School Library Instruction: Does Teaching Experience Matter?

David E. Robinson, Ed.D., Towson University, Department of Educational Technology and Literacy

Scot W. McNary, Ph.D, Towson University, Department of Educational Technology and Literacy

Abstract

This research study examined the relationship between years of traditional classroom teaching experience and teaching in school library instructional environments. Data for the study emerged from formal observations of MLS candidates' practicum teaching in school libraries. Participants in the study were examined based on the following levels of teaching experience: No Experience, Novice (1–3 years), Experienced (4–9 years), and Experienced Plus (10 plus years). Twenty planning, instruction, and reflection competencies were examined. One assessed competency, New Content Modeled, yielded increasingly better performance across levels of experience beginning in the fourth year of experience. Increasingly better performance was not noted among the nineteen other competencies assessed across all experience levels. Lesser-experienced candidates tended to score higher on planning proficiencies than did more-experienced candidates. No significant differences were noted across all competencies between candidates with no teaching experience and candidates who were teaching novices.

In the transition from the Novice to Experienced levels, a significant theme emerged as thirteen significant paired comparisons in planning, instruction, and reflection competencies were noted in this critical transition period. Study findings reinforced "the simple assumption that more teacher experience is better requires greater nuance; experience effects are complex and depend on a number of factors" (Rice 2010, 1).

Introduction

BACKGROUND

Since 1997 Towson University has partnered with local school systems to offer cohort programs that provide teachers in local systems with the opportunity to earn Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) library media specialist certification via a Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology with a concentration in School Library Media. The aim of these cohort

programs was to provide a pool of certified applicants to assume school librarian positions for anticipated vacancies due to projected retirements.

While the cohort programs have provided over five hundred certified school librarians to Maryland public schools over the past nineteen years, the school librarian shortage has continued. The MSDE reported in *Facts about Maryland's School Library Media Programs* that local school systems reported "the inability to fill current positions due to a lack of a candidate pool" (2015, 5). In the *2018–2019 MSDE School Libraries in Maryland Annual Report*, it was noted that 85 percent of schools reporting were staffed with an MSDE-certified library media specialist. Eighty percent of the schools reported having a full-time library media specialist (2019, 1). This significant and systemic shortage of school librarians provided motivation for looking further into the preparation of school librarians with varying levels of prior teaching experience.

In addition to providing certified classroom teachers with an opportunity to earn library media certification, several Maryland universities have campus-based programs for candidates seeking initial school librarian certification. These campus-based candidates typically do not possess current teacher certification and are referred to as "on-campus" candidates in this narrative. The Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) provides a path for MSDE "library media specialist" certification for those not holding a teaching certificate. This path includes a series of four undergraduate education prerequisite courses and completion of an AASL-accredited school library Master's degree program (MSDE 2003).

While the shortage of school librarian candidates has been an ongoing issue, correspondence received by school library supervisors from local school systems in recent years regarding the pool of "on-campus candidates" was tempered by district administrators' concern regarding the potential instructional readiness of school librarian candidates with no previous teaching experience. In conversations between university faculty and several of the local library media program supervisors, the supervisors indicated a strong preference for their newly hired school librarians to possess teaching experience. These supervisors and school-based administrators strongly valued the instructional role of school librarians. The supervisors and administrators expressed their belief that classroom experience served as a tremendous advantage for school librarians when fulfilling their instructional role.

In dialog among Towson University school library faculty, the belief was articulated that the "on-campus" candidates were effectively prepared via their program of study and practicum experiences to assume the full-time role of school librarian (referred to by MSDE as library media specialist) irrespective of teaching experience. Anecdotally, the university school library faculty could cite instances in which several of the most respected and award-winning Maryland school librarians began their school librarian careers with no prior teaching experience.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

These conversations stimulated a quest for data about the effectiveness of school librarian candidates in the role of instructor in relationship to prior teaching experience in the traditional classroom. Some questions posed early in this quest were:

1. Are experienced classroom teachers more effective in planning, implementing, and reflecting on school library media instruction than inexperienced or novice teachers?

2. How much teaching experience might make a difference; for example, are ten years of experience better than two years or five years?

Fortunately, data was readily available to explore these research questions. Fifteen years of lesson observation data from Towson University school librarian candidates' practicum lesson observations had been archived for ongoing program evaluation. This data was used in this research study to examine the relationship between years of classroom teaching experience and the instructional effectiveness of school librarian candidates. The primary research question guiding this research study was: In the role of teacher, what is the relationship between years of teaching experience and school librarian candidates' effectiveness in planning, implementing, and reflecting on school library-based instruction?

Literature Review

INTRODUCTION

The foundational research supporting this research study is related to the established roles of the school librarian, particularly the roles of teacher and instructional partner, and an examination of research related to the relationship between teaching experience and teaching effectiveness.

ROLES OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARIAN

The roles of the school librarian have evolved in accordance with the rapid pace of changes in process of disseminating information, while the emphasis on the instructional role of teacher has remained prominent and interconnected to the other roles of the school librarian. Over the past sixty years, the school librarian's instructional role has been described in several landmark publications. The *Standards for School Library Programs*, created by the American Association of School Librarians in 1960, explained that instruction in library skills was done in cooperation with the school principal and the department chair (e.g., history department chair in a secondary school). This collaborative instructional role continued to be emphasized in a 1969 subsequent publication, *Standards for School Media Programs* (AASL and NEA)*. Media Programs: District and School* suggested that the media specialist demonstrate competency in curriculum development, teaching and learning strategies (AASL and AECT 1975). In *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* four interwoven roles of the library media specialist were identified: instructional partner (providing further emphasis on the collaborative role), information specialist, teacher, and program administrator (AASL 1998).

In *Empowering Learners: Guidelines for School Library Programs* the teacher role of the school librarian was described as one that "empowers students to become critical thinkers, enthusiastic readers, skillful researchers, and ethical users of information" (AASL 2009, 18). In *Empowering Learners* the role of leader was added to the four roles established in *Information Power*, and the sub-roles of advocate and professional member of the learning community supplemented the five roles (AASL 2009). In 2009 a survey of selected school librarians and administrators revealed that the role of instructional partner was identified as the most critical role in the future of the profession (AASL 2009, 16).

In *Empowering Learners* the school librarian's interconnected teaching foundations of instructional partner and teacher were evident. In that book the instructional partner was described as one who "collaborates with classroom teachers" (AASL 2009, 17) and "understands the curriculum of the school thoroughly and can partner with teachers to create exciting learning experiences in an information- and media-rich environment" (AASL 2009, 19).

In planning and delivering instruction for PreK–12 learners, school librarian candidates currently receive structure and direction from the *National School Library Standards for Learners, School Librarians, and School Libraries* (AASL 2018). The accompanying *AASL Standards Integrated Framework* identifies the following essential Domains for learners and school librarians: Think (cognitive), Create (psychomotor), Share (affective), and Grow (developmental). In the instructional role of the school librarian, these Domains are to be anchored by the following six Shared Foundations: Inquire, Include, Collaborate, Curate, Explore, and Engage (AASL 2018). Data collected for this research study was collected under the guidance of the *ALA/AASL Standards for the Initial Preparation of School Librarians* (2010).

ALA/AASL STANDARDS FOR THE INITIAL PREPARATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS

To guide higher education programs in the preparation of school librarians, ALA published the *ALA/AASL Standards for the Initial Preparation of School Librarians* (2010), aligning five standards and twenty respective elements (sub-standards) with the roles and competencies of school librarianship. *Standard 1: Teaching for Learning* delineated the complex instructional role of the school librarian by means of the following elements:

> *1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning*
>
> *1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher*
>
> *1.3 Instructional partner*
>
> *1.4 Integration of twenty-first century skills and learning standards (2010, 1–2)*

Correlating the *Standard 1: Teaching for Learning* elements (1.1–1.4) with performance-based teaching assessments/competencies provided school library preparation programs with data to assess the instructional effectiveness of school librarian candidates.

In addition, school librarian candidates were able to reflect on their practical teaching experiences via element *3.4 Research and knowledge creation* by using "evidence-based, action research to collect data. Candidates interpret and use data to create and share new knowledge to improve practice in school libraries" (AASL 2010, 10).

New standards for the preparation of school librarians, *ALA/AASL/CAEP School Librarian Preparation Standards,* were released in 2019. In spring 2020 the Towson University practicum assessment tools were revised to align with the *ALA/AASL/CAEP School Librarian Preparation Standards*. While following historical precedents, the *ALA/AASL/CAEP School Librarian Preparation Standards* reflect updates in school librarianship and are "comprised of standard statements, component statements, supporting explanations for each standard and component, rubrics for each component, and assessment evidence guidelines for the standards and components. These parts of the School Librarian Standards are inextricably intertwined with each other and must be considered and applied as a whole" (AASL 2019, 2).

Given the historical significance of the school librarian roles of teacher and instructional partner, an examination of existing research to determine relationships between teaching experience and instructional effectiveness in school library instruction provided a structural basis for this research study. All data collected for this study was collected via assessment tools aligned with the *ALA/AASL Standards for the Initial Preparation of School Librarians* (2010).

MEASURING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS OR QUALITY IN RELATION TO YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Little research exists about the association between the numbers of years of teaching experience and the instructional effectiveness of school librarians. The association between the years of experience in teaching and the effectiveness of K–12 classroom teaching has been addressed more substantively. The issue of how to determine the effectiveness of teaching is ongoing, controversial, and indistinct. Jennifer Rice documented a common positive effect of teaching experience on teacher effectiveness, particularly in the first few years of teaching (2003). In the context of teacher evaluation, one common measure of teacher effectiveness in the twenty-first century has been students' test scores. A key factor in determining teacher salaries is experience, and this reality assumes that experience is correlated with effectiveness (Rice 2010). The complexity of teaching in PreK–12 environments is difficult to capture in a single construct. An examination of research on teacher effectiveness finds a variety of studies using different constructs to define teacher effectiveness. Common themes emerge in the teacher effectiveness research from 2001–2010, while more-recent research contradicts some of the findings from 2001–2010.

One common theme among multiple studies was that inexperienced teachers are less effective than teachers with at least some experience (Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor 2007a, 2007b; Harris and Sass 2011; Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger 2008; Ladd 2008; Rice 2010). Charles T. Clotfelter, Helen F. Ladd, Jacob L. Vigdor (2007a, 2007b) and Helen F. Ladd (2008) found that in comparison to other variables used to measure teacher effectiveness, including advanced degrees and licensure test scores, "early-career" experience had the strongest effect on teacher effectiveness.

While experience matters, Donald Boyd et al. noted, using value-added models controlling for student characteristics and school, that "novice teachers of low performing students are more likely to leave the profession in their first two years of teaching than teachers of high performing students" (2008, 8). Matthew M. Chingos and Paul E. Peterson supported findings that general gains in teacher effectiveness occur within the first few years of teaching experience, while noting evidence that teachers become less effective as they progress through their careers, particularly in their later career stages (2011).

John P. Papay and Matthew A. Kraft, using a longitudinal (ten-year) data set of 200,000 test scores linked to approximately 3,500 teachers, concluded that while teachers make the most progress in the first few years in the classroom, measurable progress in their effectiveness was also achieved by more senior teachers (years ten through thirty) (2015, 2016). Using comprehensive measures of pre-service and in-service training, Douglas N. Harris and Tim R. Sass determined that elementary and middle school teachers with more experience were more productive in promoting student achievement than teachers with less experience. No evidence was cited that pre-service teacher training was related to positive experience (2011). While controversial, teacher evaluation systems often use student achievement measures, including test scores, as a common way of measuring teacher effectiveness. The validity and reliability of test scores in measuring teacher effectiveness is dependent on a variety of factors, including the assessment measures used, adequacy of pre-assessment data, the concurrent effects of learning methods, and value-added judgments in the use of multiple measures (Warring 2015). The relevant and contextual use of test scores in noting the effectiveness of school library programs and school librarians has been well documented in the field. Keith Curry Lance and Debra E.

Kachel cited thirty-four statewide studies, noting a connection between strong school library programs and student achievement (2018).

In a report published by the Urban Institute at the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER), Jennifer Rice noted that "over 40 years of teacher productivity research suggests that the simple assumption that more is better requires greater nuance; experience effects are complex and depend on a number of factors" (2010, 1). Rice and CALDER staff observed several complicating factors in research examining the relationship between teaching experience and teacher effectiveness including:

- academic training and preparation may equal or outweigh the impact of early teaching experience,

- inexperienced teachers tend to teach in high-poverty schools,

- declines in performance for experienced teachers are most prevalent at the high school level (this should not be generalized to all levels),

- declines in performance for experienced teachers may be attributable to factors other than experience (for example, teacher burnout, knowledge deficits in curricular and pedagogical advancements).

This need to approach the subject with greater nuance is evident in the many contradictions in the research examining the relationship between teaching experience and teacher effectiveness. Ladd determined that veteran teachers (those with more than twenty years of experience) are more effective than those with no experience, but not necessarily more effective than teachers with five years of experience (2008). Moreover, Harris and Sass concluded that high school mathematics teachers with greater than twenty-five years of experience may be less effective than inexperienced teachers (2011). This finding is juxtaposed with the conclusion reached by Papay and Kraft that, while teachers make the most progress in improving their instructional effectiveness during their first few years in the classroom, measurable progress was also achieved by more-senior teachers with ten to thirty years of experience (2015, 2016). Other studies have shown that teachers demonstrate continued effective performance throughout their careers (Harris and Sass 2011; Wiswall 2013).

Having examined the research regarding the relationship between teaching experience and teaching effectiveness, the next step in our research process was examining this same paradigm in the school library field. An existing measure and source of data for this endeavor was the previously mentioned fifteen years of data from observation of Towson University school librarian candidates' practicum lessons. The following section provides context for the practicum experience.

Methodology

PRACTICUM EXPERIENCE

The practicum experience was designed to offer candidates hands-on school library experience. This experience permitted candidates to participate in the major aspects of school library program operations and services, such as planning, administering, and evaluating services; developing the collection; organizing, processing, and circulating materials and equipment; and

performing the school librarian roles of teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, program administrator, and leader. It was desirable that candidates had opportunities to participate in the various types of responsibilities associated with the school library program.

For the practicum experience, candidates were assigned a school-based librarian site mentor and a university supervisor. These assignments were done via coordination with the Towson University Center for Professional Practice and local school systems' internship placement coordinators. One key requirement of the practicum experience was for candidates, in the school librarian roles of teacher and instructional partner, to collaborate with a content-area teacher or specialist in the design and implementation of a unit of instruction (that is, a series of lessons). After the delivery of the instruction, candidates reflected on the lesson(s) by disaggregating quantitative and qualitative student data resulting from the unit lessons to identify areas of success and areas for future improvement in the delivery of the unit.

The university supervisor conducted at least two formal lesson observations per practicum placement. A standardized observation document was used to assess the lesson design, lesson implementation, and candidate reflection.

PARTICIPANTS

Study participants were school library candidates enrolled in a school library program at Towson University from 2005 through 2019. The candidates participated in a practicum experience in a traditional public school setting. No candidates were placed in charter schools. Maryland has 1,428 public schools in 24 school systems (MD State Archives 2019). The schools are largely homogenous in terms of management structure with few (forty-six) public charter schools (MSDE 2020). Students may participate in magnet school programs in most districts, but admission to these programs is typically based on student interest. No significant difference in student achievement between the magnet schools and other settings has been noted. For example, Maryland magnet public schools have an average math proficiency score of 42 percent (versus the Maryland public school average of 41 percent), and reading proficiency score of 42 percent (versus the 41 percent statewide average) (Public School Review 2020).

Participants planned, implemented, and reflected on instruction to PreK–12 students during their practicum experience. Secondary data (that is, existing data) for 198 candidates were used in the research study. These candidates were grouped into four levels/categories of classroom teaching experience:

- No Experience: candidates with no teaching experience

- Novice: candidates with 1–3 years of teaching experience

- Experienced: candidates with 4–9 years of teaching experience

- Experienced Plus: candidates with 10 or more years of teaching experience

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The research instrument used in this study was the assessment document used by Towson University supervisors for practicum lesson observations: *The Lesson Planning, Implementation, and Analysis (LPIA) Project Scoring Guide (LPIAPSG).* The purpose of the *LPIA* project was for candidates to gain experience in collaborative design, instructional delivery, and analysis of a

school library-related lesson. In the role of the school librarian, and in collaboration with a practicum mentor, the candidate identified a content-area teacher or specialist who would serve as a collaborator for the implementation of the project. The *LPIAPSG* was used to evaluate candidates' efforts in their design, implementation, and reflection of school library instruction.

Building on the lesson planning skills acquired in their program of study coursework, candidates produced a series of lesson plans (in collaboration with a classroom teacher/content area specialist) from the perspective of a school librarian. Candidates implemented the lessons (for the purposes of formal observation) with the intended audience, and then collected and analyzed data to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction in relation to the goals, expectations, and indicators identified. A university supervisor observed the lesson and provided feedback via the *LPIAPSG*.

Candidate competency proficiencies were scored via the *LPIAPSG* scoring rubric. The *LPIAPSG* rubric included target (above proficient), acceptable (proficient), and unacceptable (below proficient) criteria for each *LPIAPSG* planning, implementation, and reflection competency. The numerical value assigned to each target, acceptable, and unacceptable category per criteria was in the range of 0 (unacceptable) – 2 (proficient) for the majority of competencies. Higher point values were assigned to select competencies (for example Instructional Procedures).

As noted in table 1, candidates were scored on six planning competences, and as noted in table 2, candidates were scored on twelve implementation competencies. After reflecting on the lesson implementation, candidates were scored on two reflection and analysis competencies as noted in table 3. Each competency was aligned with an element in the 2010 *ALA/AASL Standard for the Initial Preparation of School Librarians* document.

Table 1. Unit/lesson planning competencies.

Planning Competency	AASL Element
1. School Description and Resources	1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning
2. Collaboration	1.3 Instructional Partner
3. Goals, Objectives, and Indicators	1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning
4. Assessment Plan	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
5. Instructional Procedures	1.4 Integration of twenty-first century skills and learning standards
6. Universal Design for Learning and Differentiation	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher

Table 2. University supervisor lesson observation scoring guide for lesson implementation.

Observed Competency	AASL Element
7. Objectives	1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning
8. Use of Pre-assessment Data	1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning
9. Motivation	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
10. Introduction	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
11. Modeling	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
12. Guided and Independent Practice	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
13. Critical Thinking	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
14. Universal Design for Learning	1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning
15. Formative Assessment	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
16. Feedback	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
17. Closure	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher
18. Summative Assessment	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher

Table 3. Candidates' reflection on their own instruction.

Reflection Competency	AASL Element
19. Analysis and Instructional Decision Making	3.4 Research and knowledge creation
20. Reflection and Self Evaluation	1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher

VALIDITY

The *LPIAPSG* was designed based on Emerson Elliott's 1996 learning principles in the JPTAAR cycle (Judges prior learning, Plans instruction, Teaches, Assesses, Analyzes, and Reflects) used within the Towson University College of Education (Towson 2012), aligned with the *Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards* (CCSSO 2011) and updated to include competencies consistent with Universal Design for Learning (CAST 2018).

Content validity was determined by experts in the school library field who received the document and conducted blind reviews. Following the blind reviews, Towson program faculty

conferred to update the document based on the feedback provided. Interrater reliability was assessed via simultaneous scoring of the instrument done with three practicum students, resulting in an 85 percent level of agreement. Faculty met at the end of each semester to compare key assessment data within the program including the *LPIAPSG*. This data was used for ongoing program improvement and enhancement of the practicum experience.

Faculty assessing the practicums remained relatively constant over the course of the data collection. A new faculty member was hired in 2013 to replace a retiring faculty member. The new faculty member participated in collaborative evaluation of select candidates and in semi-annual discussions of practicum observation data in an effort to maintain reliability in data collection.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Study participants were school library candidates enrolled in the school library program at Towson University from 2005 through 2019. The data was derived from observations of 198 candidates by Towson University supervisors. Forty-six of the observed candidates (23.2 percent) had no prior teaching experience. Twenty-eight candidates (14.1 percent) had 1–3 years of teaching experience. Almost half or 98 of the candidates (49.5 percent) had 4–9 years of teaching experience, and 26 candidates (13.1 percent) had 10 or more years of teaching experience. As noted in table 4, for the purposes of this study candidates were assigned to one of four categories or levels, based on years of teaching experience. The four levels designated were: No Experience, Novice, Experienced, and Experienced Plus.

Table 4. Participants' years of teaching experience.

Level	N	%
0 – No Experience (0 yrs)	46	23.2
1 – Novice (1–3 yrs)	28	14.1
2– Experienced (4–9 yrs)	98	49.5
3 – Experienced Plus (10+ yrs)	26	13.1

ANALYSIS PROCESS

Data was collected using the *LPIAPSG* as described in an earlier section of this paper. The first step in the data analysis was to examine the means and standard deviations for each planning competency in relation to experience levels. If no standard deviation was noted among the experience levels (indicating no individual differences), then there was no need to further

investigate experience level differences in that competency. Mean differences among the No Experience, Novice, Experienced, and Experienced Plus candidates are shown in tables 5 through 7.

An ANOVA was then conducted using SPSS Statistics software for each of the *LPIAPSG* planning, implementation, and reflection competencies to determine where there were any significant differences between the competency means of the No Experience, Novice, Experienced, and Experienced Plus candidates.

Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni test were carried out for each competency. The Bonferroni method of adjustment is calculated "by finding the critical value (alpha) for an individual test by dividing the familywise error rate (usually 0.05) by the number of tests" (McDonald 2014). In this study the critical value for pairwise mean comparisons is .05/6 (number of pairwise comparisons for each outcome) = .008 to control for Type I error inflation within each competency outcome. Bonferroni-adjusted p-values are reported in the findings below, which are the product of the observed p-value for a pairwise mean difference and the number of tests that were done for a particular outcome (McDonald 2014, 6). All adjusted p-values below 0.05 are statistically significant, controlling familywise error at 0.05. This is simply a re-expression of the Bonferroni test: one can compare each mean difference p-value to a Bonferroni adjusted p-value of 0.008 (0.05/6), or one can multiply each mean difference p-value by 6 and compare to 0.05. They are equivalent expressions.

The significant differences between experience levels are noted in the next section. These significant differences among group means are noted in tables 5 through 7 by means of a superscript of "[a]" or "[b]". Means that share a common superscript are not statistically significantly different from each other, and means that have different superscripts are significantly different from each other when the Bonferroni adjustment is applied. Significant differences are also noted in the far right column of tables 5 through 7. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals for the pairwise mean differences and effect sizes (Hedge's g) for mean comparisons are described in the text.

Findings

PLANNING

All the significant differences in the planning competency outcomes are large effects.

Instruction

As shown in table 5, a significant effect in planning of instruction was found among the four experience levels [$F(3,193)=20.28$, $p<0.001$]. The No Experience candidates (M = 4.40), Novice candidates (1–3 years of experience; M = 4.11), and Experienced candidates (4–9 years of experience; M = 4.64) engaged in significantly more planning of instruction than did the candidates with the most experience (that is, Experienced Plus; M = 2.75). Confidence intervals for mean comparisons were No Experience versus Experienced Plus 0.93–2.38, Novice versus Experienced Plus 0.55–2.16, and Experienced versus Experienced Plus 1.24–2.55. Effect sizes for these comparisons were 1.27, 1.05, and 1.81, respectively.

Table 5. Planning competency outcomes.

| Planning | Experience Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Significant differences |
| | No Experience (NE) | | | Novice (NOV) | | | Experienced (EXP) | | | Experienced Plus (EXP+) | | | |
	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Topic	2.00	0*	46	1.79	.57	28	1.92	.24	98	1.73	.43	26	
Learning Goal	2.00	0*	46	1.93	.26	28	2.00	0	98	2.00	0*	26	
Objectives	2.00	0*	46	1.93	.26	28	1.99	.10	98	2.00	0*	26	
Instruction	4.40[a]	1.21	46	4.11[a]	1.13	28	4.64[a]	.91	98	2.75[b]	1.46	26	NE>EXP+ NOV>EXP+ EXP>EXP+
Assessment Plan	2.63[a]	.61	46	2.30[ab]	.79	28	2.49[a]	.67	98	2.06[b]	.71	26	NE>EXP+ EXP>EXP+

Note: *Experience levels with 0 Standard Deviation were not compared with other experience levels. Means with different superscripts (e.g., [a] or [b]) are significantly different after Bonferroni correction, $p < 0.05$. Means with common superscripts, (e.g., [a] and [a] or [ab] and [b]) are not statistically significantly different. Significant differences are also summarized in the last column of the table.

Assessment Plan

A significant effect in developing of assessment plans was also found among the four experience levels [$F(3,193)=4.37$, $p=0.005$] as shown in table 5. No Experience candidates (M = 2.63), and Experienced candidates (4–9 years of experience; M = 2.49) engaged in significantly more development of assessment plans than did the candidates with the most experience (that is, Experienced Plus: M = 2.06). The differences were statistically significant (CIs: 0.12–1.02 and 0.02–0.84, and ES = 0.88 and 0.63, respectively).

IMPLEMENTATION

All but one of the significant effects found among the implementation competencies were large.

Objectives

As shown in table 6, a significant effect in sharing objectives was found among the four experience levels [F(3,193)=4.52, p=0.004]. Experienced candidates engaged in significantly more sharing of objectives (M = 2.97) than did Novice candidates (M = 2.71; CI: 0.07–0.44, ES = 0.76).

Table 6. Implementation competency outcomes.

| Implementation | Experience Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Significant differences |
| | No experience (NE) | | | Novice (NOV) | | | Experienced (EXP) | | | Experienced Plus (EXP+) | | | |
	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Objectives	2.90[ab]	.29	46	2.71[a]	.60	28	2.97[b]	.22	98	2.92[ab]	.28	26	NOV<EXP
Pre-assessment	2.89[ab]	.43	46	2.57[a]	1.07	28	2.94[b]	.28	98	2.92[ab]	.28	26	NOV<EXP
Motivation	2.40[ac]	.81	46	2.09[a]	1.11	28	2.77[b]	.51	98	2.84[bc]	.37	26	NE<EXP NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+
New Content Introduced	2.62[ac]	.63	46	2.50[a]	.73	28	2.86[b]	.36	98	2.92[bc]	.28	26	NE<EXP NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+
New Content Modeled	2.47[a]	.63	46	2.21[a]	1.06	28	2.84[b]	.37	98	2.92[b]	.28	26	NE<EXP NE<EXP+ NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+

Implementation	Experience Level												Significant differences
	No experience (NE)			Novice (NOV)			Experienced (EXP)			Experienced Plus (EXP+)			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Guided and Independent Practice	2.51^{ab}	.56	46	2.41^{a}	.79	28	2.76^{b}	.45	98	2.74^{ab}	.44	26	NOV<EXP
Critical Thinking	2.60^{ac}	.57	46	2.46^{a}	1.07	28	2.88^{b}	.43	98	2.92^{bc}	.28	26	NE<EXP NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+
Formative Assessment	2.74^{ab}	.51	46	2.43^{a}	1.14	28	2.88^{b}	.35	98	2.88^{b}	.33	26	NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+
UDL Feedback	2.68^{ac}	.56	46	2.64^{a}	.73	28	2.94^{b}	.26	98	2.96^{bc}	.14	26	NE<EXP NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+
Closure	2.67^{ac}	.67	46	2.48^{a}	.74	28	2.90^{bc}	.33	98	2.92^{bc}	.28	26	NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+
Summative Assessment	2.85^{ab}	.47	46	2.71^{a}	.71	28	2.97^{b}	.17	98	3.00^{b}	.00	25	NOV<EXP NOV<EXP+

Note: Means with different superscripts (e.g., [a] or [b]) are significantly different after Bonferroni correction, $p < 0.05$. Means with common superscripts (e.g., [a] and [a] or [ab] and [b]) are not statistically significantly different. Significant differences are also summarized in the last column of the table.

Pre-Assessment

A significant effect in using pre-assessment data was also found among the four experience levels [$F(3,193)$=4.00, p=0.009]. Experienced candidates engaged in significantly more use of pre-assessment data than did Novice candidates, M = 2.94 vs. M = 2.57; CI: 0.08–0.65, ES = 0.66) (see table 6).

Motivation

A significant effect in providing motivation in instruction was found among the four experience levels [$F(3,193)$=9.38, p<0.001]. Experienced candidates provided significantly more motivation in instruction (M = 2.77) than did No Experience candidates (M = 2.40; CI: 0.04–0.70, ES = 0.66) and Novice candidates (M = 2.77 vs. M = 2.09; CI: 0.29–1.08, ES = 0.60). Experienced Plus candidates also exceeded Novice candidates (M = 2.84 vs. M = 2.09; CI: +0.24-1.26, ES = 0.89) (see table 6).

New Content Introduced

A significant effect in new content introduced was found among the four experience levels [$F(3,193)$=6.15, p=0.001]. Experienced candidates engaged in introducing new content (M = 2.86) significantly more than did No Experience candidates (M = 2.62, CI: 0.01–0.48, ES = 0.52) and the Novice candidates (M = 2.50, CI: 0.08–0.65, ES = 0.77). Experienced Plus candidates also introduced more new content than did Novice candidates (M = 2.92 vs. M = 2.50; CI: 0.06–0.78, ES = 0.75) (see table 6).

New Content Modeled

A significant effect in new content modeled was found among the four experience levels [$F(3,193)$=12.32, p<0.001]. Experienced candidates modelled significantly more content than did No Experience candidates (M = 2.84 vs. M = 2.47; CI: 0.10–0.64, ES = 0.79) and Novice candidates (M = 2.84 vs. M = 2.21; CI: 0.30–0.95, ES = 1.06). Experienced Plus candidates also modeled significantly more content than did candidates with no experience (M = 2.92 vs. M = 2.47; CI: 0.07–0.83, ES = 0.80) and Novice candidates (M = 2.92 vs. M = 2.21; CI: 0.29–1.12, ES = 0.90).

Guided and Independent Practice

A significant effect of experience was found in offering guided and independent practice [$F(3,193)$ = 4.51, p = 0.004]. Experienced candidates provided significantly more practice than did Novice candidates (M = 2.76 vs. M = 2.41; CI: 0.04–0.66, ES = 0.66) (see table 6).

Critical Thinking

A significant effect in eliciting critical thinking through instruction was found among the four experience levels [$F(3,193)$=5.61, p=0.001]. Experienced candidates elicited significantly more critical thinking (M = 2.88) than did No Experience candidates (M = 2.60. CI: 0.001–0.56, ES = 0.58) and Novice candidates (M = 2.46, CI: 0.08–0.75, ES = 0.67). Experienced Plus candidates

elicited significantly more critical thinking than did Novice candidates (M = 2.92 vs. M = 2.46; CI: 0.03–0.88, ES = 0.58) (see table 6).

Formative Assessment

A significant effect in providing formative assessment was found among the four experience levels [$F_{(3,193)}$=4.94, p=0.002]. Experienced (M = 2.89) candidates used significantly more-effective formative assessment than did Novice candidates (M = 2.43; CI: 0.13–0.77, ES = 0.58). Experienced Plus candidates also used significantly more-effective formative assessment than Novice candidates (M = 2.88 vs. M = 2.43; CI: 0.04–0.87, ES = 0.73) (see table 6).

UDL-Aligned Feedback

A significant effect in providing instruction and feedback aligned with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) was found among the four experience levels [$F_{(3,193)}$=6.45, p<0.001]. Experienced candidates provided significantly more UDL-aligned instruction and feedback than did No Experience candidates (M = 2.94 vs. M = 2.68; CI: 0.05–0.46, ES = 0.68) and the Novice candidates (M = 2.94 vs. M = 2.64; CI: 0.05–0.54, ES = 0.73). Experienced Plus candidates also offered more UDL instruction than did Novice candidates (M = 2.96 vs. M = 2.64; CI: 0.002–0.63, ES = 0.60) (see table 6).

Closure

A significant effect in providing lesson closure was found among the four experience levels [$F_{(3,193)}$=6.77, p<.001]. Experienced candidates provided significantly more lesson closure than did Novices (M = 2.90 vs. M = 2.48; CI: 0.14–0.70, ES = 0.93). Experienced Plus candidates also provided significantly more closure than did Novices (M = 2.92 vs. M = 2.48; CI: 0.08–0.80, ES = 0.49). These are large and moderate effects respectively (see table 6).

Summative Assessment

A significant effect in the use of a summative assessment was found among the four experience levels [$F_{(3,193)}$=4.36, p=0.005]. Experienced candidates engaged in significantly more utilization of summative assessment than did the Novice candidates (M = 2.94 vs. M = 2.71; CI: 0.04–0.47, ES = 0.72). Experienced Plus candidates also used summative assessment significantly more than did Novices (M = 3.00 vs. M = 2.71; CI: 0.01–0.56, ES = 0.80) (see table 6).

REFLECTION ON INSTRUCTION

As with planning and implementation competencies, in the context of reflection competencies significant effects were large.

Analysis and Decision Making

As shown in table 7, a significant effect in reflective analysis and decision making was found among the four experience levels [$F_{(3,193)}$=4.86, p=0.003]. Experienced candidates' reflection

and self-analysis, as assessed by university supervisors, were significant in comparison to the Novice group (M = 2.98 vs. M = 2.71; CI: 0.06–0.47, ES = 0.76).

Table 7. Reflection competency outcomes.

Reflection	Experience Level												
	No experience (NE)			Novice (NOV)			Experienced (EXP)			Experienced Plus (EXP+)			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Significant differences
Analysis and Decision Making	2.83[ab]	.37	46	2.71[a]	.71	28	2.98[b]	.14	98	2.84[a]	.37	26	NOV<EXP
Reflection and Self-Evaluation	4.59[ab]	.93	46	4.36[a]	1.42	28	4.92[b]	.37	98	4.64[ab]	.99	26	NOV<EXP

Note: Means with different superscripts (e.g., [a] or [b]) are significantly different after Bonferroni correction, p < 0.05. Means with common superscripts (e.g., [a] and [a] or [ab] and [b]) are not statistically significantly different. Significant differences are also summarized in the last column of the table.

Reflection and Self-Evaluation

A significant effect in reflection and self-evaluation was also found among the four experience levels [F(3,193) = 4.19, p=.007] (see table 7). Experienced candidates engaged in significantly more reflection and self-evaluation than did Novice candidates (M = 4.92 vs. M = 4.36; CI: 0.09–1.03, ES = 0.76).

Study Limitations

The following limitations must be taken into consideration when interpreting the research findings:

- The reporting of the candidate data was not masked/blinded because the supervisors and candidates knew each other, a circumstance that made it difficult to isolate and eliminate bias in ratings.

- Inter-rater reliability was limited. Candidates were not typically rated by multiple raters.

- It cannot be determined whether there were individual differences in learning outcomes (that is, whether the students assessed by the supervisors learned what they were supposed to learn while in the program). For example, are the competencies that were

rated ones that the candidates already had? Or were the competencies developed as a result of instruction?

- Experience as a teacher may be heterogeneous within experience levels. For example, the set of teachers with 4–9 years of experience could include teachers who have been at four different schools in four years, and others who have been at the same school for nine years.

Significance of the Research

As noted in the literature review, little research has examined the relationship between teaching experience and the effectiveness of school librarian candidates in the role of teacher. The more-substantive research regarding teaching experience and the effectiveness of instruction in the classroom was used to frame the following data analysis.

Research questions addressed in this study included:

- Are experienced classroom teachers more effective in planning, implementing, and reflecting on school library media instruction than inexperienced or novice teachers?

- How much teaching experience might make a difference (for example, are ten years of experience better than two years or five years)?

This study's results were nuanced in relation to the research questions. It would be expected, based on the existing research examining teaching experience and teaching effectiveness, that candidates with more teaching experience would score significantly higher on the assessed school library planning, teaching, and reflection competencies than those with less experience, particularly in the initial years of teaching (Podolsky, Kini, and Darling-Hammond 2019).

When comparing instructional competencies between Novice candidates (1–3 years of classroom teaching experience) and Experienced candidates (4–9 years of experience), the data did yield results consistent with existing research. Experienced candidates scored significantly higher in thirteen instructional and reflection competencies.

The existing research did not support this study's results comparing No Experience and Novice candidates (1–3 years of experience). No significant differences were noted among the planning, instructional, and reflection competencies between these two levels of experience.

Given the variability of the results among experience levels, data was examined for categorical themes across experience levels (see table 8). The resulting analysis compared the results for similar and/or different themes than what would have been expected based on the literature examining teaching experiences and teaching effectiveness.

Table 8. Summary of significant pairwise Bonferroni-adjusted mean comparisons.

	No Experience vs. Novice	No Experience vs. Experienced	No Experience vs. Experienced Plus	Novice vs. Experienced	Novice vs. Experienced Plus	Experienced vs. Experienced Plus
Planning						
Instruction			NE>EXP+		NOV>EXP+	EXP>EXP+
Assessment Plan			NE>EXP+			EXP>EXP+
Implementation						
Objectives				NOV<EXP		
Pre-assessment				NOV<EXP		
Motivation		NE<EXP		NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
New Content Introduced		NE<EXP		NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
New Content Modeled	NE<EXP	NE<EXP+		NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
Guided and Independent Practice				NOV<EXP		
Critical Thinking		NE<EXP		NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
Formative Assessment				NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
UDL Feedback		NE<EXP		NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
Closure				NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
Summative Assessment				NOV<EXP	NOV<EXP+	
Reflection						
Analysis and Decision Making				NOV<EXP		
Reflection and Self-Evaluation				NOV<EXP		

Note: NE=No Experience NOV = Novice EXP = Experienced EXP+ = Experienced Plus. Direction sign indicates direction of difference.

The analysis revealed several significant themes and findings including:

- Planning competencies seemed to show trend differences among the experience levels and lesser-experienced candidates tended to do more planning.

- No significant differences existed across any competencies examined (planning, implementation, and reflection) between Novices and those with no experience.

- Only two significant differences were noted between Experienced and Experienced Plus candidates among planning competencies examined, and none were observed among implementation and reflection competencies.

- One competency, New Content Modeled, yielded four differences across experience levels, perhaps indicating that teaching experience matters when modeling new content.

- Most (thirteen) of the significant pairwise group differences occurred for Novice versus Experienced comparisons. These comparisons may indicate that a critical transition occurs between the Novice and Experienced teacher levels in how they approach lesson planning and implementation as school librarians in training.

THEMES

Trend differences among planning competencies were noted in that lesser-experienced candidates tended to do more planning. This finding is supported by the research of H. Jerome Freiberg (2002) who noted that novice teachers spend more time planning instruction than veteran teachers, and more-experienced teachers are able to use their cumulative experience to plan based on the learners, content, and context. The scores on planning competencies for the most-experienced teachers in this study (Experienced Plus) may have been affected by their not needing to formally document their planning on paper, instead relying on their cumulative teaching experience to guide the lessons.

The only differences noted between candidates in the Experienced and Experienced Plus categories were among the planning competences. Experienced candidates scored at higher levels than did the Experienced Plus candidates.

The absence of competency differences (in planning, implementation, and reflection) between candidates in the Novice and No Experience categories in this study contradicts multiple studies. This finding suggests that inexperienced teachers are less effective than teachers with some experience in in the context of teacher evaluation, particularly in the first few years of teaching (Boyd et al. 2008; Chingo and Peterson 2011; Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor 2007a, 2007b; Harris and Sass 2011; Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger 2008; Ladd 2008; Rice 2003, 2010; and Podolsky, Kini, and Darling-Hammond 2019). Studies examining the nuances of teacher experience and teacher effectiveness may provide some insight about why school librarian candidates, some of whom had no experience and others who were novice teachers were not evaluated significantly differently with respect to competency. Jennifer Rice noted that several factors require consideration in examining the complex relationship between teaching experience and teacher effectiveness, including the possibility that academic preparation may equal or outweigh the impact of early teaching experience (2010).

In principle, all candidates for whom data was analyzed in the study reported here received the same amount of AASL accredited school librarian program preparation and mentorship in their roles as school librarian candidates regardless of prior teaching experience level. One supposition that may be considered for future research would be to more carefully examine the types of mentorship provided to candidates with no experience and novice candidates. In 2017 David E. Robinson and William Sadera noted in "Factors Affecting Technology Integration in

Internship Teaching Experiences" that enhanced supports via the development of coordinated opportunities with mentor teachers and other school-based personnel can contribute to the success of pre-service teachers. The mentor school librarians may be providing more structure and guidance in planning and implementing school library instruction to candidates with no teaching experience on the assumption that candidates with some teaching experience need less guidance.

The varied roles of the school librarian may be a confounding factor requiring further study in explaining the absence of differences observed between candidates in the No Experience and Novice categories in school library instructional settings. The traditional classroom teacher's primary role is instructor. Those entering the traditional classroom with no teaching experience are primarily focused on the efficacy of instruction. In contrast, school librarians serve in the following five primary roles as defined by AASL: teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, program administrator, and leader (2009). Gaining proficiency in these varied roles may offset gains in teaching experience that novice teachers possess when candidates for school librarian certification undergo their practicum experience.

Intuitively, gains might be expected in implementation and reflection competencies with increasing levels of teaching experience. However, this assumption that more is better is nuanced. Experience effects are complex and depend on a number of factors (Rice 2010). Boyd et al. (2008) and Chingos and Peterson (2011) supported findings that general gains in teacher effectiveness occur within the first few years of teaching experience, but diminish over time, particularly in the later stages of teachers' careers. Conversely, other studies indicate continued effective teacher performance throughout their careers (Harris and Sass 2011; Wiswall 2013).

One possible explanation of the lack of significant differences between candidates in the Experienced and Experienced Plus categories in the context of planning and implementation competencies is that at the Experienced level, while candidate planning and implementation competency proficiencies have not diminished, they may have plateaued.

Other factors that can affect the relationship between Experienced and Experienced Plus candidates' teaching experience and effectiveness include teacher burnout, deficits in candidates maintaining curricular and pedagogical advancements, and factors unique to placement settings, such as socioeconomic and community parameters (Rice 2010).

The dynamics of the school library instructional environment result in simultaneous large group instruction, small group instruction, students and faculty resource acquisition, research, media production, and casual use. Candidates' instructional proficiency as school librarians may be aligned with their accumulated teaching experience most notably beginning at the Experienced level. Anne Podolsky, Tara Kini, and Linda Darling-Hammond supported this supposition by noting "teachers' effectiveness increases at a greater rate when they teach in a supportive and collegial working environment, and when they accumulate experience in the same grade level, subject or district (2019, 1)." In other words, for teaching experience to be helpful to school librarian candidates, it may need to be lengthy experience within well-functioning schools—experiences novices would not yet have attained. The experienced teachers may have crossed a threshold of accumulated teaching experience in the same grade level, subject, or district (Podolsky, Kini, and Darling-Hammond 2019) to be able to transfer this pedagogical proficiency to instruction in the school library, while accommodating the demands of the other roles of the school librarian. This finding provides another opportunity for future research to examine if there are nuances to school library instruction that are best supported by a certain number of years of teaching experience.

Expansion of this concept may help address another theme prominent in the findings. Novice teachers were rated significantly less competent than experienced teachers for thirteen competencies, suggesting that a critical transition and threshold of experience may occur from the Novice to Experienced levels that would not have differentiated between candidates with no teaching experience and novice candidates (Boyd et al. 2008; Chingo and Peterson 2011; Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor 2007a, 2007b; Harris and Sass 2011; Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger 2008; Ladd 2008; Rice 2003, 2010; Podolsky, Kini, and Darling-Hammond 2019).

While significant differences in instructional competencies were noted in a majority of paired instructional comparisons between candidates at the Novice and Experienced levels, only two significant planning differences and no significant instructional competency comparisons were noted between Experienced and Experienced Plus candidates. This pattern of leveling performance among the most veteran teachers is conflicted in the existing research. Some studies are supportive of the few significant differences across competencies examined (planning, implementation, and reflection) between Experienced and Experienced Plus candidates in this study. Jennifer Rice indicated that performance declines for experienced teachers and may be related to factors other than teaching experiences. These factors may include teacher burnout and lack of knowledge on current pedagogy (2010). Helen Ladd concluded that teachers with twenty years of experience are more effective than those with no experience, but not more effective than those with five years of experience (2008). Other studies are contradictory in providing evidence of teachers continued effective performance throughout their careers (Harris and Sass 2011; Wiswall 2013). Factors that explain why more- and less-experienced teachers may not be very different with respect to performance may hold for experienced versus very-experienced teachers when they elect to change careers and become school librarian candidates.

Experienced candidates engaged in significantly more reflection and self-evaluation than Novice candidates. Data in this study revealed that candidates with no experience were able to reflect on instruction with no significant differences noted when compared with candidates in the Experienced and Experienced Plus categories. This finding may be attributable to coordinated support provided for the No Experience candidates by mentors, university supervisors, and local school systems. A lack of similar support for candidates in the Novice category may explain the significant difference found between Experienced and Novice candidates' reflecting on their own instruction during their practicum experience. In the absence of support, candidates who were novice teachers may not have yet developed the pedagogical skillset to accurately reflect on their instruction. These Novice candidates will not have had the accumulation of instructional experiences and context they needed for reflection (Freiberg 2002).

In a holistic examination of all competencies assessed, modeling new content yielded many differences across experience levels, indicating that teaching experience may matter when modeling new content. Other than the trends noted in the transition from novice to experienced teacher, the data did not reveal themes indicating that experience consistently matters across experience levels for the other competencies assessed.

SUMMARY

Several themes emerged in this study examining the relationship between school library practicum candidates' levels of teaching experience and teaching effectiveness in school library practicum experiences. One assessed competency, new content modeled, yielded increasing performance with results across levels of experience beginning in the fourth year of experience.

However, this pattern was not prevalent across experience levels for the other competencies assessed.

Less-experienced candidates tended to score higher on planning proficiencies than more-experienced candidates. In opposition to existing research examining this relationship in traditional classroom settings, there were no significant differences noted across all planning, instruction, and reflection competencies in the practicum experiences between candidates with no teaching experience and novice candidates (those with 1–3 years of teaching experience).

In addressing the relationship between teaching experience and the effectiveness of school library instruction, a significant theme emerged in the analysis between novice candidates and experienced candidates (those with 4–9 years of teaching experience). Thirteen significant paired comparisons in planning, instruction, and reflection were found for this critical transition period. In contrast, few significant differences were noted between the experienced candidates and those with ten years or more experience (termed Experienced Plus in this study).

These emergent themes provide opportunities for further research rooted in the following research questions:

- How much teaching experience facilitates training to be an effective teacher in a school library environment? How much of this experience transfers? Why?

- Are there traditional instructional competencies in which little transfer of teaching to school library planning, teaching, and reflection competencies occurs?

- How might the varied roles of the school librarian affect planning, implementation, and reflection on instruction in candidates with fewer than four years of teaching experience?

- Are there differences in the mentorship of candidates with no teaching experience versus those with experience as a classroom teacher? What are the impacts of those differences?

- Are there differences based on the grade-level and content-area teaching experience of candidates that relate to preparation and transfer of teaching skills to librarianship? For example, is an elementary certified and experienced teacher more effective in preparation, implementation, and reflection of school library instruction than a high school certified social studies teacher?

Consistent with the over forty years of research on teacher experience and teacher effectiveness in the traditional classroom, this study reinforces "the simple assumption that more is better requires greater nuance; experience effects are complex and depend on a number of factors" (Rice 2010, 1). In fact, maybe greater nuance in the school library teaching environment exists than in the traditional classroom.

Works Cited

American Association of School Librarians. 1960. *Standards for School Library Programs.* Chicago: ALA.

———. 1998. *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs*. Chicago: ALA.

———. 2009. *Empowering Learners: Guidelines for School Library Programs*. Chicago: ALA.

———. 2010. *ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians*. <www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org.aasl/files/content/aasleducation/schoollibrary/2010_standards_with_rubrics_and_statements_1-31-11.pdf> (accessed July 1, 2020)

———. 2018. *National School Library Standards for Learners, School Librarians, and School Libraries*. Chicago: ALA.

American Library Association, American Association of School Librarians, and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. 2019. *ALA/AASL/CAEP School Librarian Preparation Standards*. <www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org.aasl/files/content/aasleducation/ALA_AASL_CAEP_School_Librarian_Preparation_Standards_2019_Final.pdf> (accessed April 27, 2021).

American Association of School Librarians, and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. 1975. *Media Programs: District and School.* Chicago: ALA.

American Association of School Librarians, and National Education Association. 1969. *Standards for School Media Programs.* Chicago: ALA.

Boyd, Donald, et al. 2008. "Who Leaves? Teacher Attrition and Student Achievement." *National Bureau of Economic Research* (Working Paper 14922). <www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w14022/w14022.pdf> (accessed April 29, 2021).

CAST. 2018. "UDL Guidelines" [version 2.2]. <http://udlguidelines.cast.org> (accessed May 11, 2021).

Chingos, Matthew M., and Paul E. Peterson. 2011. "It's Easier to Pick a Good Teacher than to Train One: Familiar and New Results on the Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness." *Economics of Education Review* 30 (3): 449–65.

Clotfelter, Charles T., Helen F. Ladd, and Jacob L. Vigdor. 2007a. "How and Why Do Teacher Credentials Matter for Student Achievement?" (Working Paper 2. Revised). Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, Urban Institute. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED509655.pdf> (accessed April 29, 2021).

———. 2007b. "Teacher Credentials and Student Achievement in High School: A Cross-Subject Analysis with Student Fixed Effects" (Working Paper 13617). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w13617/w13617.pdf> (accessed April 29, 2021).

Council of Chief State School Officers. 2011. "InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards."
<https://ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards> (accessed May 25, 2021).

Elliott, Emerson. 1996. "What Performance-Based Standards Mean for Teacher Preparation." *Educational Leadership* 53 (6): 57–58. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ519780&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

Freiberg, H. Jerome. 2002. "Essential Skills for New Teachers." *Educational Leadership* 59 (6): 56–60.

Harris, Douglas N., and Tim R. Sass. 2011. "Teacher Training, Teacher Quality, and Student Achievement." *Journal of Public Economics* 95 (7/8): 798–812.

Kane, Thomas J., Jonah E. Rockoff, and Douglas O. Staiger. 2008. "What Does Certification Tell Us about Teacher Effectiveness? Evidence from New York City." *Economics of Education Review* 27 (6): 615–31.

Ladd, Helen F. 2008. "Value-Added Modeling of Teacher Credentials: Policy Implications." Paper presented at the second annual CALDER research conference, "The Ins and Outs of Value-Added Measures in Education: What Research Says," Washington, DC, November 21.

Lance, Keith Curry, and Debra E. Kachel. 2018. "Why School Librarians Matter: What Years of Research Tell Us." *Phi Delta Kappan* 99 (7): 15–20.

Maryland State Archives. 2019. "Maryland at a Glance: Education." <https://msa.maryland.gov/msa/mdmanual/01glance/html/edschools.html> (accessed May 11, 2021).

Maryland State Department of Education. 2003. "Library Media Specialist." <http://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Documents/ITSLM/slm/COMARLibraryMediaSpecialist.pdf> (accessed May 11, 2021).

———. 2015. "Facts about Maryland's School Library Media Programs: 2014–2015." Baltimore: MSDE.

———. 2019. "MSDE School Libraries Annual Report: 2018–2019." Baltimore: MSDE.

———. 2020. "Charter Schools." <http://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Charter-Schools/index.aspx> (accessed September 21, 2020).

McDonald, John, H. 2014. "Handbook of Biological Statistics." Baltimore: Sparky House Publishing. <www.biostathandbook.com/HandbookBioStatThird.pdf> (accessed May 11, 2021).

Papay, John P., and Matthew A. Kraft. 2015. "Productivity Returns to Experience in the Teacher Labor Market: Methodological Challenges and New Evidence on Long-Term Career Improvement." *Journal of Public Economics* 130: 105–19.

———. 2016. "The Myth of the Performance Plateau." *Educational Leadership* 73 (8): 36–42.

Podolsky, Anne, Tara Kini, and Linda Darling-Hammond. 2019. "Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of U.S. Research." *Journal of Professional Capital and Community* 4 (4): 286–308. <www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JPCC-12-2018-0032/full/pdf?title=does-teaching-experience-increase-teacher-effectiveness-a-review-of-us-research> (accessed May 1, 2021).

Public School Review. 2020. "Top 10 Best Maryland Magnet Schools." <www.publicschoolreview.com/maryland/magnet-public-schools> (accessed September 20, 2020).

Rice, Jennifer King. 2003. *Teacher Quality: Understanding the Effectiveness of Teacher Attributes*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

———. 2010. "The Impact of Teacher Experience: Examining the Evidence and Policy Implications" (Brief 11). Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, Urban Institute. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED511988.pdf> (accessed May 13, 2021).

Robinson, David E., and William Sadera. 2017. "Factors Affecting Technology Integration in Internship Teaching Experiences." *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning* 40 (4): 57–66. <www.itdl.org/Journal/Apr_17/Apr17.pdf> (accessed May 18, 2021).

Towson University. 2012. *Portfolio Handbook for Elementary Education Interns.* <www.towson.edu/coe/about/accreditation2014/documents/standard3/R.3.4.e.37.pdf> (accessed May 13, 2021).

Warring, Douglas F. 2015. "Teacher Evaluations: Use or Misuse?" *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 3 (10): 703–709. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1077674.pdf> (accessed May 13, 2021).

Wiswall, Matthew. 2013. "The Dynamics of Teacher Quality." *Journal of Public Economics* 100: 61–78.

Cite This Article

Robinson, David E., and Scot W. McNary. 2021. "School Library Instruction: Does Teaching Experience Matter?" *School Library Research* 24. <www.ala.org/aasl/slr/volume24/robinson-mcnary>.

School Library Research (ISSN: *2165-1019*) *is an official journal of the American Association of School Librarians*. It is the successor to *School Library Media Quarterly Online and School Library Media Research. The purpose of School Library Research is to promote and publish high quality original research concerning the management, implementation, and evaluation of school libraries. The journal will also emphasize research on instructional theory, teaching methods, and critical issues relevant to school libraries. Visit the* SLR website *for more information.*

The American Association of School Librarians empowers leaders to transform teaching and learning. Visit the AASL website *for more information.*