

AASL Urban Schools Task Force Survey Report

January 8, 2011

Administration of Survey

The AASL Urban Schools Taskforce was charged “to pull together data and resources related to urban school libraries in order to recommend strategies for support of urban school libraries and resources to be added to the Essential Links on the AASL website”. As part of our work, the taskforce conducted two national surveys to gain feedback from urban librarians and urban library administrators about their current work situations and specific needs.

Both surveys targeted persons who work in districts of 40,000 or more students. The building-level survey was conducted during October, 2010. It was publicized via the AASL listserv, LM_NET, Twitter, and various secondary channels. The district-level survey was issued by invitation of the taskforce in October and November of 2010. The surveys were developed by the taskforce and administered via Google Doc interfaces. Both surveys were conducted anonymously to provide confidentiality for respondents.

Copies of this report, survey summaries, and raw data in spreadsheets can be found at <http://connect.ala.org/node/94762>. Summary data are also found in the appendix of this report. The taskforce conducted these surveys to inform our recommendations. It is beyond the scope and expertise of the taskforce to provide scientific analysis of the collected data, but we do believe our work provides significant insight into the support needs of urban school librarians.

Building-Level Survey Summary

This survey was conducted in October, 2010, with the purpose of gaining information from building-level librarians working in large urban districts about their specific work situations and needs. [See summary data in the appendix.] In this survey, we received 798 total responses, but eliminated the responses of 65 persons, as they indicated that their districts had less than 40,000 students. All responses were preserved in the raw data located at <http://connect.ala.org/node/94762>.

Survey results are based on the responses of 733 librarians. Ninety-six percent of respondents indicated that they work in urban districts, so we feel assured that we captured the feedback of librarians working in large urban districts. Respondents were fairly evenly dispersed among grade levels with 37 % working in a PK – 5 setting, 19% working in a PK – 6 schools, 19% working in grades 6 – 8, and 25% working in grades 9 – 12. Of these respondents, 23% indicated that they are members of ALA and 16% are members of AASL. Higher percentages of respondents are members of state (28%) and local (26%) organizations. We received responses from librarians in 28 states, the District of Columbia, and Canada.

The highest percentages of responses came from Florida (11%), Illinois (11%), New York (13%), and Texas (19%).

Urban Students

In this survey, we felt it was important to gather information about the students served by these urban librarians because it directly informs the needs of the library programs. Survey respondents indicated that high percentages of their students qualify for free or reduced lunch with 51% of librarians reporting that 80% or more of their students qualify. In all, 86% of respondents indicated that 40% or more of their students qualify. This is significant because it is a measure of the number of students living in poverty conditions which can also indicate their limited access to books and other materials in the home, as well as their “at-risk” educational status at school.

In the survey, it was also indicated that 48% of the responding librarians serve populations with 21% or more students who are English Language Learners (ELL). Students who are learning English have special requirements for reading materials in native and English languages, high/low reading materials, and materials that reflect their cultures; school librarians are specifically trained to address these specialized needs.

Not surprisingly, 82% of respondents indicated that 40% or more of the students they serve are non-Caucasian, with 56% sharing that 80% or more of their students are non-Caucasian. Urban school librarians serve a disproportionately high number of minority students. These students have needs for materials that reflect their ethnicities, cultures, and interests. They require reading materials that address a wide range of reading levels – from college preparedness to non-readers. They can require high/low materials and books appealing to the interests of urban young persons. Urban school librarians are uniquely placed to fulfill these needs, as they are usually the only teacher in their buildings who work with all students across grade levels and the curriculum.

Urban Library Resources

With such pronounced needs, the library program is clearly positioned to help these urban students succeed academically. However, we learned that 39% of respondents indicated that their libraries have fewer than 10,000 print volumes, with 13% having fewer than 5,000 volumes. These numbers make it challenging to offer a balanced collection that adequately supports today’s rigorous curricula. Of more concern, 52% of respondents shared that the average age of their print collection is 11 years or older. Students being served by these libraries will not have access to current and accurate information in print. Although libraries are often on the forefront in providing resources in digital formats, it is still important to have a robust print collection to complement the deficiencies that occur from insufficient numbers of electronic devices and the unavailability of quality eBooks and audiobooks licensed for shared distribution.

The growing availability of educational resources in electronic formats also makes it necessary for today’s school libraries to provide access to computers. Urban school libraries are often challenged to provide working computers equitably to all students across larger districts. In our survey, 68% of

respondents indicated that they have twenty or fewer working computers and 42% have ten or fewer computers. This makes it unlikely that effective, full-class instruction can take place using computers. Fortunately, 94% of these computers have Internet connectivity. However, 53% reported no increase in the numbers of computers in their libraries in the past three years, with 18% actually experiencing a decrease in working computers.

Libraries and library-related cooperatives are often the purchasing agents for access to subscription online databases. These databases provide students with a vast wealth of information to support their research and learning requirements. This information is current, relevant, aligned to the curriculum, vetted by subject-matter experts, and written at appropriate reading levels. The information comes from reference sources, magazines and journals, newspapers, primary source documents, podcasts, videoclips, and digital images. Professional journal articles and research reports often provide the latest pedagogical information to teachers and administrators. These databases contain information that is not available on the public Internet and is often available 24/7/365 from home and school.

In this survey, 67% of respondents indicated that they have access to ten or fewer subscription online databases with 35% indicating their access to be to 0 – 5 databases. With this small number, it would be difficult to provide resources to adequately meet the needs of students across the language arts, sciences, social studies, and other parts of the curriculum. And, while 21% of respondents indicated an upward trend in the number of databases in the past three years, 55% reported no change, and 25% actually reported access to fewer databases in the past three years. In today's challenging economic times, databases provide affordable resources to equitably meet the needs of all students. In urban areas, databases are particularly important to provide information to students who may not have access to resources and technology at home. Properly resourced urban school libraries are positioned to play an important role in promoting the use and availability of these electronic materials to support teaching and learning.

Urban Library Funding & Staffing

Adequate funding for libraries is fiscally responsible because libraries equitably support the needs of all students in the school and materials are shared broadly throughout the building. Our survey indicates inequity in library funding, with 16% of respondents receiving \$10,000 or more annually while 21% receive \$0 - \$1,000 per year. While funding requirements can vary greatly based on the needs of individual schools, most librarians would be challenged to respond to the needs of students for current research information and recreational reading materials on budgets of less than \$5,000 per year; however, 59% of respondents attempt to do just that. And, unfortunately, 45% of respondents shared that their budgets have been reduced in the past two years. Given the challenging economic times, it is difficult to reconcile underfunding school libraries with the need to maximize the impact of available funding for all students and to share resources frequently and broadly across all classrooms.

Just as there is a need for classroom teachers who are certified in their areas of expertise, it is important that certified librarians, who are expected to be information literacy specialists and technology leaders in their schools, staff school libraries. Students benefit from school librarians who are educated to help

them experience academic success in K -12 settings, as well as to prepare them to succeed in college and the workplace. Librarians are frequently the only teachers in non-classroom roles who work directly and academically with all students in the school. Few teachers are in a position to so greatly impact the school culture, so it makes sense to staff these positions with highly-qualified persons.

Unfortunately, only 37% of respondents indicated that their libraries are staffed by one or more full-time, professionally credentialed librarians. A trend that has been playing out nationally in many school districts is to staff libraries with part-time credentialed librarians, non-credentialed teachers, or non-credentialed solo library aides. Our survey indicates that urban libraries have also seen this trend, with 57% indicating they are staffed by a part-time librarian and 36% by aides. While, in some cases, the library has multiple staff assigned to the library, results indicate that 63% of libraries do not have a full-time professional librarian staffing the library and 35% indicate a decline in staffing in the past three years.

Less staffing also often correlates with reduced hours of operation. Thirty-five percent of our respondents shared that their libraries are only open during school hours. Nine percent have extended hours before and during school and an additional 9% have extended hours during and after school. Only 34% have extended hours before, during, and after school. While 18% of our respondents saw an increase in staffing in the past three years, 19% saw a decrease in staffing in the same time period. In urban districts, where it is less likely for students to have adequate resources for schoolwork at home, it is important to offer extended hours to students to provide them with additional access to computers, print resources, help with homework, and safe meeting spaces.

Urban Library Needs

We asked survey respondents to identify their top three needs to support the success of their library programs. The top response (67%) was for increased funding for the library program and books. That was followed by requests for additional technology/hardware/tech support (43%) and improved staffing (42%). Other top responses included improved scheduling (25%) and facilities improvements (13%).

Respondents were also asked the top three ways that they felt AASL could support their needs. Forty-nine percent indicated a need for continued advocacy at the national, state, and local levels. They also expressed a need for advocacy for increased funding (22%); professional development, especially if free; online resources (16%); and grants and scholarships (11%). There were also requests specific to the needs of urban school librarians for specialized reading lists to target urban fiction, English Language Learner, early childhood, high/low, and ethnic needs (5%). In addition, 8% wanted AASL to serve as a national clearinghouse for research related to the impact of school libraries on student achievement, especially in urban areas.

Overall, respondents' needs and support requests mirror the need of many educators for sufficient funding to support their work. Librarians' requests for funding are important because they reflect the needs of the total school population rather than funding targeted for a narrow band of interests; also, these resources are highly shared to maximized impact. Librarians' requests are student-centered with

needs expressed to provide additional hours of operation, technology, and an environment conducive to learning for all learners.

Their responses indicate a confidence in knowing how to provide a quality library program to their students given sufficient support and funding. They look to AASL to help advocate on their behalf and to provide them with professional development to keep current. They also would like AASL to help them identify research and resources to support the needs of their urban populations.

District-Level Survey Summary

Our survey of district-level administrators was conducted in October – November, 2010. Twenty-eight administrators from districts with 40,000 or students responded. The purpose of this survey was to gain information on the needs of urban school librarians from the perspective of the administrator. [See summary data in the appendix.] Raw data related to this survey can be found at <http://connect.ala.org/node/94762>.

About Urban Library Administrators

District-level administrator respondents often hold advanced degrees, such as a Master's in Library Science (61%) and a Master's of Education (32%); they, also, hold other degrees, such as specialist degrees (21%), other Master's (14%), and Ph.D (7%). Seventy-nine percent of the respondents have worked as a school librarian and 54% have also been classroom teachers.

Only 19 (68%) of the 28 respondents are members of ALA and only 18 (64%) are members of AASL. These results warrant further investigation to ascertain why there is not greater membership in our national professional organizations among leaders at our larger districts. Since this correlates strongly with the number of persons who have Master's of Library Science degrees, one possibility is that approximately one-third of these leaders also hold other job responsibilities in their districts and are not necessarily fully focused on administration for libraries.

There is a range of other full-time support staff at the district level - no full-time employees (7%), one full-time employee (36%), up to five employees (11%), and more than five (7%). Among full-time employees, only eleven districts (39%) report that 50% or more of their additional staff have advanced degrees. Part-time employees are less prevalent at the district level with 24(86%) districts having none. While priorities are to provide direct library services to students, large districts that have no or only one full-time employee to support all of their district's librarians will be highly challenged to provide effective support in the areas of building-level consulting/evaluation, professional development, policy implementation, and alignment of the work of librarians to other core district initiatives.

Job Responsibilities – Urban Library Administrators

Urban library administrators perform an array of duties with the frequency of “every day”, “often” or “sometimes”. These duties include budgeting (79%), fundraising (43%), staff evaluations (64%), hiring/staffing decisions (61%), recruitment (61%), curriculum planning (82%), special programming (79%), evaluation of library programs (86%), building-level consulting (86%), and professional development (93%). These results indicate that central office library administrators play important roles in supporting the work of building-level librarians to provide quality library programs for their students.

District-level offices often share or influence school purchasing decisions in such areas as books and magazines (36%), audio-visual equipment (29%), computers (32%), computer software (46%), and assistive technologies (18%). Schools most heavily look to district offices to help provide or supplement their access to online databases (57%). In current economic times, it makes sense to have some district oversight in large urban districts while preserving the choices of individual schools based on local needs. Library administrators should work with their purchasing departments to broker aggressive strategic source pricing to leverage the collective buying power of their larger districts, maximizing the educational dollars available to student resources.

Library administrators also play a key role in communicating with stakeholder groups. Respondents reported that “every day”, “often”, or “sometimes” they interface with other district administrators (64%), parents (57%), local government (43%), state government (43%), and federal government (79%). As many districts in the nation look at the adoption of Common Core standards, implementation of other specialized curricula, innovative teaching strategies, support for special needs students, effective integration of technology, and other strategies to provide quality education, large urban districts can benefit from oversight by a library department that works to align the school’s library program work with the district’s work.

An important role of centralized library departments is to provide effective professional development for librarians. District-level administrators reported that they “regularly” or “sometimes” provide professional development in the areas of literacy (82%), information literacy (96%), collection development (93%), curriculum and content (96%), standards for the 21st century learner (96%), Common Core standards (68%), testing (57%), technology (93%), grants (43%), and fundraising (43%). Due to the specialized roles that librarians play in the total education program and the fact that other central offices are not staffed to offer professional development through the lens of the librarian, it is clear that urban library administrators oversee important continuing education that can ultimately impact tens of thousands of students. School librarianship is undergoing seismic changes to its resources and programs with the advent of web-based technologies. At no time in history has humankind experienced such an explosion of online information. Our students are generally not information literate to effectively access, evaluate, and use this information, so it is important that librarians are knowledgeable to help students navigate this “information overload”. Library administrators play an important role in keeping building-level librarians abreast of information and trends in the field which inform their professional practices.

District-level administrators provide support to building-level librarians in many core district priorities that impact students. Eighty-nine percent of administrators support summer reading programs, an important component of comprehensive literacy initiatives in urban areas. Administrators report supporting racial (50%) and ethnic (54%) diversity in staffing school libraries. In addition, socio-economic diversity (39%), multiple language support (46%), special education (43%), and community building (39%) are significant priorities. Although these percentages indicate that library administrators play important roles in coordinating their districts' library programs to district goals, they also indicate that there is room for growth. This taskforce encourages library administrators to continue to strive to work with other departments and schools to ensure that their districts' library programs are aligned with the larger work of their districts.

District-level administrators must regularly communicate with the librarians they support to share information about the profession, their district initiatives, and upcoming events and professional development opportunities. Our survey results indicate that administrators communicate "every day" or "often" by email (96%), Intranet (54%), face-to-face meetings (50%), and site visits (46%). They "rarely" or "never" use wikis (68%), blogs (75%), instant messaging (93%), Twitter (79%), Facebook and similar social networking sites (100%), and teleconferencing (68%). Administrators are to be commended for their commitment to regular communications with school-based librarians. Channels such as email and face-to-face meetings provide forums for effective exchanges of information. However, this taskforce encourages library administrators to, also, model the use of prominent web-based technologies, such as Twitter, Facebook, webconferencing, blogs, and wikis to familiarize librarians with the benefits of leveraging these technologies for professional growth and instruction. Although some of these technologies may be blocked within school networks, there is a sufficient wealth of library-related information to be found to justify their use outside of the workday for interested professionals.

District-Level Urban Library Needs

Respondents indicated a variety of needs to support the librarians they serve. Prominent needs include staffing schools with librarians (25%), providing libraries with support staff (21%), gaining more recognition for the role of librarians (21%), and increasing budgets for libraries (18%). They indicated that AASL can assist them most directly in creating standards for the presence and certification of school librarians (25%), providing free/inexpensive professional development webinars (25%), advocacy directed at district-level administrators (18%), and advocacy directed at school administrator organizations (18%). [See survey summary in the Appendix for other responses.]

These responses indicate that district-level administrators are concerned with issues related to funding and in creating an awareness of the contributions of school librarians to student achievement. They feel that AASL can help them by raising the professional standards for librarianship, providing affordable professional development, and advocating on behalf of school librarians to high-level decision-makers.

Major Needs of School Librarians Serving in Large Urban Districts

1. Advocacy related to the importance of funding for school libraries for books, technology, electronic resources, and adequate certified staffing to highlight how these resources impact student achievement in an effective library program
2. Free and low-cost professional development to keep librarians knowledgeable in a quickly changing profession
3. Specialized book lists that meet the needs of urban students
4. Continued support for the recognition and implementation of library standards for the 21st century learner

Major Needs of District Library Supervisors Serving in Large Urban Districts

1. Standards for the presence and certification of librarians at the building level
2. Alignment of LIS standards with national curriculum standards
3. Professional development available to district librarians at minimal or no cost
4. Advocacy to national administrator organizations for effective library programs and the role of the school librarian

APPENDIX

I. Building-Level Survey Summary

II. District-Level Survey Summary

**I. AASL Urban Schools Taskforce
Building-level Survey of Librarians in Districts of 40,000 or more students
Conducted October, 2010**

Overall Respondents

798 total respondents
733 respondents from district of 40,000 or more students
65 respondents – not from district of 40,000 or more

Grade levels served

Grade levels	# of respondents	% of total
PK – 5	273	37%
PK - 6	139	19%
6-8	138	19%
9-12	181	25%
PK – 5, 9-12	1	0%

% of student body on free or reduced lunch

% of students	# of students	% of total
0% - 19%	48	7%
20% - 39%	56	8%
40% - 59%	99	14%
60% - 79%	154	21%
80% - 100%	376	51%

of students served by library program

# of students	# of respondents	% of total
1 - 499	194	11%
500 - 999	319	44%
1,000 – 1,499	105	14%
1,500 – 1,999	46	6%
2,000+	68	9%

Hours of operation

Before school only	5	0%
Before & during school	69	9%
Before, during, & after school	248	34%
Before & after school only	9	1%
Before, during, after school, & weekends	6	0%
During school hours only	259	35%
After school only	4	0%
During & after school	63	9%
During, after school, & weekends	3	0%
Other combinations	66	9%

Trends in hours of operation in past three years

Reduction in hours	139	19%
Same number of hours	465	64%
An increase in hours	129	18%

Library Staffing

One or more library aides	260	36%
One part-time certified librarian	418	57%
One full-time certified librarian	209	29%
Two or more certified librarians	61	8%
One or more certified teachers not certified as school librarians	42	6%
Volunteers & student volunteers	11	2%
Other, including tech support	4	0%

* respondents could choose more than one answer

Trends in library staffing in past three years

Staffing levels decreased	256	35%
Staffing levels same	425	58%
Staffing levels increased	52	7%

District Primarily Urban

No	29	4%
Yes	704	96%

% of student who are English Language Learners (ELL)

0% - 10%	242	33%
11%-20%	144	20%
21%-30%	108	15%
31%-40%	63	9%
41%-50%	46	6%
More than 50%	129	18%

% of student who are non-Caucasian

0%-19%	67	9%
20%-39%	64	9%
40%-59%	83	11%
60%-79%	110	15%
80%-100%	408	56%

Size of print collection

1- 4,999	97	13%
5,000-9,999	188	26%
10,000-14,999	254	35%
15,000+	194	27%

Average age of collection

1-5 yrs	77	11%
6-10 yrs	276	38%
11-15 yrs	255	35%
16-20 yrs	93	13%
21+ yrs	32	4%

of working computers

0-10	305	42%
11-20	188	26%
21-30	118	16%
31-40	76	10%
41-50	20	3%
50+	26	4%

% of computers with Internet connectivity

0%-25%	26	4%
26%-50%	6	0%
51%-75%	12	2%
76%-100%	689	94%

Computer trends in number of working computers over past three years

Fewer working computers	133	18%
About the same # of working computers	386	53%
More working computers	214	29%

of subscription online databases

0-5	256	35%
6-10	232	32%
11-15	133	18%
16-20	55	8%
20+	57	8%

Trends in # of online databases over past three years

Fewer databases	182	25%
About the same # of databases	399	55%
More databases	152	21%

Annual book budget 2009-2010

\$0-\$1,000	157	21%
\$1,000-\$1,999	49	7%
\$2,000-\$2,999	66	9%
\$3,000-\$3,999	90	12%
\$4,000-\$4,999	75	10%
\$5,000-\$7,500	114	16%
\$7,501-\$10,000	68	9%
\$10,000+	114	16%

Funding book budget funding trends compared to the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years

Less than previous two years	332	45%
About the same as the previous two years	342	47%
More than the previous two years	58	8%

Annual library supply budget 2009-2010 school year

\$0-\$1,000	526	72%
\$1,000-\$1,999	80	11%
\$2,000-\$2,999	51	7%
\$3,000-\$3,999	32	4%
\$4,000-\$4,999	44	6%

Professional organizational memberships

ALA	309	23%
AASL	212	16%
State library organization	380	28%
State or national technology organization	101	8%
Local library organization	343	26%

* respondents could choose more than one answer

Responding states/countries

Alabama	21	3%
Alaska	2	0%
California	6	0%
Canada	4	0%
Colorado	28	4%
Connecticut	1	0%
District of Columbia	30	4%
Florida	83	11%
Georgia	27	4%
Illinois	77	11%
Louisiana	21	3%
Maryland	37	5%
Michigan	1	0%
Minnesota	2	0%
Nebraska	28	4%
Nevada	24	3%
New Jersey	1	0%

New Mexico	15	2%
New York	94	13%
North Carolina	5	0%
Ohio	18	2%
Oklahoma	16	2%
Oregon	1	0%
Pennsylvania	3	0%
Rhode Island	1	0%
Tennessee	4	0%
Texas	138	19%
Virginia	6	0%
Washington	12	2%
Wisconsin	24	3%

Top three needs of respondents

Advocacy/admin support	62	8%
Collaboration	47	6%
eBooks/audiobooks	24	3%
Facilities improvements	98	13%
Funding/books	489	67%
Scheduling	183	25%
Staffing	308	42%
Technology/ hardware/ tech support	312	43%
Librarian professional PD/ tech PD/ teacher PD	24	3%
Online databases	21	3%

* respondents could choose more than one answer

Other outlier responses: reading incentive programs, guest speaker programming, leveled readers, library curriculum, urban lit readings lists, ELL reading lists, urban boys reading lists, Spanish language reading lists, early childhood reading lists, district support/district librarian, community/parental involvement, student motivation, awareness of the impact of standardized testing on library program, better collaboration with public library system, salary increases, assessment of library program, parental resources in Spanish, security system, more research about reading in the library for urban teen readers, overaggressive filtering, support for student transition to college, greater access to professional publications, automation support.

Top three ways AASL can provide support

Advocacy (political/ administrative/ other prof orgs)	356	49%
Create book lists (urban lit, ELL, early childhood, hi/low), online resource lists	40	5%
Host events and conferences	12	2%
Provide grants/scholarships	84	11%
Highlight/ advocate about funding needs of librarians	161	22%
Develop library curriculum/ curriculum addressing needs of urban students/ curriculum related to Common Core	22	3%
Foster networking among librarians	13	2%
Provide professional development/ free professional development/ online materials	119	16%
Serve as a clearinghouse for and promote research highlighting the impact of school libraries on student achievement, esp in urban areas	59	8%
Continue to support use and information about library standards	10	1%

* respondents could choose more than one answer

Other outlier responses: Freebie items such as posters and bookmarks; develop library-related speaker's bureau; serve as a clearinghouse of best practices; provide support for new librarians; advocate with university administration, teacher, and librarian preparation programs to highlight benefits of collaboration with librarians; continue support for state and local library associations, including providing local face-to-face professional development; lower membership dues; contribute support to benefits of maintaining state-wide online database availability; promotional information targeting parents; help define librarian's role and job description; promote use of audio/eBooks; promote equitable access to technology; encourage collaboration and mentorship; promote NBCT certification for librarians; provide more information literacy tools that librarians can use; develop librarian evaluation rubric; provide information on managing interns and volunteers; continue accrediting program guidelines; provide more information on supporting students of color; provide incentive programs to attract minority candidates to the field; work with teacher unions to develop greater support for librarians in their ranks; highlight model urban libraries; develop weeding guidelines; organize cataloguing volunteer support; organize book drives; advocate to publishers for diversity in children's literature; continue to support intellectual freedom; develop national help line for librarians; create school librarian job bank; develop multi-cultural student library materials; provide a collection analysis tool; focus on development of library resources for bilingual students;

*Survey results are rounded and may not equal exactly 100%

II. AASL Urban Schools Taskforce
District-level Survey of Librarians in Districts of 40,000 or more students
Conducted October/November 2010

Overall Respondents

28 total respondents
28 respondents from district of 40,000 or more students
0 respondents – not from district of 40,000 or more

Amount of time spent on selected responsibilities by the district supervisor in the average week.

Activity	Everyday	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Technology Troubleshooting	6 21%	9 32%	6 21%	5 18%	1 4%
Budgeting	4 14%	11 39%	7 25%	5 18%	1 4%
Fundraising for building programs	0 0%	5 18%	7 25%	8 29%	8 29%
Policies/Procedures	5 18%	9 32%	10 38%	3 11%	0 0%
Evaluation of librarians/staff	1 4%	3 11%	14 50%	5 18%	5 18%
Hiring/Staffing decisions	0 0%	2 7%	15 54%	7 25%	4 14%
Recruitment	0 0%	7 25%	10 38%	9 32%	2 7%
Collection Development	4 14%	11 39%	9 32%	4 14%	0 0%
Curriculum Planning	5 18%	9 32%	9 32%	5 18%	0 0%
Special programming	2 7%	8 29%	12 43%	5 18%	0 0%
Evaluation of library programs	3 11%	7 25%	14 50%	4 14%	0 0%
Book challenges	0 0%	0 0%	10 38%	13 46%	5 18%
Copyright issues	0 0%	2 7%	10 38%	12 43%	3 11%
Building- level consulting	6 21%	7 25%	11 39%	3 11%	0 0%
Professional development	4 14%	15 54%	7 25%	1 4%	0 0%

Level at which purchasing decision occur in each district for certain resources

Resource	Building-level Library	District and Building Level	District Level Library Office	Elsewhere in the District	Not at All/Unknown
Books/Magazines	15 54%	10 36%	3 11%	0 0%	0 0%
Electronic databases	2 7%	10 36%	16 57%	0 0%	0 0%
Audiovisual equipment	12 43%	8 29%	0 0%	0 0%	1 4%
Computers	7 25%	9 32%	1 4%	0 0%	1 4%
Computer software	5 18%	13 46%	3 11%	0 0%	1 4%
Assistive technologies	4 14%	5 18%	1 4%	0 0%	2 7%

Frequency of types of communication used by district supervisor with librarians and library support staff.

Communication	Everyday	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Email	24 86%	3 11%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%
Wiki	0 0%	5 18%	4 14%	7 25%	12 43%
Blog	0 0%	2 7%	5 18%	7 25%	14 50%
Intranet	11 39%	4 14%	2 7%	4 14%	6 21%
IM/Online Messaging	0 0%	1 4%	1 4%	8 29%	18 64%
Twitter	0 0%	2 7%	2 7%	2 7%	20 71%
Facebook, MySpace, etc	0 0%	0 0%	2 7%	6 21%	22 79%
Teleconference	0 0%	1 4%	8 29%	9 32%	10 38%
Face to face meetings	2 7%	12 43%	11 39%	3 11%	0 0%
Newsletter	0 0%	7 25%	8 29%	5 18%	8 29%
Site Visits	3 11%	10 38%	14 50%	1 4%	1 4%

Frequency of contact by district supervisor with library stakeholder groups.

Stakeholder Group	Everyday	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
District administrators	1 4%	12 43%	5 18%	8 29%	1 4%
Parents	12 43%	4 14%	0 0%	5 18%	7 25%
Community organizations	2 7%	2 7%	4 14%	16 57%	4 14%
Association leaders	3 11%	0 0%	6 21%	9 32%	10 38%
Vendors	0 0%	1 4%	7 25%	17 61%	3 11%
Public libraries (local)	0 0%	1 4%	7 25%	17 61%	3 11%
Local government	12 43%	0 0%	0 0%	4 14%	12 43%
State government	9 32%	1 4%	2 7%	8 29%	8 29%
Federal government	22 79%	0 0%	0 0%	1 4%	5 18%

Frequency of different types of professional development.

Activity	Regularly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Literacy	14 50%	9 32%	4 14%	1 4%
Information literacy	18 64%	9 32%	1 4%	0 0%
Collection development	14 50%	12 43%	2 7%	0 0%
Curriculum and content	14 50%	13 46%	1 4%	0 0%
Standards for the 21 st Cent Learner	15 54%	12 43%	1 4%	0 0%
Common Core Standards	5 18%	14 50%	5 18%	4 14%
Testing/assessments	7 25%	9 32%	7 25%	5 18%
Technology	16 57%	10 38%	2 7%	0 0%
Grants	1 4%	11 39%	12 43%	4 14%
Fundraising	1 4%	11 39%	10 38%	6 21%

Number of individuals and level of employment in the district office.

Type	0	1	2	3	4	5	More than 5
Full-time	2 7%	10 38%	6 21%	4 14%	1 4%	3 11%	2 7%
Part-time	24 86%	4 14%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Other employees in the district office, not the supervisor, who have advanced degrees (MLS, MA, PhD, etc.)

	None	Less than half	Half	More than half	All	NA
Full-time	13 46%	2 7%	3 11%	2 7%	6 21%	2 7%

Amount of time spent by district office staff on selected responsibilities in the average week.

Activity	Everyday	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Clerical/administrative tasks	17 61%	6 21%	3 11%	0 0%	1 4%
Curriculum development	3 7%	11 39%	7 25%	5 18%	1 4%
Teaching prof development	2 7%	12 43%	9 32%	0 0%	4 14%
Technology integration	5 18%	12 43%	8 29%	1 4%	1 4%
Creating library programming	5 18%	7 25%	10 38%	4 14%	1 4%
Mentoring librarians/support staff	9 32%	13 46%	4 14%	1 4%	0 0%

Previous professional experience

Degree	Number/%
School librarian	22 79%
Classroom teacher	15 54%
Other type of librarian	3 11%
School-level administrator	1 4%
IT Specialist	3 11%
District-level administrator (not library related)	2 7%
Other	6 21%

Degrees and certificates of the district supervisor.

Degree	Number/%
Master's (MA)	4 14%
Master's of Library Science (MLS, MLIS, or MSIS)	17 61%
Master's of Education (M.Ed)	9 32%
Ph.D	2 7%
Ed.D	1 4%
MBA	1 4%
Other type of specialist (reading, teaching, etc.)	6 21%

Professional Organizations

Organization	Number/%
ALA	19 68%
AASL	18 64%
State library organization	17 61%
State school library organization	14 50%
AERA	0 0%
ASIST	0 0%
ASCD	6 21%
ISTE	6 21%

Building-level support for special programs offered

Activity	
Racial diversity	14 50%
Ethnic diversity	15 54%
Socioeconomic diversity	11 39%
Multiple language support	13 46%
Special education	12 43%
Community building	11 39%
Charter schools	7 25%
Classroom libraries	8 29%
After school programs	9 32%
Tutoring	7 25%
Summer reading	25 89%

What are the top three areas needing improvement in your school district?

Needs	Number/%
Increased budget	5 18%
Budget line reserved for district	2 7%
Inadequate staffing at the district office	3 11%
Schools without librarians	7 25%
Schools needing support staff	6 21%
School district must require library cert.	3 11%
Recognize library as part of curriculum	2 7%
More recognition of librarian's role	6 21%
Professional development for librarians	2 7%
Technology needs	2 7%
Improve the library curriculum with standards	2 7%
More collaboration time for librarians	2 7%

What are the top three things that AASL can do to support your work?

AASL Support	Number
Create standards for the presence and certification of librarians in schools	7 25%
Standards for collections	2 7%
More direct alignment of LIS standards with curriculum standards	4 14%
Push for alignment and standads in NCLB for libraries and librarians	4 14%
Advocate to district administrators directly	5 18%
Advocate more to school administrator organizations	5 18%
Advocate for federal funding for all school libraries	3 11%
Support for academic research	2 7%
Free/inexpensive webinars	7 25%
Travel funds and scholarship for conferences	3 11%
Lower membership fees for librarians	2 7%
Encourage more recruitment of potential school librarians to LIS programs	2 7%

Other Comments:

<p>Need for books, materials, software that address diversity needs.</p>
<p>Pittsburgh, PA actually has only ~26,500 students. I was asked to fill this out anyway.</p> <p>I was just cut to half time with libraries, and my ex-full-time clerk was also cut to half time with libraries. We each have other duties which suck up over 50% of our time and energy. It's hard to service our 60+ schools this way.</p> <p>I have developed a system -- that is very easy for building level teacher-librarians and district level administrators to use -- that calculates/estimates monthly usage of materials (circulation, in read-alouds, usage in library-lessons and research.) It was presented at last year's PSLA and folks seemed to be excited to know that such a thing is possible. I am willing to share. (I don't get to national meetings because I am not given time off and I need to pay my own way.)</p>
<p>I'm very glad to know that this task force exists! I would like to receive updated information and status reports on any pertinent information concerning urban school library issues! We are all out here trying to keep our programs on the administration's radar (locally, statewide and nationally). However, it feels like we are losing ground fast! Please keep up your work!</p>
<p>Because we are in such dire financial times, next school year I may lose the only licensed, professional I have. For the 2011-12 school year, it may just be me trying to do everything. I don't know if other large districts are in the same boat or not.</p>
<p>Thanks!</p>
<p>Support for libraries is on the decline and more often than not they are the first to get cut. Many of the librarians in my district have not kept up with the technological demands and lack the necessary skills to develop 21st century learners. We need a new model of service and AASL should lead the way in this regard.</p>
<p>"We' have a major image problem. We believe the image of the school librarian has changed but not every school librarian in the field knows it. Principals say "I want a library that is the hub of my school" but when asked to articulate what that means, they are not able to describe it. AASL - has and needs to continue to help define the expectation for quality school library service.</p>

I have only been in this position for 10 months. The position was empty for 3 years prior to that. I had trouble answering your questions because my answers are tempered by context. Your survey doesn't allow for the context which is relevant here. This district is starting over.

Making progress, but with the money tightening in schools, programs are going to suffer and be more difficult to maintain. We are forward thinking in this district and have provided for 21st century learning resources for student use.

I am sure we are no different than other districts ~ we are facing more cuts every year. We currently have 1 school without a librarian, and part time librarians at 12 schools. There will probably be more cuts at the end of this year.

The survey was not clear about whether looking at entire staff or certificated only