Educating for School Library Leadership: Developing the Instructional Partnership Role

Judi Moreillon

School of Library and Information Studies, Texas Woman's University, P.O. Box 425438, Denton, TX, 76204-5438. Email: jmoreillon@twu.edu

The American Association of School Librarians and researchers in the field have identified the instructional partner role as critical to the future of school librarianship. Educators of school librarians must help prepare preservice candidates to serve effectively in this role. This research report describes a content analysis study conducted in three sections of LS5443: Librarians as Instructional Partners, an online graduate course. The purpose of the study was to investigate course features, assignments, tools, and resources that made the greatest change in candidates' understandings of the competencies needed to enact instructional partnerships. The findings suggest dispositions, communication skills, and collaborative practices, including the use of technology tools required to collaborate with three or more classmates, influenced study participants' previously-held understandings of instructional partnerships.

Keywords: LIS education, LIS school librarian students, instructional partnerships, content analysis, online education

Introduction

In *Empowering Learners: Guidelines for School Library Programs* (AASL, 2009), the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) outlines five roles for the school librarian: leader, instructional partner, information specialist, teacher, and program administrator. Kachel et al. (2011) summarized the research findings of the School Library Impact Studies (Library Research Service, 2011) and identified a positive correlation between classroom-library collaboration for instruction and increased student achievement in fifteen out of the twenty-one studies they reviewed. More specifically, planning with teachers, coteaching, teaching ICT (information and communication technologies), and providing in-services to teachers are among the library predictors of students' academic achievement on standardized tests, particularly in reading and language arts (Achterman, 2008, p. 62–65).

As instructional partners, the work of school librarians is integrated into the academic program of the school, increasing their potential to affect student achievement significantly. However, when school librarians are asked whom they serve, "most would answer students, yet the primary clientele in terms of power, impact, and effect would be teachers" (Haycock, 2010, p. 3). Further evidence of a lack of attention to the instructional partner role has been cited in professional development activities for school librarians. In a study of 2010–2011 school librarian conference offerings, Cahill, Moreillon, and McKee (2011) found that the fewest number of sessions involved presenters who shared their experiences in the instructional partner role. Where will preservice school librarians learn and

ISSN: 0748-5786

initially practice this role if not in the university classroom?

Study Context, Problem, and Purposes

As suggested by the course title, the goal of LS5443: Librarians as Instructional Partners is to develop preservice school librarians' understandings and competencies related to practicing instructional partnerships. This course is taught completely online; the three course sections under study were taught in the regular 15-week semester in fall 2010 and spring 2011. The course is not self-paced, but is designed for candidates to interact with one another through biweekly online discussions and multiple collaborative assignments. It is designed with a constructivist learning framework in which candidates take responsibility for their own learning by building on their prior experiences, interacting with course materials and one another, and developing skills as instructional partners through collaborative project-based assignments.

LS5443 is most often one of the last courses candidates take before participating in their practicum field-work experiences. As a faculty practicum supervisor, the researcher/instructor reviews candidates' goals and objectives for their practicum placements, which occur in both elementary and secondary schools. The researcher noticed a consistent absence of coplanning, coteaching, and coassessing K-12 students' learning outcomes in candidates' practicum objectives. When asked about this break with best practices, candidates reported that the librarians in whose schools they would be serving did not engage in collaborative planning, did not practice the instructional partner role, or had done so in the past and the instruction was already predetermined when the candidate arrived to conduct the practicum.

Research in education has suggested that classroom teachers, regardless of teacher preparation program interventions, teach the way they were taught as K-12 students (Lasley, 1980; Pajares, 1992). A corollary would be that school librarians may also teach the way they were taught by their own K-12 librarians, or the way they observe their site supervisors' teaching, or not teaching, in their practicum. This study proposes to identify some effective ways to shore up candidates' value for and experience of instructional partnerships in the university classroom that could result in their long-term commitment to practicing this vital role.

The purposes of this study are to improve the course under investigation and other courses taught by the researcher and to suggest ways school librarian educators can best prepare preservice candidates for serving in the instructional partnership role when they enter into practice. Haycock (1995) has pointed out that research has revealed much of the "what" and the "why" of issues related to the practice of school librarianship but little of the "how." The goal of this study is to suggest "how" these preservice school librarians learned to become effective instructional partners and leaders through online graduate coursework.

Literature Review

Developing instructional partnerships is one way school librarians enact a leadership role in their schools (Haycock, 2010; McGregor, 2003; Todd, 2011; Zmuda & Harada, 2008). Research in school librarianship confirms that school administrators correlate a successful educational program with an active, collaborative, and resourceful library program (Lance, Rodney, & Schwarz, 2010; Levitov, 2009). Success as a leader in schools today is most often defined in terms of student achievement. School librarians who effectively practice the instructional partnership role have a greater potential to positively affect K-12 student learning and have the opportunity to serve as leaders and change agents

in their schools (Moreillon, 2007, 2012; Moreillon & Ballard, 2012; Todd, 2011).

Candidates' final course reflections supplied the data for this study. Focused cognitively on the "big idea" of the course, instructional partnerships, and engaging in asynchronous discussions—the regular practices of this community of practice (Wenger, 1998)—study participants were primed for reflection (Prawat, 1998). Communication theory suggests that knowledge is created through conversation (Lankes, 2010; Pask, 1975). In their postings, candidates demonstrated individual and collective meaning-making related to course content (Gilbert & Moore, 1998; Swan, 2001; Yukawa, 2010). Online communication is effective for synthesizing learning (Rice & Gattiker, 2001) and promotes socio-emotional components in which discussants exchange empathetic messages and engage in self-disclosure (Fulton, Botticelli, & Bradley, 2011). The asynchronous nature of the online discussion in which candidates participated over a period of five days provided them the opportunity to reflect through writing and offered them sufficient time to extend their thinking in their responses to classmates.

Self-reflection supports metacognition. Through self-reflection, learners can effectively determine what they learned, how they learned it, and how they integrated it into their prior knowledge or how it changed their schema. In short, they develop the skills and behaviors associated with metacognition. Learners who are able to employ metacognitive skills are more confident about what they know and are more successful at independent learning (Coffield, Mosely, Hall, & Ecclestone, 2004; Marzano, 1998).

LS5443 course content is founded on research related to standards-based teaching. Standards prescribe "what" should be taught and assessed (Heck, Banilower, Weiss, & Rosenberg, 2008; Stiggins & DuFour, 2009; Tomlinson, 2000). Building instruction around standards and specific learning objectives results in a guaranteed, viable curriculum that supports student achievement (Marzano, 2007). LS5443 course objectives are based on the Texas State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) standards, which are aligned with the ALA Core Competences of Librarianship (ALA, 2009) and ALA-AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians (ALA-AASL, 2010). A standards alignment chart is linked from the course modules wiki homepage (http://ls5443.pbworks.com). Each course assignment is aligned with SBEC standards and is described on the course modules wiki Assignments Summary page (http://tinyurl.com/ls5443-assignments).

In their collaborative partnerships, candidates in this course practice dispositions they need or will need to be successful in their current or future roles as collaborating school librarians. Preservice classroom teacher research has identified specific dispositions or attitudes (Arnstine, 1967) or "habits of mind" (Katz & Raths, 1985) that improve educators' practice of teaching. Bush and Jones (2010) conducted a Delphi study in which they queried board members of nationally-recognized journals for school librarians regarding the professional dispositions they felt will be essential to the future practice of school librarianship. The top five dispositions identified in their study results are the focus of LS5443: critical thinking, creative thinking or problem solving, teaching, collaborating, and leading. In addition, the candidates in this study were familiar with the "dispositions in action" for 21st-century (K-12) learners identified by AASL (2007) such as initiative, confidence, persistence, flexibility, and openness to new ideas.

The American Library Association Office for Accreditation is currently focusing program assessment on student learning outcomes as measured in terms of skills gained and attitudes changed as a result of candidates engaging in graduate-level library science coursework (ALA, 2011). This effort attests to the fact that the university classroom is a laboratory for the

practice of librarianship outside of the classroom. In this context, what is learned is the direct result of what learners "do" during their coursework (Jeng, 2011).

In a climate of increased accountability via external measures, faculty can reclaim the real purpose of assessment data—to improve instructional practice. The study of one's own teaching and the integration of findings into faculty teaching practices are necessary to improve teaching and provide service to the profession (Boyer, 1997; Shulman, 2000). This study had a goal of confirming or disconfirming the researcher/instructor's observations and anecdotal beliefs with evidence from participants' reflections to note themes and patterns. These will be useful to the researcher in further developing instructional interventions for this and other courses for preservice school librarians and may influence the practices of other educators of school librarians.

Participants and Course Context

A total of 61 graduate students, herein called candidates, participated in this study. Thirty-eight, or 62.3%, of the candidates were practicing or former classroom teachers (one candidate who was serving as an educator in a science center but did not hold a classroom teaching credential was included in this category). Twenty were serving as school librarians on emergency certification and had classroom teacher certification, and three were serving as college-level library staff for a total of 23, or 37.7%, in the librarian category. (Data from non-school library study participants are noted in the data tables.) Candidates engaged with partners, small groups, or the whole class to interact with course material. Except for the initial self-portrait assignment, candidates completed all other projects collaboratively.

Candidates conducted their collaborative work on wikis to document their communication and negotiations. The wiki history and the discussion tab feature were the predominant tools for measuring candidates' collaborative engagement in projects. Teams that choose to use other communication tools such as Skype, chat, Twitter, and other social networking venues also documented those activities with logs linked to their wikis. In all of the collaborative projects, at least two criteria or 20% of the final score addressed the frequency and quality of partners' collaboration. Both process and product were stressed and assessed.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study parallel the final reflection questions for the course. To interrogate the data effectively, the researcher reordered the candidates' final reflection questions to reflect the data analysis process, which began by searching for the specific course features, assignments, tools, and resources identified by candidates.

1. What in particular about this course caused candidates to change their thinking related to classroom-library instructional partnerships?
2. What did candidates understand differently about instructional partnerships as a result of participating in this course?
3. How did candidates describe how they came to this new understanding?

Candidates were asked to: "Be as specific as you can be. If appropriate, please refer to a specific assignment, reading, technology tool, or other course content that influenced your thinking." Candidates were also instructed to compose their response to these three questions in the form of an elevator speech of up to 150 words. A number of candidates composed an elevator speech for each of the three questions rather than one speech for all three.

Candidates used their final reflection postings as prompts to engage one another in discussion about their individual and collective learning outcomes from the course.

In addition to posting their own responses, candidates were required to respond to at least two other classmates' postings, which was the requirement for threaded discussion postings throughout the semester. The final reflection postings and discussion provided the data for this study. In total, these data consist of 315 postings, an average of 5.2 postings per candidate.

The final reflection was only worth ten points, 1.6% of the total course grade. While end-of-course grades are one outcome data point, the data used for this study were gleaned from candidates' self-reflections in which they practiced metacognitive skills. Although these may be considered "indirect" measures, there is no other way to determine what a learner perceives as support for her or his growth other than to ask and accept the response as valid. While self-reporting may not always yield valid data (Brown & Green, 2001) and may cause respondents to give the socially-desirable response (Hopkins, 1998), the routine nature of the discussion format, the low risk of negative consequences, and the candidates' lack of awareness that their reflections would be analyzed in this study increased the reliability of their responses.

Method

Study data were analyzed through the collection and comparison among candidates' responses to the three final reflection questions. Hand coding was used to find common topics and themes. The researcher interrogated the final reflection data in several ways. First, initial postings were organized by specific features of the course, specific assignments or tools, and/or resources that candidates reported influenced their development as instructional partners. Using a content analysis approach, the final reflection data were then coded and analyzed using a constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to determine common themes in how participants came to and described their new understandings of the instructional partner role.

In addition, the researcher reviewed the initial program features cited by candidates in terms of two participant groups: candidates who were serving in school libraries on emergency certification and candidates who were currently or formerly practicing classroom teachers. After the researcher completed the initial coding of these data, she shared coding samples with a researcher at another university who verified the validity of the process and directions taken to further interrogate the data.

The researcher then analyzed responses to the initial postings and noted themes that emerged from these data. By looking more closely at specific examples, the researcher applied conversation theory and attempted to represent the perspectives of the candidates as they constructed knowledge and arrived at agreements based on their responses to one another. To do so, the researcher coded the responses to the initial postings that generated the most conversation among candidates.

Throughout the analysis process, the researcher maintained a stance that both acknowledged her impact on the data and honored the emergent nature of the data (Rossman & Rallis, 1998). As the instructor administering the final reflection, her role could have influenced participants' responses. This study was based on existing data and permission to use these data was granted by the university's institutional review board rather than from participants, eliminating another possible reason participants might exaggerate their responses. By posing open-ended questions, the researcher attempted to minimize her impact on the candidates' responses. It should be noted that the researcher did not participate directly in any online discussions during the semester. Instead, she summarized feedback in twice-a-week announcements, whole-class emails, or responded privately to individual candidates. She did not provide any type of feedback related to the final reflection.

Table 1. Course Features and Assignments.

Category	CT	SL	N	%
Various Partners	16	14	30	49.2
Multiple Assignments	16	8	24	39.3
Collaborative Lesson Plan	15	7	22	36.1
Wikis and Collaborative Online Tools	11	8	19	31.1
Marketing and Advocacy Project	6	1	7	11.5
Portrait of a Collaborator	2	2	4	6.6
Persuasive Presentation	2	8	4	6.6

CT = Currently Practicing or Former Classroom Teachers

SL = Currently Practicing School Librarians

Findings

In their initial postings, candidates identified partner work, specific assignments, and Web 2.0 collaborative tools that supported their growth as instructional partners. The requirement to work collaboratively with at least three and in most cases four different classmates over the course of the semester was the most frequently identified support for developing the instructional partnership role. Table 1 shows the number of candidates who mentioned specific course features and/or assignments in their initial postings. If posts included more than one of these categories, the researcher made no attempt to determine if one topic was more impactful than another. Instead, she recorded more than one response for that posting.

Working with various collaborative partners was mentioned most frequently in candidates' elevator speeches; nearly half commented on this course requirement. Table 2 shows the various descriptors candidates who cited working with various partners used to describe their new understandings of instructional partnerships. The descriptors indicate what candidates understood differently regarding what was needed to enact this role effectively.

Although candidates were asked to pinpoint specific assignments that influenced their understanding of the practice of instructional partnerships, Table 3 shows that 39.3% mentioned multiple collaborative projects, rather than one in particular. The descriptors are the understandings they gained in the process of working on partner or small group projects.

Table 4 shows that more than one third of the candidates cited the three-part collaborative lesson planning project as having the greatest impact on their development as instructional partners. Almost half of these candidates described their

Table 2. Various Partners.

Category	CT	SL	N	%
Flexibility, trust, openness, risk-taking, willingness to change	10	6	16	26.2
School librarian's responsibility to reach out	1	5	6	9.8
Partnership of equals, a common goal	3	2	5	8.2
Not always successful but always a learning experience	2	1	3	4.9
Total	**16**	**14**	**30**	**49.2**

CT = Currently Practicing or Former Classroom Teachers

SL = Currently Practicing School Librarians

Table 3. Multiple Assignments.

Category	CT	SL	N	%
Improvements in instructional practices from two heads, job-embedded professional development	13	6*	19	31.1
Developing coteaching relationships for advocacy	3	2	5	8.2
Total	**16**	**8**	**24**	**39.3**

CT = Currently Practicing or Former Classroom Teachers

SL = Currently Practicing School Librarians

*Two responses from practicing college library staff

understanding in terms of the difference between cooperation and collaboration; four times as many classroom teachers as school librarians noted this difference. Forty percent of the candidates who identified the collaborative lesson plan assignment as having the most impact also noted the benefits of coplanning for K-12 students as well as for educators.

Technology tools integration was a strong component of this course. Table 5 shows that wikis and other technology tools for collaborative work were identified by nearly one third of candidates as having had an impact on their development as instructional partners. Candidates described electronic tools in terms of confidence-building and possessing expertise to bring to the classroom-library collaboration table.

In their initial postings, candidates also noted a variety of course resources as specific support for building their expertise in this role. Candidates cited coteaching and evidence-based practice PowerPoint presentations, a course textbook *Collaborative Strategies for Teaching Reading Comprehension: Maximizing Your Impact* (Moreillon, 2007), and a chapter about collaboration and leadership by McGregor (2003). They specifically remarked on the fact that these resources showed them *how* to coplan and coteach and the importance of measuring and sharing K-12 student learning outcomes. Candidates also noted the use of collaborative planning forms, classroom-library collaboration testimonials, synchronous online group office hour chats, and asynchronous discussion board postings by currently practicing school librarian classmates as resources that changed their understandings of the instructional partner role.

The researcher analyzed candidates' responses to the top four posts in each of the three sections under study. In one sec-

Table 4. Collaborative Lesson Plan.

Category	CT	SL	N	%
Difference between cooperation and collaboration, synergy (could not separate teammate's work from own)	8*	2	10	16.4
Co-creating, coteaching, and coassessing to benefit students and teachers, too	5	4**	9	14.7
Contributing strengths/developing weaknesses	2	1	3	5.0
Total	**15**	**7**	**22**	**36.1**

CT = Currently Practicing or Former Classroom Teachers

SL = Currently Practicing School Librarians

*One response from non-certified educator

**One response from practicing college library staff

Table 5. Wikis and Collaboration Technologies.

Category	CT	SL	N	%
Confidence, ability to teach to others, expertise	11	8*	19	31.1

CT = Currently Practicing or Former Classroom Teachers

SL = Currently Practicing School Librarians

*One response from practicing college library staff

tion, one post entitled "Toot! Toot!" and focused on advocating for the instructional partner role instigated sixteen responses, the greatest number of responses for any single post in all sections. Similarly, in another section, a post about advocating for this role garnered six responses, as did two other posts in this class, one related to collaborating with Web 2.0 tools and another that noted the impact of testimonials from classroom teachers about the benefit of classroom-library collaboration for instruction. (These testimonials are resources for the case study assignment.) In the third section, a post entitled "Collaboration: It's Worth It" prompted eight responses from classmates. In their initial postings three candidates questioned whether or not instructional partnerships were "worth" it. Only one of the three ultimately concluded that, in her experience, they were not.

Eight additional posts across the sections initiated six or more exchanges. Three cited specific features of the collaborative work in the course: interdependence throughout the process, coteaching with classroom teachers, and specifying the strengths the candidate herself or himself brought to partner projects. Two involved learning about the librarian's responsibility for initiating collaboration with classroom teachers, and one of those discussed using expertise with technology tools as support for helping teachers address classroom curricula. Two other posts focused on classroom-library collaboration as a way to build advocates for the school library program, and one focused on the evidence provided by documenting collaborative work on wikis.

Discussion

The state affiliate representatives at the AASL Vision Summit held in Chicago in 2006 identified instructional partnerships as the most critical role for the future of the profession (AASL, 2009, p. 16). The goals and objectives of LS5443 are aligned with this assessment of the central importance of this role. The participants in this study suggest various ways a university course helped them embrace the instructional partner role. In their final course reflections, they synthesized their learning, shared their individual understandings, and developed collective agreements to which they had come over the course of the semester.

Candidates' acknowledgement of the importance of dispositions suggests they understood the role their attitudes play in successful collaborative work. Ten candidates who were classroom teachers and six currently practicing school librarians, who attributed their development to working in multiple partnerships, mentioned dispositions such as flexibility, trust, openness, risk-taking, and willingness to change as keys to successful instructional partnerships (see Table 2). A third-grade teacher wrote: "We need to work with people with different personalities. As a librarian, we have to figure out the best way to accomplish this task [collaboration] to provide students the opportunities they need. I can do this now."

Some of the dispositions cited by candidates are included in the descriptions of the professional dispositions identified by Bush and Jones (2010); other dispositions cited appear in standards for 21st-century K-12

students (AASL, 2007). A middle school librarian noted: "Before this class, I thought I had participated in collaborative partnerships. Previously, when working with partners, we would each work on separate parts of the lesson. Now, I know that each partner must take an active, vested interest in the entire lesson. Collaborative partnerships are a give and take relationship." An elementary librarian wrote: "Working with different partners over the course of the semester and learning their strengths combined with mine was necessary to making decisions and to taking risks."

Taking responsibility for reaching out to classroom teachers was an often-cited risk-taking behavior necessary for successful partnerships. More school librarians than classroom teachers mentioned this responsibility. An elementary librarian wrote: "What I have learned from this course is that that burden is on us, as librarians, to create these opportunities and be proactive in their presentation. . . . I think we did learn that we must be persistent and consistent as we work with instructional partners and that the task is not always easy just as you stated."

For the candidates in this study, multiple assignments with various partners helped them develop an understanding of the instructional partner role. More than twice as many classroom teachers as school librarians mentioned improvements in instructional practices as a significant outcome of conducting multiple collaborative assignments (see Table 3). This acknowledgement suggests the potential of collaborative work to improve the quality of instruction and educator proficiency. A third-grade teacher wrote: "I too had not considered the librarian a valuable partner in the teaching process. After working on the collaborative lesson plan, I could clearly see how two people working together for the students could produce a dynamite lesson! I have wondered why I have never seen or experienced this in the school [setting]. . . . Teachers don't realize how valuable this relationship could be, and what could be accomplished for students." A high school librarian noted: "My new understanding evolved through collaborative projects in which there were no assigned positions, only final objectives. As such, there was no designated leader . . . In contrast to 'my project done with assistance by my partner,' I contributed to 'our project.'"

In citing the collaborative lesson plan as having the greatest impact on their understanding of instructional partnerships, the comments from classroom teachers significantly outnumbered those of practicing school librarians (see Table 4). This could suggest that these candidates are not experiencing classroom-library collaboration in their current teaching environments. It may also suggest that currently practicing school librarians, about one third of the participants in this study, may have already developed collaborative lesson plans in their roles as librarians. As a result, this assignment had a greater impact on the classroom teachers who participated in the course. A third-grade teacher wrote: "It's easy to view the librarian as more of an assistant than a partner. Through this class, I am beginning to see the value of partnership and utilizing the librarian."

Candidates used wikis to conduct and provide evidence of their collaborative work (see Table 5). Each wiki history was used as an indicator of candidates' contributions to their team's work. They also used multiple Web 2.0 tools for collaboration, such as mind-mapping and storyboarding tools. In addition, candidates selected Web 2.0 tools to present their learning for several final products. In their elevator speeches, they expressed increased confidence in their ability to learn, use, and teach Web 2.0 tools to others. Developing this area of expertise increased candidates' self-perceptions as leaders in the area of technology tools integration. They believed they had significant, marketable skills to bring to the collaboration table. An elementary librarian wrote: "Using all the new Web 2.0 tools, I have

enjoyed finding new ways to reach out to teachers and students. I have also learned to problem solve [technical problems] with this course!"

The study findings suggest that developing assignments and utilizing instructional strategies and tools that require and support collaboration between and among preservice school librarians helped prepare them for the instructional partner role. By experiencing successful, and even less than successful, collaborative relationships in their preservice education, school librarian candidates developed a value for the instructional partnership role as well as skills and dispositions that will serve them in enacting this role in the field. A science educator summarized her experience in this way: "Many thanks to all my partners who applauded my cooperation; yet demanded my collaboration! True collaboration is not particularly safe or familiar yet when it emerges, the result is integrated, bonded, whole. It is a solution rather than a mixture, to use the vocabulary of elementary chemistry; no longer separable into its constituent parts."

Limitations of this Study and Opportunities for Further Research

This study did not follow candidates into their practice of school librarianship. For the 32.8% of study participants who were already serving as school librarians, their discussion postings suggested that the content and processes of this course were already affecting their instructional practices. Following those candidates plus the 60.6% of candidates who would presumably matriculate through the program and secure positions in the practice of school librarianship could have made this study more robust. Future studies that do so are needed to determine whether or not the value for the instructional partnership role and the skills and dispositions developed in the university classroom can help practitioners overcome the barriers to enacting this role in the field.

Conclusion

"Preparing SLMSs [school library media specialists] who are ready to assume leadership roles and responsibilities in their schools should be a priority for school media preparation programs" (Shannon, 2008, p. 38). If instructional partnerships provide a pathway to leadership, then developing this role during candidates' preservice education is a key responsibility of educators of school librarians. University educators can provide opportunities for candidates to practice collaboration with various classmates during a single course. Candidates can develop the identity, competencies, and dispositions of an effective instructional partner. School librarian educators can design and develop multiple assignments that simulate the job-embedded professional development that results from effective collaborative work, particularly in the area of lesson planning. They can utilize collaborative Web-based tools to facilitate communication and collaborative planning to familiarize candidates with tools they will integrate into their collaborative work with colleagues and the lessons they coplan for K-12 students.

Along this learning path, school librarian candidates may develop a value for instructional partnerships while they practice the necessary skills and dispositions—including flexibility, trust, openness, risk-taking, and a willingness to change—to enact this role in the field. This value combined with skills and dispositions may help school librarian graduates overcome barriers to enacting the instructional partner role to become the new leaders needed to ensure the future of school libraries staffed by professional school librarians. While there are no guarantees that the learning experiences and interventions facilitated in the university classroom will be enacted by all school librarian graduates, educators of school librarians must be conscientious and persistent in their efforts to help candidates change their existing paradigms during their preservice education.

Acknowledgements

The researcher would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Mirah Dow, professor, School of Library and Information Management, Emporia State University, for her review of the data coding in this study.

References

Achterman, D. (2008). *Haves, halves, and have-nots: School libraries and student achievement in California.* (Published doctoral dissertation). University of North Texas. Retrieved from http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc9800/m1/

American Association of School Librarians (AASL). (2007). *Standards for the 21st-century learner.* Chicago, IL: American Association of School Librarians.

American Association of School Librarians (AASL). (2009). *Empowering learners: Guidelines for school library programs.* Chicago, IL: American Association of School Librarians.

American Library Association (ALA). (2011). *Resources for LIS program administrators.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforprogramadministrators

American Library Association (ALA). (2009). *Core competences of librarianship.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/careers/corecomp/corecompetences

American Library Association (ALA) and American Association of School Librarians (AASL). (2010). *Standards for initial preparation for school librarians.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/aasl/aasleducation/schoollibrary/schoollibrary

American Library Association Office for Accreditation. (2011). *Resources for LIS program administrators.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforprogramadministrators

Arnstine, D. (1967). *Philosophy of education: Learning and schooling.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, A., & Green, T. D. (2001). *The essentials of instructional design: Connecting fundamental principles with process and practice.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Bush, G., & Jones, J. B. (2010). Exploration to identify professional dispositions of school librarians: A Delphi study. *School Library Research, 13*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume13/bush_jones

Cahill, M., Moreillon, J., & McKee, R. (2011). The library conference, an insufficient knowledge builder: How the roles of the school librarian are addressed through state-level conference offerings. Conference Proceedings of the Treasure Mountain Research Retreat #17: *Knowledge Building in the Learning Commons: Moving from Research to Practice to Close the Achievement Gap.* Osseo, MN. Retrieved from https://sites.google.com/site/treasuremountain17papers/paper-22

Coffield, F., Mosely, D., Hall, E., & Ecclestone, K. (2004). *Should we be using learning styles? What research has to say about practice.* London, England: Learning and Skills Research Center.

Fulton, B., Botticelli, P., & Bradley, J. (2011). DigIn: A hands-on approach to a digital curation curriculum for professional development. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 52*(2), 95–109.

Gilbert, L., & Moore, D. R. (1998). Building interactivity into web courses: Tools for social and instructional interaction. *Educational Technology, 38*(3), 29–35.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Hackman, M., & Johnson, C. (2003). *Leadership: A communication perspective.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Haycock, K. (1995). Research imperatives for information professionals: Developing foundations for effectiveness. *School Library Media Annual, 13*, 113–26.

Haycock, K. (2010). Leadership from the middle: Building influence for change. In S. Coatney (Ed.), *The many faces of school library leadership* (pp. 1–12). Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Heck, D. J., Banilower, E. R., Weiss, I. R., & Rosenberg, S. L. (2008). Studying the effects of professional development: The case of the NSF's Local Systemic Change through Teacher Enhancement Initiative. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 39*(2), 113–152.

Hopkins, D. K. (1998). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Jeng, L. H. (2011). *Student learning outcome assessment: A program's perspective.* Presentation for the ALA Committee on Accreditation, ALA Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Kachel, D. E. *et al.* (2011). *School library research summarized: A graduate class project.* Mansfield, PA: School of Library & Information Technologies Department, Mansfield University.

Katz, L. G., & Raths, J. D. (1985). Dispositions as goals for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 1*(4), 3017.

Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. C., & Schwarz, B. (2010). The impact of school libraries on academic achievement: A research study based on responses from administrators in Idaho. *School Library Monthly, 26*(9), 14–17.

Lankes, R. D. (2010). *The atlas of new librarianship.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Lasley, T. J. (1980). Preservice teacher beliefs about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*, 38–41.

Levitov, D. D. (2009). *Perspectives of school administrators related to school library media programs after participating in an online course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators."* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri-Columbia.

Marzano, R. (1998). *A theory-based meta-analysis of research on instruction.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continental Regional Educational Laboratory.

Marzano, R. (2007). *The art and science of teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGregor, J. (2003). Collaboration and leadership. In B. K. Stripling & S. Hughes-Hassell (Eds.), *Curriculum connections through the library* (pp. 119–219). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Miller, D. W. (1995). Professional development and the diffusion of innovations in school library media centers. (Unpublished dissertation). University of Missouri, St. Louis.

Moreillon, J. (2007). *Collaborative strategies for teaching reading comprehension: Maximizing your impact.* Chicago, IL: ALA Editions.

Moreillon, J. (2009). *LS5443: Librarians as instructional partners.* Retrieved from http://ls5443.pbworks.com

Moreillon, J. (2012). *Coteaching reading comprehension strategies in secondary school libraries: Maximizing your impact.* Chicago, IL: ALA Editions.

Moreillon, J., & Ballard, S. D. (2012). Coteaching: A pathway to leadership. *Knowledge Quest, 40*(4), 6–9.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 307–332.

Pask, G. (1975). *Conversation, cognition and learning: A cybernetic theory and methodology.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.

Prawat, R. S. (1998). Current self-regulation views of learning and motivation viewed through a Deweyan lens: The problems with dualism. *American Educational Research Journal, 35*, 199–224.

Rice, R. E., & Gattiker, U. E. (2001). New media and organizational structuring. In F. M. Jablin & L.L. Putnam (Eds.), *New handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 544–584). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shannon, D. M. (2002). The education and competencies of school library media specialists: A review of the literature. *School Library Research, 5*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume52002/shannon.cfm

Shannon, D. M. (2008). School library media preparation program review: Perspectives of two stakeholder groups. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 49*(1), 23–42.

Shulman, L. S. (2000). From Minsk to Pinsk: Why a scholarship of teaching and learning? *The Journal of Teaching and Learning, 1*(1), 48–53.

Stiggins, R., & DuFour, R. (2009). Maximizing the power of formative assessments. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(9), 640–644.

Swan, K. (2001). Virtual interaction: Design factors affecting learner satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online course. *Distance Education, 22*(2), 306–331.

Todd, R. J. (2011). "Look for me in the whirlwind": Actions, outcomes and evidence. Conference Proceedings of the Treasure Mountain Research Retreat #17: *Knowledge Building in the Learning Commons: Moving from Research to Practice to Close the Achievement Gap.* (34–50). Osseo, MN. Spring, TX: LMC Source.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). Reconcilable differences? Standards-based teaching and differentiation. *Educational Leadership, 58*(1), 6–11.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yukawa, J. (2010). Using evidence based practice in LIS education: Results of a test of communities of practice model. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 5*(1), 104–128.

Zmuda, A., & Harada, V. H. (2008). *Librarians as learning specialists: Meeting the learning imperative for the 21st century.* Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.