E. Amount of time in present position

PART II: COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS (d)

- A. Description of community before, at time of and after merger
- B. Population
- C. Age distribution

Under 5	5-18
19-64	64 and over

 population variance
- D. Major races and ethnic groups:

Blacks	Spanish-Americans
Caucasians	Asians
Other (specify)	
- E. Major occupations/professions
- F. Median income
- G. Average educational level.

PART III: LIBRARY SERVICE AREA CHARACTERISTICS (d)

- A. Geographical description of the legal service area before, at time of and after merger
- B. Number of people served

1. Age distribution (d)

under 5	5-18
19-64	65 and over
2. Major races and ethnic groups

Blacks	Spanish Americans
Caucasians	Asians
Other (specify)	
3. Major occupations/professions
4. Median income
5. Average educational level
6. Percentage of service area community members who have completed a college education
7. Percentage of high school seniors expected to enter college.

PART IV: COMBINED FACILITY-GENERAL INFORMATION

- A. Are there written purposes, goals and objectives for the library? (d)
 1. Copy attached
- B. Are annual reports available? (d)
 1. 19__ to 19__
- dr C. Did you have a separate school and public library before the two facilities were combined?
- D. The combined facility is which of the following: (d)
 1. School housed public library branch serving school and community members
 2. School housed main library serving school and community members
 3. School housed public library not serving as a school media center

PART V: COMBINED FACILITY-PLANNING

- MLdr A. How did the idea of the combined school public library originate in your area?
pr dr
MSup
- dr pr B. What are the main reasons why a combination library has been established in your city/town?
MSup
bd
- dr bd C. Did a sum of money become available which influenced the initiation of the merger, i.e. federal funds?
- dr pr D. What tasks are duplicated in school and public libraries which provide a basis for combining facilities?
MSup

- dr pr E. Do your future plans include the continuation of this type of organizational pattern, or do you anticipate a separate school and public library?
- MLdr F. Was a preliminary study conducted to help determine that this organizational pattern was most suitable to this situation?
1. If the study was informal, are committee and other types of reports available for examination?
- MLdr G. If a preliminary study was conducted, by whom and what methods were used to arrive at the conclusions drawn in the study?
- MLdr H. Who was involved in the preliminary planning?
MSup
- MLdr I. How was it determined who would be involved in preliminary planning?
pr
- MLdr J. Were all of these people involved from the beginning? If no, why were changes made?
bd
- MLdr K. What authority did this body have and from where did they obtain their authority?
bd
- MLdr L. What decisions were made and what steps were performed during this phase and by whom?
bd pr
- MLdr M. How long did the planning phase last?
bd
- MLdr N. What were the chief problems faced during this period of time?
bd pr
- MLdr O. What do you feel is the optimum composition of a body charged with preliminary planning?
bd pr
- dr pr P. What do you feel are essential steps which must take place during the planning phase for the combined facility and who should be responsible for carrying out each step?
bd
- MLdr Q. Has a similar body remained in existence to plan the future development of the library?

PART VI. COMBINED FACILITY-LEGAL JURISDICTION

- dr A. What legal basis did you use for combining libraries in your state? (d)
State #
Legal rulings/exceptions
- B. Does a formal agreement for the combined facility exist between the school and public library? (d)
1. Is a copy of the contract available? (d)
2. What are the provisions of the contract? (d)

- C. What provisions are made for legal and equitable division of materials and equipment should the libraries separate at a later date? (d)
- D. Does one board, or other legal entity have jurisdiction over the public and school libraries or are they governed by two separate bodies? (d)
1. Organization chart available?

- dr bd E. Is there a single board which governs the combined program?
1. Number on the board
 2. Interests represented
 3. Length of term
 4. Self-perpetuating; Elective; Appointive, by whom
 5. Constitution/by laws available

bd F. What responsibilities has this (these) board(s) assumed?

bd G. How were the responsibilities of each determined? (d)

bd H. What systematic means have been established for both boards to meet together on mutual programs and concerns?

PART VII: COMBINED FACILITY-FINANCIAL DATA

- A. What is the total amount budgeted for the library operation this fiscal year? (d)
1. Amount per capita
 2. Amount per student

dr B. If a single board governs the library, do the city (district) and the school both provide support as regular parts of their budget?
School district, public library district, other

dr C. If the library is governed by separate boards, who does the accounting?

- D. Budget (copies attached) (d) before, at time of, after if now separate
- | | AMOUNT BUDGETED | SOURCES | | |
|--|-----------------|---------|--------|-------|
| | | School | Public | Other |

1. Wages:
 - Professional personnel
 - Non-professional personnel

2. Materials:

Books:

- Children
- Young Adult
- Adult

Periodicals:

- Children
- Young Adult
- Adult

Audiovisual materials:

- Children
- Young Adult
- Adult

Other non-book materials:

- Children
- Young Adult
- Adult
- Professional education collection
- Curriculum related materials
- 3. Binding
- 4. Utilities
- 5. Maintenance (building, janitorial services)
- 6. Mixed charges (rent, insurance, etc.)
- 7. Supplies
- 8. Other expenditures
- 9. Capital expenditures
 - Building
 - Equipment
 - Audiovisual
 - Other
 - Other capital expenditures (specify)

- E. How does the amount budgeted compare to the amount spent last year? (d)
- MLdr F. How does it compare with the amount spent by other public library(ies)
dr branches which are not combined in the community?
- MLdr G. What significant changes in funding laws have occurred since the merger?
- MSup H. How does it compare with other school libraries...
pr
- dr pr I. What restrictions, if any, have been placed on the use of funds because of the participation of two different types of libraries in this program? (Local, State, Federal sources)
- dr pr J. What steps have been taken to deal with these limitations?
- K. Have you received LSCA funds? Under what title? How did you use the funds? What year? Is the LSCA report available?
- dr L. What is your per unit cost of operation? (d)
- dr pr M. Have economies resulted from this organizational pattern? Is there documented evidence to support the savings? Specify
- dr N. Are Patrons charged for borrowing materials?
If yes, under what circumstances? (d)

PART VIII: COMBINED FACILITY-PURCHASING, PROCESSING, ORGANIZING MATERIALS

- dr A. Are materials acquired through:
1. Centralized educational purchasing department
 2. Centralized public library purchasing
 3. Other, specify

- dr B. Are materials selected on a continuous basis?
- dr C. Who processes the materials purchased for the combined facility?
- dr D. Are there any priorities set up for processing these materials?
 - 1. If so, what are the priorities?
- E. Are the cards for all materials filed in a single card (or other type of) catalog or are they divided? (o)
 - 1. If they are divided, what is the basis for the division? (o)

PART IX: COMBINED FACILITY-SELECTING MATERIALS (o)

- A. Which of the following selection tools are owned by the library? (o)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALA Booklist Book Buyers Guide BPR Choice Elem. School Lib. Coll. Hornbook Kirkus Library Journal Media & Methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New York Times Book Review Previews Publishers Catalogs Publishers Weekly Saturday Review School Library Journal Standard Catalog Series Top of the News Other
---	--

- B. To which of the following indexes does the library currently subscribe? (o)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abridged Reader's Guide Biography Index Biological and Agricultural Index BIP Book Review Digest CBI Current Biography Education Index 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essay and General Literature Index Facts on File International Index New York Times Index Public Affairs Information Service Reader's Guide to Periodical Lit. Subject Guide to BIP Monthly Catalog Vertical File Index
---	---

- C. List of standard business tools owned by the library. (o)

dr D. What are you doing to work systematically toward a well balanced collection to support both school and public library use?
MSup

dr E. Do you have a written selection policy to guide the selection of materials? (d) Copy available?

F. Are there separate selection policies for school and public library collections? (d)

dr G. How was the policy developed?

dr bd H. Has this policy been officially adopted by your governing board?

- MSup I. What strengths do you perceive in the selection policy and procedures?
dr ls
- MSup J. What weaknesses do you perceive in the selection policy and procedures?
dr ls
- K. Does the book selection policy provide for systematic withdrawal? (o)
- dr ls L. Who is involved in the selection of materials?
- dr ls M. What systematic means are employed to assure the continued involvement of these people in the selection process?
ts
- dr ls N. In your opinion should others be involved? Who and why?
ts
- dr ls O. Identify other individuals who feel they should be involved in the selection process.
ts
- dr P. Who has the final authority for selecting materials? (d)
- dr ls Q. Are any restrictions placed on the selection of materials? Identify, if yes.
- dr R. What provisions are made for handling questioned materials? (d)

PART X: COMBINED FACILITY-CIRCULATION OF MATERIALS

- A. Are children, young adult and adult materials shelved in separate areas? (o)
- dr ls B. Have problems occurred because of access by children to adult materials? Identify problems.
- dr ls C. What steps have been taken to prevent or solve these problems?
- dr D. Are there written circulation policies which define the circulation services available to the community and limit those materials not circulated to the public? (d) Any restrictions because of funding source, etc.?
- E. Are circulation procedures uniform? (d)
- F. How many registered borrowers are in each of the following categories? (d)
- | | |
|---------|---------|
| Under 5 | 19-64 |
| 5-18 | over 65 |
- G. What are the restrictions on materials that children, young adults and adults can check out or examine in the library? How are they enforced? (d)

- H. What are the restrictions on the circulation of audiovisual materials and equipment? How are they enforced? (d)
- I. How are reserve materials handled? (d) (o)
- J. What procedure is followed if a non-school community member requests a book that is on reserve for school children? (d)
- K. Total annual circulation: (d)
 Children
 Young Adult
 Adult
- L. Can a person outside of the community check out materials from the library?

PART XI: COMBINED FACILITY-COLLECTION (d)

- A. Total volumes
- B. Total volumes added annually
- C. Total number of gifts added annually
- D. Total volumes withdrawn annually
- E. Total audiovisual resources available:
- | | School | Public |
|--------------------|--------|--------|
| 1. Recordings | | |
| 2. Films | | |
| 3. Filmstrips | | |
| 4. Micromaterials | | |
| 5. Other (specify) | | |
- F. Total number of periodicals available
- MLdr G. What do you consider the optimum size for this collection? Standards, other criteria
 MSup
 dr
- dr H. Are young adult materials considered as part of the adult collection? (d)
- I. What is the ratio of:
- | | Adult users | School-age users |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Books | | |
| Periodicals | | |
| Audiovisual Materials | | |
- J. How extensive is the backfile of periodicals? (d)
- K. Does the library provide interlibrary loan services for materials not located in the library? (d)

L. What is the library policy on obtaining additional copies of needed materials? (d)

dr M. Does the library rent books from a rental agency?

dr N. Does the library belong to any book clubs?

dr O. Are any approval plans such as Greenaway used?

dr P. Is the library a member of, or eligible to use, a cooperative film circuit?

Q. Does the library collect ephemeral materials, such as clippings, pamphlets, on current topics? (o)

MSup R. Have you observed duplication in the school and public library collection? To what extent?
dr ls

MSup S. Have savings resulted from combining school and public library collections? What amount?
dr

MSup T. What are areas where the greatest savings result?
dr

PART XII: COMBINED FACILITY-OPERATION AND PROGRAMMING

A. What are the hours of operation of the library? (d)

B. During these hours is the facility open to all community members? (d)
1. If no, what are the restrictions?

C. Do these hours differ at any time of the year? (d)
1. If yes, how do they differ?

dr ls D. Do students return to use the library after school?
MSup 1. If no, why not?

dr E. Are classes scheduled into the library? (d)

dr F. How many at one time?

dr G. Are classes scheduled at regular intervals? (d)
What is the interval frequency?

dr H. Are classes from other school scheduled to use this library during school hours?

dr I. How often have groups from other schools visited in the last six months? (d)

dr ls J. What problems/advantages have you encountered in meeting the needs of children and young adults who do not attend this school but are in your service area?

dr Is K. How often has the librarian from the combined facility gone into other schools in the past six months to make teachers and students aware of the services available to them?

Is L. What types of services are given by the librarian to teachers and students in the school containing the combined facility?

Is M. What average amount of time is spent by the librarian in helping teachers plan and implement instructional units?

Is N. What amount of time is spent helping students with individual reference questions and research projects?

Is O. What amount of time is spent by the librarian helping students and teachers create their own curricular materials?

Is P. What other duties take the largest proportion of the librarian's time?

Is Q. Are there projectionist, student aide, book review or other library clubs which are available for children and young adults? What are the requirements for membership?

Is dr R. Have you encountered problems in meeting the needs of students and teachers in the school? If yes, identify problems.

Is dr S. What are the reasons for these problems? (d)

Is dr T. Has the combined program provided advantages in meeting the needs of students and teachers? If yes, identify these advantages before, at time of, after.

Is ts U. Is the librarian on the curriculum committee of the school?

Is V. Does the school have a library committee?

Is W. Who are its members?

Is X. What types of programming are provided for children and young adults? How often have they been offered in the last six months?

	Check, if offered	Frequency, if offered
Book reviews	_____	_____
Career programs	_____	_____
Elementary School story hours	_____	_____
Family night programs	_____	_____
Film programs, children	_____	_____
Film programs, young adult	_____	_____
How-to-do-it programs	_____	_____
Preschool story hours	_____	_____
Programs on topics of current interest	_____	_____
Puppet shows	_____	_____
Summer reading programs	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____

Is Y. Are you reaching the intended audience?

Is Z. What means do you use to advertise these programs?

Is AA. What types of programming are provided for adults? How often have these programs been offered in the last six months?

	Check, if offered	Frequency, if offered
Book talks	_____	_____
Film programs	_____	_____
Programs on topics of current interest	_____	_____
Panel presentations	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____

BB. Did you reach the intended audience?

Is CC. Approximately how much staff time is devoted to programming for adults?

DD. Is this an increase or decrease over time spent last year?

Is EE. What services for adults are offered most frequently in the library?
Check, if offered:

Community resources file	Reference services to the business, community
Videotaping activities	Genealogical search services
Opportunities for continuing education	Activities for the Aging
Information referral	Activities for the Disadvantaged
	Services for the Blind
	Other (specify)

Is FF. What three library services are used most frequently by adults?

Is GG. What three library services are used least by adults?

Is HH. Why do adults fail to use these services?

Is II. What services are most often requested by adults that are not available to them?

Is JJ. Why aren't these services available?

Is KK. What kind of outreach services do you have? How frequently are they offered? List services and frequency.

Is LL. How are the outreach services funded?

Is MM. Are the outreach programs coordinated with those of any other agency?

QQ. In the last six months, how many interlibrary loans have been requested for 1) adults, 2) young adults, 3) children? (d)

dr RR. What library services are obtained from the following sources?

- MSup.
1. District school media center
 2. State library
 3. State department of education
 4. Regional centers
 5. Other centers

dr SS. Are you a member of a public library system? (d)

dr TT. What services are available through system membership? (o)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Acquisition | In-service training |
| Cataloging | Other personnel services |
| Centralized Bookkeeping | Rotating collections |
| Interlibrary loan | Others (specify) |

ls UU. What methods are used to advertise these services and activities?

ls VV. What advantages do you think a combined library offers adults that separate libraries would not?

dr WW. What problems have arisen in adult programming as a result of the merger?

PART XIII: COMBINED FACILITY-PERSONNEL

ls A. Number of staff hours spent on:

	<u>Public Library</u> <u>Service</u>	<u>School Library</u> <u>Service</u>
Reference services	_____	_____
Technical services	_____	_____
Org. & Main. of collection	_____	_____
Collection Development	_____	_____
Circulation services	_____	_____
Programming	_____	_____
In-service training	_____	_____

dr B. How many professional staff members are employed in the combined program? (d)

dr C. Indicate degrees held by the professional staff and their areas of specialization and years of professional library experience.

dr D. Indicate the amount of teaching experience of each member of the professional staff (position, subject, number of years)

dr E. How are the responsibilities of the professional staff divided? (d)

dr F. Do all staff members serve all patrons?
If no, who serves whom?

- dr G. What number of professional librarians work on each shift?
- dr H. What is the composition (specialization) of each shift?
- dr I. What hours and days do the school media specialists work?
- dr J. What hours and days do the public library specialists work?
- dr K. Are there hours when the library is staffed only with nonprofessionals?
- dr L. Who is designated as head of the program?
- MLdr M. Was this person hired specifically for this program or moved from one of the other libraries in the system when the combination program was opened?
- MLdr N. Is this administrator employed by the school or by the public library?
- dr O. Are all of the professional librarians responsible to the same administrator?
- pr P. What is the principal's organizational relationship to the library staff?
- dr pr Q. What is the principal's organizational relationship to the library?
- dr R. Are all professional librarians paid from the same source?
- dr S. Are all of the professional librarians on the same salary schedule or do school and public salaries differ?
- dr T. Do all professional librarians get the same number of sick leave days?
1. If no, how do they differ?
- dr U. Do all professional librarians get the same number of holidays and annual leave days?
1. If no, how do they differ?
- dr V. Who is responsible for keeping personnel records?
- dr W. Do all librarians work in the combined program in the summer? On the weekend? At night? If no, who does not?
- X. How many clerical personnel are employed in the program? (d)
- Y. What are their responsibilities? (job description) (d)
- dr Z. To whom are these personnel responsible?
- dr AA. Who funds these positions?
- dr BB. What hours and days do they work?

dr pr CC. What problems have arisen with personnel employed in the combined program?
MSup

dr pr DD. Do you attribute these problems to this organizational pattern?
MSup

dr EE. How many of the staff meet appropriate certification regulations established by the state?

Is FF. Have staff members had both public and school library experience and/or coursework?

GG. Is civil service used to classify library staff?

dr HH. What staff development activities are provided?

dr II. Do public library personnel have an opportunity to participate in school library continuing education programs?

dr JJ. What continuing education opportunities are available?

PART XIV: COMBINED FACILITY-SITE CHARACTERISTICS

dr A. Is there a written statement of purpose, scope and function of the building facilities? (d)

dr B. Was the facility initially planned and designed to accommodate the combined library or was the combination proposed after the facility was built?

C. Were any state or federal funds used to construct the facility?
Percentage of total:

dr D. If the facility was not originally planned for the combination has any renovation taken place to accommodate the combination?

dr E. If no renovation has taken place, is the facility adequate to accommodate the services which should be offered to school and public library users?

dr F. What physical changes would you suggest to remedy the inadequacies that you perceive in the facility?

dr G. Is the combined library facility constructed to allow for expansion?

dr H. Are any plans underway for new or expanded library quarters?
1. If so, explain.

dr I. What physical areas in the library are shared by both types of libraries?

dr J. What areas within the facility are used solely by one or the other type of library? Why?

K. Is the combined library located in a heavily populated business area? (o)

dr L. Is there adequate planning for noise control? (o)

M. In relation to the school, where is the library located? (o)

N. Is there a separate outside entrance to the library on the ground level for adults and others besides students who want to use the library?

O. Is the building well marked as a public library with a sign which is visible from the street? (o)

P. Are the streets well lighted after dark?

Q. Is there a convenient, safe street crossing to the library?

R. Are washrooms available at all hours? Can they be supervised easily from the library?

S. Is the building designed to accommodate elderly or handicapped persons? (o)

Are there many steps to the entrance of the library?

Are all entrances and exits at ground level?

Is close and adequate public parking available to the entrance?

Are washrooms equipped for the handicapped?

T. Size of the facility—before, at time, now:

1. Total square feet in building
2. Total square feet for stack area
3. Total square feet for reading room area
4. Seating capacity for all patrons
5. Number of square feet per person

U. Is the facility large enough to provide separate areas for the following:

1. An area for quiet reading
2. An area for preschool children where they do not bother either adults or school children
3. An area for school programs
4. An area for teacher preparation of materials
5. An area for exhibits and demonstrations
6. An area for audiovisual storage
7. An area for listening and viewing
8. An area for conference rooms
9. An area for work space
10. An area for offices
11. An area for public restrooms
12. An area for school use on research projects or class projects

V. When a whole class or classes are in the library, how much area is left for others who wish to use the library?

- W. Is there an area where controversial materials would not be accessible to minors and yet remain openly accessible to the public? (o)
- X. Is there a meeting room which can be scheduled for community use to provide programming for the library's public? (o)
- Y. What restrictions are placed on the meeting room?
- Z. Do adults have a separate area designated solely for their use in the library away from students? (o)
- AA. What accommodations for listening and viewing materials have been made in the library? (o)
- BB. Are there separate restroom facilities for non-school population? (o)
- CC. Does the library have its own telephone? (o)
- Is DD. Is it used for answering reference questions?

PART XV: COOPERATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

- A. Do you feel the need to cooperate with other types of libraries to serve patron needs more effectively?
- B. What services can other libraries offer that will help you to meet the needs of your users?
- C. What services can you offer other libraries which will help them expand their program?
- D. What are the areas in which cooperation between your library and others occurs most frequently?
- E. What are the areas in which cooperation occurs least frequently?
- F. What types of libraries do you call upon most frequently for their cooperation?
- G. What advantages have resulted in your program from cooperation?
- H. Have you been involved in cooperative efforts that have failed?
- I. To what do you attribute these failures?
- J. Have formal agreements been developed to facilitate the cooperative efforts?
- K. What are the terms of these agreements?
- L. Is there a need for more cooperation between your library and others?
- M. If yes, how can this be achieved?

N. Have cooperative efforts been hampered by the merger?

O. If yes, why?

P. What is the relationship of the merged branch to other branches in the system?

PART XVI: COMBINED FACILITY-OPINIONS AND EVALUATION

dr A. Are you working to meet both qualitative and quantitative school
MSup library media and public library standards?

All B. What factors have made the combined program a success in this area?

All C. What advantages have resulted from this organizational pattern?

All D. Has the library reached its expected level of use?

All E. What problems have resulted from this combination?
Security?
Undesirable people?

All F. What solutions do you suggest for these problems?

All G. Does this combined program tend to have more school related or more community related activities?

All H. Does this combined program discourage the development of adequate school library media centers?

All I. What is your philosophy of a joint school-public library program?

All J. Are you committed to this approach to library services?

All K. What advice would you give others who are considering this organizational pattern in their own area?

APPENDIX B.

BOOKS USUALLY FOUND IN A PUBLIC LIBRARY WHICH HAVE CAUSED CONTROVERSY

CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS USUALLY FOUND IN A PUBLIC LIBRARY

This list is drawn from OIF/ALA Memorandum and the Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom. It is not compiled in any order; pure "random" listing.

1. Go Ask Alice
2. Catch 22
3. Down These Mean Streets
4. Slaughterhouse Five
5. The Communist Manifesto
6. Catcher in the Rye
7. Soul on Ice
8. Our Bodies, Ourselves
9. Deliverance
10. Man: A Course of Study
11. The Exorcist
12. Rosemary's Baby
13. Of Mice and Men
14. The Godfather
15. Fear of Flying
16. Manchild in a Promised Land
17. American Heritage Dictionary
18. Dictionary of American Slang
19. Lord of the Flies
- *20. The Hite Report

* Not yet in the above intellectual freedom lists, but the five participants in the selection process felt it should be included.

APPENDIX C
CHECKLIST OF PERIODICALS

CHECKLIST OF PERIODICALS.

Alaska	Illinois History	School Science and Mathematics
America	Inspórts	Science
American Girl	Instructor	Science & Children
American Forests	Jack and Jill	Science Digest
American Heritage	Journal of Aerospace Educ.	Science News
American Red Cross Youth News	Junior Bookshelf	Science World
Americas	Junior Scholastic	Scientific American
Arithmetic Teacher	Kansas School Naturalist	Senior Weekly Reader
Arizona Highways	Kids for Ecology	Sesame Street
Art and Man	Kids Magazine	Sightlines
Arts and Activities	Ladies Home Journal	Smithsonian
Atlantic	Learning	Sports Illustrated
Audubon	Man and His Music	Senior Scholastic
Audiovisual Instruction	Maryland Conservationist	Stone Soup
Badger History	Maryland Magazine	Teacher
Baseball Digest	Model Airplane News	Texas Historian
Better Homes and Gardens	Model Railroader	This Magazine is About Schools
Bookbird	My Weekly Reader News Parade	Time
Boys' Life	New York Times Magazine	Today's Education
Business Week	National Geographic	TV Guide
Canadian Children's Lit	National Geographic World	UNICEF News
Canadian Children's Magazine	National Parks & Conservation Magazine	U. S. News and World Report
Changing Times	National Wildlife	Walkabout
Child Life	Natural History	Wee Wisdom
Childhood Education	Nature Canada	Weewish Tree
Children's Digest	Newsweek	Wilson Library Bulletin
Children's Playmate	Outdoor Life	Wisconsin Trails
Coed	Owl Magazine	The Yorker
Cricket	Pacific Search	Young Athlete
Curious Naturalist	Pack-o-Fun	Young Miss
Current Events	Pictorial Education	Young World
Current Science	Plays	Zoonooz
Early American Life	Popular Electronics	
Early Years	Popular Mechanics	
Ebony	Popular Science	
Ebony Junior	Ranger Rick	
Education Digest	Read	
Eye	Reader's Digest	
Family Health	Reading Teacher	
Farm Journal	Roots	
Field and Stream	Saturday Evening Post	
Flying	Saturday Review	
The Futurist	Scholastic News Citizen	
Good Housekeeping	Scholastic News Explorer	
Harper's	Scholastic Newstime	
High Fidelity and Musical America	Scholastic Search	
Highlight's for Children	Scholastic Spring	
Holiday	Scholastic Teacher	
Horse Lover's National Magazine	School Arts	
Humpty Dumpty's Magazine	School Media Quarterly	

APPENDIX D

STATUS OF FLINT, MICHIGAN COMMUNITY LIBRARIES

STATUS OF FLINT, MICHIGAN COMMUNITY LIBRARIES

Flint, Michigan has had a tremendous influence on the direction of community education in the United States. Consequently, many people have journeyed there to learn how to implement the concept effectively as community education has gained widespread acceptance.

Because of Flint's prominence in this movement the combined school public library programs of this community were of special interest in this study. In many cases those attending workshops in Flint look to agencies there as models to be replicated in their own communities.

With this in mind one of the members of the research team performing this study interviewed the director of the public library, the school media supervisor and one of the principals of a school which had a combined program to determine the effectiveness of the combined library program. These interviews were conducted before the interview schedule used in the study was completed; but some basic questions developed for the interview schedule were asked.

It was found that four branches in elementary schools were school-housed public libraries which also served as school libraries. In the past there had been other school-housed public libraries in junior high schools in Flint, but it was felt that they were unworkable so they were discontinued. The chief problems in the remaining combined programs were the limitations placed on the utilization of the library by other community members during school hours; the disagreements which arose between school and public librarians; and, the presence of adult materials in the elementary school.

The director of the public library stated that at the present time the public library is a division of the Board of Public Education. However, because of problems with this organizational pattern and with the remaining

combined library programs, it is hoped that in one year the school and public libraries will be separated and the public library will be under a separate department. The director further observed that when school and public libraries are under the same division this seems to limit the services that the public library can offer in community education.

SELECTED REFERENCES

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Anderson, Herschel V., ed. South Dakota State Library Newsletter 3 (June 1976):1-11.
- Babcock, Julie. "Cooperation Between Types of Libraries, 1968-July 1971: An Annotated Bibliography." Philadelphia: Drexel University, Graduate School of Library Science, 1971. ED 057 879
- Chicago Public Library. "Annual Report, Wendell Smith Branch, 1974."
- Committee Report, Fairfax County (Va.) Public Library, Fairfax County Public Schools. "School-Housed Public Library." 1973. (Typewritten.)
- Fleming, Lois D. "State Libraries-- A Survey on Community Education." 1976.
- Garrison, Guy, ed. Total Community Library Service. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.
- Gilluly, Maureen E., and Wert, Lucille M. "Cooperation Between Types of Libraries; An Annotated Bibliography: 1968-1971 Supplement." Illinois Libraries 54 (May 1972):385-400.
- Grove, Pearce S., ed. "Library Cooperation," Library Trends 24 (October 1975).
- Haycock, Ken. The School Media Centre and the Public Library: Combination or Co-operation. Toronto: Ontario Library Association, 1974.
- Kirschens, James A. The Olney Venture: An Experiment in Coordination and Merger of School and Public Libraries. Community Service Report No. 4. Denton: North Texas State University, 1975.
- Kraus, Joe W. "Prologue to Library Cooperation," Library Trends 24 (October 1975):169-181.
- Lange, Phil C. and Hug, William E. "The School, the Community, and the Media." The National Elementary Principal 54 (January/February 1975):50-56.
- Library Administration Division. Multi-Purpose or Multi-Agency Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1972. (Typewritten).
- Lovechuk, A.M., Chairman, Brevard County (Fla.) Library Board. "A Survey of State Library Agencies Regarding School-Community Library Services 1971.
- Montana State Library. Long Range Program for Library Development. 1972.
- Palmini, Cathleen. "Cooperation Between Types of Libraries; An Annotated Bibliography: 1971-1972 Supplement." Illinois Libraries 55 (May 1973): 358-369.
- Peterson, Harry N. "Public Library Branches in School Buildings." ALA Bulletin 54 (March, 1960):215-218.

Rand McNally Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide. 108th edition. Chicago, 1977.

Rudser, Ronald. "A Study of Combination School/Public Libraries in North Dakota." prepared for North Dakota Governor's Advisory Council on Libraries, [1976?].

Stenstrom, Ralph H. Cooperation Between Types of Libraries 1940-1968: An Annotated Bibliography. Chicago: American Library Association, 1970.

Unger, Carol Payne. "The School-Housed Public Library, Revisited." Master of Arts Thesis, University of Chicago, 1977.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1970 Census of the Population. vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, 1973.

Vermont, Department of Libraries. A Long-Range Program for Library Development in Vermont. 1972.

Webster's New Geographical Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1972.

Wezeman, Frederick. Combination School and Public Libraries in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Library, 1965.

White, Ruth M. The School-Housed Public Library—A Survey, Public Library Reporter No. 11. Chicago: American Library Association, 1963.

Woolard, Wilma Lee Broughton. "The Combined School/Public Library Concept: Will It Work?" Master of Science Thesis, University of Chicago, 1977.

The Working Committee on School and Public Library Cooperation in the State of New Hampshire. A Statewide Program for School and Public Library Cooperation. Concord, 1976.