

Copyright of works published in School Libraries Worldwide is jointly held by the author(s) and by the International Association of School Librarianship (IASL). The author(s) retain copyright of their works, but give permission to IASL to reprint their works in collections or other such documents published by or on behalf of IASL. Author(s) who give permission for their works to be reprinted elsewhere should inform the editor of School Libraries Worldwide and should ensure that the following statement appears with the article: Reprinted with permission, from School Libraries Worldwide, <issue volume, number, date, pages>.

Contributions of Library Power to Collaborations Between Librarians and Teachers

Norman L. Webb

University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA

Carol A. Doll

Wayne State University, USA

A major goal of Library Power was to increase the collaboration among classroom teachers and librarians. The research reported in this article supports the conclusion that Library Power was successful in achieving this goal. Analysis of data from over 400 schools (including collaboration logs completed by librarians and questionnaires completed by principals, librarians, and teachers) shows that participation in Library Power increased the percentage of schools where teachers and librarians collaborated to plan instruction and to develop the library collection. Library Power also apparently increased the percentage of teachers who collaborated with the librarian in schools where collaboration already existed. Collaborative logs supported the conclusion that library skills were integrated into the curriculum at all grade levels.

One characteristic of the field of education over time has been the desire to do a better job of teaching children and adolescents. One of the reform efforts of the 1990s is to increase collaboration. As defined by Friend and Cook (1992), "Interpersonal collaboration is a style for direct interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal" (p. 5). Careful reading of this definition reveals several important components. Collaboration is a style, not a strictly delineated procedure. Collaboration mandates personal and reciprocal contact between the professionals involved. Collaboration involves two or more people of equal status, at least within the forum of the meeting. Librarians and teachers participating in true collaboration do so voluntarily, or at least willingly as the collaboration evolves. The final products or lessons designed benefit from the skills and knowledge of all group members. All the professionals involved are working to reach a common goal, which often ultimately is to benefit the students. In other words, true collaboration is a multifaceted, complicated process.

School librarians have been aware of the need for collaboration with teachers for many years. Both the 1988 and 1998 national guidelines for the school library profession in the United States recognize the potential value of

collaboration between teachers and school librarians. *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (American Association of School Librarians & Association for Educational Communications and Technology [AASL & AECT], 1988) details the role of the school librarian in curriculum and instructional development. Among other things, school librarians are urged to work with teachers to develop objectives, analyze learner characteristics, create and evaluate learning activities, identify appropriate materials, and assist in teaching the unit. School librarians are urged to "assume leadership roles in developing opportunities to work with teachers" (p. 37). Ten years later, *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (AASL & AECT, 1998) states emphatically that collaboration is one of three basic ideas vital to an effective school library program.

One of the main tenets of Library Power—one of the six goals for the program—is to increase collaboration between teachers and the librarian. Increased collaboration among librarians and teachers is essential if the librarians and libraries are to become more central to the instructional missions of schools. In theory, increased collaboration among librarians and teachers will produce more effective planning for instruction and more effective use of the library resources. By discussing and developing lesson plans and anticipated student learning with teachers, the librarian will be better able to order materials and to develop a collection that is aligned with and supportive of the curriculum. Teachers will have more flexibility in planning instructional activities by using the librarian as another teacher and expanding instructional activities into the library. With the librarian and teachers jointly planning and monitoring instruction, the needs of students will be more effectively met.

This article discusses collaboration in Library Power schools and addresses the following themes:

- The nature of collaboration;
- Evidence in collaboration logs;
- Collaboration and library skills instruction;
- The difficulty of advancing collaborative practices.

The Nature of Collaboration

What constitutes collaboration can be interpreted in different ways. This section discusses what collaborative activities teachers and librarians engaged in as reported by principals, librarians, and teachers. In general, after joining Library Power, more librarians participated in planning for instruction by identifying goals and activities, designing unit activities, and delivering instruction. However, librarians' major responsibilities often remained the traditional ones of identifying and gathering resources in support of instruction, teaching information skills, and helping students create products. Teachers usually retained sole responsibility for evaluating students and grading.

The Library Power project, realizing the importance of collaboration, emphasized that teachers and librarians should work together. In questionnaire responses, librarians, principals, and teachers agreed that Library Power had contributed to increasing collaboration among librarians and teachers. Some collaboration among teachers and librarians was reported in nearly all of the Library Power schools. The following findings are based on an analysis of questionnaire data and confirmed by the case studies. Ninety-nine percent of the principals (N=456) of schools with Library Power reported that the librarians had collaborated with at least some teachers to plan and design instruction and to develop the collection. In 1997, 36% of the principals reported that their school had fully adopted collaborative planning and instructional design between the librarian and teachers. An even higher percentage of the principals (43%) reported that their school had fully adopted collaboration between the librarian and teachers in developing the library's collection.

Many principals indicated that since their school had joined Library Power, at least some teachers had begun to collaborate for the first time. In 1997, 80% of the principals reported that at least some teachers at their school had begun to collaborate in planning and designing instruction with the librarian. A majority of principals (72% in 1997) also reported that some teachers had begun to collaborate with the librarian in planning for collection development.

Nearly all of the principals indicated that Library Power was at least partly responsible for the increase in collaboration at their schools. Over half of the principals attributed the increase in collaboration among librarians and teachers mostly to Library Power. An additional 35% attributed the increase in collaboration to both Library Power and other school reforms. Overall, over 90% of principals indicated that Library Power, working alone or with other school reforms, was responsible for increasing collaboration. As one principal wrote, "Library Power goals and practices encouraged, and even mandated, the collaborative process. New ways of teaching and planning required the administration to facilitate planning time."

Librarians' responses to questionnaire items supported the findings from principals that Library Power increased collaboration in schools. A greater proportion of the teachers in schools regularly collaborated with the librarians after the school had joined Library Power than before. Librarians reported that before their schools joined Library Power, they had regularly collaborated in planning or providing instruction with 22% of the teachers in their schools. After the schools joined Library Power, librarians reported they regularly collaborated with over half of the teachers on the faculty, 56% in 1997. However, there was a large variation among Library Power schools. When all the questionnaires are considered, the percentage of teachers with whom librarians reported collaborating ranged among the schools from 0% to 100%.

Data from teachers' questionnaires helped confirm the responses from the principals and librarians. In a 1997 survey, 57% of the teachers reported at least some collaboration with the librarian for planning and designing instruction; the librarians reported they had collaborated with 56% of the teachers. That is, data from both the librarians and teachers indicate that, on average, a little over half of the teachers in Library Power schools in 1997 were regularly collaborating with librarians. Only 15% of the teachers reported they were not collaborating with the librarians.

Collaboration can be analyzed both by its form and by its substance. Degrees of collaboration range from only tangential activities to significant cooperation among participants, all with equal stakes in the endeavor. Webb identified five levels for the range and variation in the nature of collaborative activities (Webb & Romberg, 1994). These levels are not distinct and do not form a strict hierarchy. Each level has a purpose and role in the school. In any school, faculty could be engaged at times in all different levels of collaboration, each fulfilling different purposes and different ways of meeting students' needs.

1. Awareness-Teachers and librarian are aware of each others' activities.
2. Parallel-Teachers and librarian engage in parallel activities, teacher in the classroom and the librarian in the library.
3. Coordinated-Teachers and librarian coordinate a division of labor and responsibilities for instructional activities in one location such as the library.
4. Interactive-Teachers and librarian cooperate with each other and assume equal responsibility for planning and delivering instruction.
5. Shared-Teachers and librarian share full responsibility for their own learning and the learning of students. A professional learning community has been created.

The purpose for teacher-librarian collaboration can vary greatly, from planning and designing instruction, to evaluating the degree to which the library's collection is aligned with the curriculum, to providing instruction to students. All these purposes and others were documented in Library Power schools. In understanding how collaboration is functioning in schools, both the purpose for collaboration and the level of the collaboration are important to consider.

Nearly all of the principals, more than 95%, reported that both teachers and the librarian participated in identifying and gathering materials, teaching information skills, and helping students create reports. Principals reported that teachers and librarians delivered instruction and designed unit activities. In two thirds of the schools, teachers and librarians created goals and objectives. Librarians in about one third of the schools helped design student evaluations or evaluate performance.

Principals confirmed that teachers and librarians had cooperated more in planning for instruction. Of nearly 370 principals who responded to an

open-ended question regarding the extent and ways in which Library Power affected the collaborative process, 43% gave some response that indicated teachers and librarians had increased their joint planning on instructional units. The following excerpts from principals' comments help to illustrate this point:

Now the librarian is intricately involved in planning instruction and carrying it out.

Library Power had a positive impact in that it encouraged teamwork and collaborative planning, which was nonexistent on some grade levels.

Before Library Power, collaboration was almost nonexistent. As we get more training we are changing from individually developed units to those collaboratively planned. We have made progress in this direction with still some ways to go.

One reason principals gave for increased collaborative planning among teachers and librarians was that Library Power provided the professional development needed by staff to learn about collaboration. A second was that Library Power afforded more time for collaboration and planning. Also, in some schools, principals held teachers and the librarians accountable for collaborating with each other.

In summary, Library Power increased collaboration in schools. Over 90% of the principals attributed to Library Power at least some increase in collaboration in their schools. About one third of the principals reported that collaboration had been fully adopted by the faculty in their schools. Furthermore, teachers and librarians engaged in a variety of collaborative activities. The highest percentage of librarians reported they worked with teachers in activities more traditionally identified with librarians: teaching information seeking or research skills, identifying and gathering materials and resources, and helping students create products. However, there was strong evidence, both from the principals and teachers, that librarians were becoming more active in the instructional mission of the schools.

Evidence in Collaboration Logs

The collaboration logs provide more information about what happened in collaborative activities. Librarians and teachers in Library Power schools were asked to document the five most successful cases of collaboration during the 1996-1997 school year by completing a collaboration log for each case. (A copy of the collaboration log form developed by David Loertscher is located at the end of this article). Both the librarian and those teachers involved in collaborative activity were instructed to report the goals and purposes for the activity, the content area, the grade level(s), the time spent in planning, the distribution of work during the instructional activity, and an evaluation of how they felt the activity went. For the 1996-1997 school year, librarians from 485 schools returned questionnaires. In a systematic random

sample of 60 schools, 35 included collaboration logs, and a total of 157 activities were reported. In the random sample, the percentage of collaborative activities for a particular grade level ranged from 27% in middle school to 8% in kindergarten. Overall, 35% of the collaboration activities were in the grade range kindergarten through third grade, and 25% were in the fourth to sixth-grade range. The highest frequency of activities reported were in the social studies content area (23%) followed by science (21%) and language arts (11 %). However, 33% of the reported activities were interdisciplinary, combining such topics as mathematics and social studies or reading and science.

The collaboration logs included few details about the collaborative planning process. They often had information about the amount of time teacher(s) and the librarian spent planning the unit. They also listed the responsibilities of the teacher and librarian, both individually and/ or jointly. Some librarians reported information about student activities, which also gave the location of the activities. There was information about what worked well in the unit, suggestions for improvement, and a list of information skills integrated into the unit. Although it is possible to make some assumptions from these data, it is not possible to state definitively that a certain type or level of collaboration occurred. Examination of a number of the collaboration logs revealed an emerging pattern supporting a conclusion that collaborative planning did indeed take place.

Carol A. Doll was a case study researcher for two schools in the Library Power project. Her experiences allowed additional insight into the collaborative process in Library Power schools and helped in interpreting the collaboration logs. In one school, collaboration was not well developed. Both the principal and librarian were new, and it was a relatively traditional school with self-contained classrooms, although grade-level teachers did plan together as a group. The librarian kept the library open during the planning sessions and spent time with the teachers as she could. Her main contribution was to identify resources available in the library or that would be purchased. The collaboration logs submitted to Library Power from this school consisted of six fully designed and detailed units, one for each grade K-4 and Special Education. For example, the second-grade unit was "This Land Is Your Land," and integrated all curriculum areas to explore why people come to America. Unfortunately, there was no indication of who worked on the original unit, what their individual contributions were, who taught or co-taught each of the areas, or what role the librarian played in its design. Although there was evidence of a good final product, there was no indication of the mechanics of collaboration that resulted in that product.

The other school was a magnet school with master teachers who had been teaching without textbooks for several years before Library Power was implemented. The principal strongly supported Library Power and mandated collaborative planning. Grade-level teachers planned together regularly and met once a month for a half-day. The librarian joined them for the full time.

(A substitute was hired to be in the library, and the principal creatively scheduled such activities as music, art, and physical education to find release time for the teachers.) At these meetings, the librarian did suggest resources available in the library or that would be purchased to enhance each unit. But the librarian also participated in the design of the lessons. For example, one final library activity she devised was used as the final evaluation for the whole unit. Also, when the teachers discussed students who had problems, the librarian participated fully. This represents a higher order of collaborative activity than that observed at the first school. In the collaboration logs from the second school, five units were described that documented planning time between teachers and librarian, identified the specific responsibilities of each, indicated how the project was evaluated, and shared comments from teachers and librarian about the success and weaknesses of each. The third grade unit focused on students learning about their local community. Teachers introduced the topic and talked about geographic and historic factors. The librarian worked with students on research skills and helped them find information about the community in the library. Students each produced a page based on their research that was compiled into a book for the classroom. In this case, both teachers and librarian helped teach the unit/ and the library skills presented in the library were used by students to produce the final product of the lesson.

Although details about the collaborative process were not specifically documented in the collaboration logs, it was possible to make assumptions about the collaborative process by examining the collaboration logs. Interpretation of the information available in the collaboration logs was supported by Doll/s experience in the two schools she visited. From her examination of the collaboration logs of the 35 schools in the sample, she was able to infer levels of collaboration. Parallel collaboration (Level 2) was evident for teachers and librarians who each worked with students, perhaps accidentally on the same topic, without the benefit of any systematic planning. Coordinated collaboration (Level 3) occurred when teachers and librarians deliberately planned together and then divided the responsibilities and tasks. Interactive collaboration (Level 4) occurred when the librarians were also involved in evaluating students. Of the 157 activities examined, 3% were judged to be Level 2/ 82% were at Level 3/ and 5% were at Level 4. There was insufficient information to judge for 10% of the units. No activity was rated as Level 1 or Level 5.

In summary, the collaboration logs supported conclusions that collaboration did occur in Library Power schools. Most of the activities reported were interdisciplinary projects, and over 80% of the activities reported were at Level 3/ where the teacher and librarian worked together and coordinated a division of labor and responsibilities.

Collaboration and Library Skills Instruction

For years, school librarians have been responsible for teaching students "library skills." This is appropriate because this is their area of expertise. Too often, however, library skills have been taught in isolation: the student comes to the library at a regularly scheduled time, learns how to use an index, returns to the classroom, and leaves the library skills in the library. Examination of the Library Power collaboration logs showed a different pattern. Librarians were still primarily responsible for teaching library skills. But for the schools reporting to Library Power, the skills were no longer taught in isolation. There was a recurring pattern of using library time to help students meet the learning objective of a unit. The following excerpts from collaboration logs show how library skills or information skills were incorporated into the unit.

Log 1: sixth-grade unit of the ancient civilization of Egypt

The librarian will use this unit to reintroduce several resources in the library. Sixth-grade students may have forgotten the session held three months ago, so will use this project to remind them about the use of the card catalog, atlas, Readers' Guide, and other reference sources. We will discuss each item, and then I will give them a practice sheet with questions based on Egypt. The teacher and I will monitor and support where necessary. When the students have completed the practice sheet, we will begin on their projects. Students will have individual questions for their projects. They will try to find resources to answer these questions on their own and will be assisted as necessary. The librarian will grade the practice sheet, and the teacher will grade the projects.

Log 2: high school biology unit to identify trees

Proposed Learning Activities and Projects

1. Use library resources to learn more about different trees on Nature Trail.
2. Use library resources to find pictures to aid in identification of trees.
3. Use library resources to do reports on various trees.
4. Use audiovisual material such as films to reinforce reference material.
5. Identify and label trees.

What library skills were integrated into the unit?

Using Catalog Plus to locate books

Using InfoTrac to locate current magazine and microfiche articles

Using encyclopedia on CD to print general articles

Using index and alphabetical order

Log 3: A second-grade unit on neighborhoods:

Information Skills Objectives

Students will be able to:

1. Use cardinal directions to locate general areas on a map.
2. Locate a place on a simple map by following directions.
3. Use map keys to interpret symbols and read a map.

Learning Activities

1. Use a street map of your community and put a pin on each classmate's home. Plan different ways to get home, get to school, or get to other classmate's homes.
2. Make a list of places that are within walking distance, and then make another list of places that are not within walking distance.
3. Draw maps of your neighborhood, classroom, and playground.
4. Bring in and share different kinds of maps, such as street maps, state maps, or homemade maps.
5. Compare symbols in maps to actual photographs.
6. Use maps and rulers and map keys to measure distances on maps.

In summary, it is important to remember that respondents were asked to report the most successful units they designed. This does not imply that all units in the schools were uniformly of this quality. But there was repeated evidence throughout the collaboration logs that students had to use library skills successfully to complete the units described. One section of each log asked respondents to list the library or information skills that were integrated into the unit. Sometimes there was direct evidence that the librarian or teachers taught or reviewed the skills with the students, and sometimes there was indirect evidence. The final conclusion was that, in the units reported, library skills were not often isolated in the library, but instead were essential to student success in attaining curriculum unit objectives.

Difficulty of Advancing Collaborative Practices

Instituting collaboration among teachers and librarians in a school is difficult. How this is done will vary from school to school. Each school has its own culture with established patterns of work, set time schedules, and defined responsibilities and roles. Changing the work patterns in a school requires changing perceptions of what is important, control over time, and territorial boundaries, among other conditions. Because each school has its own culture, how an innovation is applied and adapted by a school will vary. Even if a school adopts an innovation, rarely is it fully assimilated into the school as intended by its developer (Popkewitz, Tabachnick, & Wehlage, 1982; Romberg & Pitman, 1990).

Advancing collaboration among staff in a school is an attempt to change the school culture. The skills of collaboration can be learned through study groups, coaching and mentoring, networks, case discussions, and other professional development opportunities. These activities can equip school staff with tools and techniques to build and maintain supportive, professional communities in their schools (Loucks-Horsley, Hewson, Love, & Stiles, 1998). More difficult is getting teachers and librarians to believe that collaboration is good for them and their students and to assume ownership for this new practice.

Collaboration among colleagues is not without problems if attempted blindly and superficially. Poorly conceived collaboration or contrived collaboration can be as much a negative force as a positive one (Fullan &

Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hargreaves, 1989). Productive collaboration is a skill that has to be learned. Teachers and librarians need to learn how to communicate with each other and how joint planning can benefit the work of each. They need to learn how to solve problems, offer productive criticisms, understand the expectations and needs of the other person, and establish a common language. School staff members may have individual goals and styles that inhibit working with others. Some may not have the confidence to open up their classroom practices and reveal their possible inadequacies to fellow teachers and librarians. Incentives such as promotion or recognition may encourage individual staff members to go it alone (Raths, 1993).

Collaboration requires time (Loucks-Horsley et al., 1998). Teachers' and librarians' professional time during a week is already full, not only with teaching responsibilities but also with supervision duties, parent conferences, record keeping, and lesson preparations. Not only do staff members need to learn the skills to collaborate with their colleagues, they also need to be given the necessary support that will create a climate where collaboration is valued. School principals and district administrators must give the teachers the time needed to do effective collaboration.

Strong administrative efforts and staff buy-in are needed for schoolwide collaboration among staff to reach its full potential to improve instructional effectiveness in a school. Without administrative support, the impact of collaboration is less likely to have ripple effects among staff. The challenges to understanding how collaboration was incorporated in Library Power schools include determining how pervasive collaboration had been in Library Power schools and determining how the program had served to increase the proportion of those who participate.

Often changes occur gradually over time. The natural expectation would be that the longer a school participated in Library Power, the greater the proportion of staff would participate in collaborative practices. This was not the case for collaboration and Library Power. The percentage of schools with full adoption of collaboration did not increase significantly with the number of years a school had participated in Library Power (Table 1). The percentage of schools with full faculty adoption of collaboration ranged from 30% to 39%, a variation of only 9% over five years. Principals at 36% of the schools that had participated in Library Power for only one or two years reported full faculty adoption of collaborative practices. This was only slightly fewer than 39% of the principals in Library Power schools that had participated for three years, and slightly more than the 30% of the principals of Library Power schools that had participated for four years.

On the other hand, for schools reporting *some collaboration*, there is an increase in collaboration related to the length of time a school had participated in the program (45%-54%). The schools with full adoption of collaborative practice, about one third of the schools, appeared either to reach this level within the first year of joining Library Power or not at all. Other

Table 1
Percent of Principals in 1997 by Level of Collaborative Planning and
Designing of Instruction Between Teachers and Librarians by Year School
Joined Library Power (LP)

School's Initial Year in Library	Years in Library Power	Number of Respondents N	Degree of Adoption of Collaboration Among Faculty (Percentage of Principals Responding)				Existed Before Library Power
			Fully Adopted	Some	Little	Not at all	
1992-1993	4 years	33	30%	54%	15%	0%	20%
1993-1994	3 years	67	39%	55%	6%	0%	12%
1994-1995	2 years	112	36%	55%	9%	0%	19%
1995-1996	1 year	83	37%	43%	18%	1%	16%
1996-1997	less than one year	44	36%	45%	18%	0%	35%
Total		339	36%	51%	12%	.3%	19%

*Statistically significant difference from three previous years (1993-1994, 1994-1995, 1995-1996).

schools increased, at least to some degree, the concentration of faculty engaging in collaboration the longer they were in Library Power, but still were not able to involve all of the faculty.

In some schools, collaboration already existed before Library Power was implemented. This indicates that collaboration in the Library Power schools was not entirely due to Library Power. However, not enough information was available about the collaboration prior to Library Power to explore fully what was happening and what influence earlier events may have had on Library Power's implementation in those schools.

Overall, more principals reported full faculty adoption of collaboration between teachers and librarians on collection development than on planning and designing instructional units (Table 2). For each of the five years, from 3% to 10% more schools had full faculty adoption of collaboration on collection development than on instructional planning and design. As is shown in Table 2, there was no discernible pattern by year in the rate of faculty adoption of collaboration between teachers and librarians on collection development.

As with planning and design of instruction, collaboration on collection development existed in some schools before Library Power. Prior to the project, from 2% to 19% of the Library Power schools had more collaboration on collection development than on planning and instructional design. (The 1996-1997 cohort of schools is an exception.) The greater percentages of

Table 2
1997 Level of Collaborative Planning on Collection Development Between
Teachers and Librarians Reported by Principals

School's Initial Year in Library	Years in Library Power	Number of Respondents	Degree of Adoption of Collaboration Among Faculty (Percentage of Principals Responding)				Existed Before Library Power
			N	Fully Adopted	Some	Little	
1992-1993	4 years	33	33%	45%	21%	0%	26%
1993-1994	3 years	67	45%	45%	10%	0%	31%
1994-1995	2 years	112	46%	46%	7%	1%	21%
1995-1996	1 year	81	40%	46%	15%	0%	21%
1996-1997	less than one year	44	41%	43%	16%	0%	31%
Total		337	42%	45%	12%	.3%	28%

schools where staff collaborated on collection development may reflect the traditional role of school librarians in providing materials to support classroom activities.

In summary, longer experience with Library Power did not steadily increase collaboration between teachers and the librarian. There was a greater increase of teacher collaboration with the librarians on collection development than of teacher collaboration with the librarians on instructional planning. What is clear is that a high percentage of schools, over 60%, that joined Library Power incorporated collaboration among faculty where this practice had not existed prior to the school's joining Library Power.

Conclusions

Library Power contributed to increasing collaboration between librarians and teachers. The requirements for becoming a Library Power school and the program's strong emphasis on linking the library with instruction encouraged schools to develop a climate of collaboration. As a result, librarians coordinated their activities with teachers, thus improving the libraries' support for the curriculum and also incorporating information resources into teaching and learning. There is evidence that many librarians and teachers went further and actively planned and designed lessons together.

Many different levels of collaboration were observed in Library Power schools. What is evident from our four-year study is how complex advancing collaboration in schools can be. A few of the schools claimed to engage all of the faculty in collaborating with the librarians, but in most of the schools only about half of the teachers participated. It was difficult to increase the proportion of teachers who collaborated with the librarian, and changes

evolved slowly. A number of librarians reported they had to seek out teachers actively to learn how to engage in productive collaboration and how to find the time to interact with them. The difficulty that some schools had in advancing collaboration among their faculty highlights the progress made in other schools.

In conjunction with this increasing collaboration, there is evidence that library skills instruction was incorporated into unit outcomes and less often isolated in the library. Collaboration is a means for expanding the resources in a school and for existing resources to be used more efficiently and effectively. Library Power has helped schools to move in that direction.

References

- American Association of School Librarians & Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1988). *Information Power: Guidelines for school library media programs*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- American Association of School Librarians & Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1998). *Information Power: Building partnerships for learning*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Fullan, M.G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of education change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A. (1989). *Curriculum and assessment reform*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Hewson, P.W., Love, N., & Stiles, K.E. (1998). *Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Nelson, B.S. (1994). Mathematics and community. In N.L. Webb & T.A. Romberg (Eds.), *Reforming mathematics education in America's cities: The urban mathematics collaborative project* (pp. 8-23). New York: Teacher College Press.
- Popkewitz, T.S., Tabachnick, B.R., & Wehlage, G. (1982). *The myth of education reform: A study of school responses to a program of change*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Raths, J. (1993). Organization and support systems associated with science and mathematics education. In R. Stake, J. Raths, M. St. John, D. Trumbull, M. Foster, S. Sullivan, & D. Jenness (Eds.), *Teacher preparation archives: Case studies of NSF-funded middle school science and mathematics teacher preparation projects*. Urbana, IL: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois.
- Romberg, T.A., & Pitman, A.J. (1990). Curricular materials and pedagogical reform: Teachers' use of time in teaching mathematics. In M. Ben-Peretz & R. Bromme (Eds.), *The nature of time in schools* (pp. 189-226). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Simon, M.A. (1997). Developing new models of mathematics teaching: An imperative for research on mathematics teacher development. In E. Fennema & B.S. Nelson (Eds.), *Teachers in transition* (pp. 55-86). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stocks, J., & Schofeld J. (1997). Educational reform and professional development. In E. Fennema & B.S. Nelson (Eds.), *Teachers in transition* (pp. 283-308). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Webb, N.L., Heck, D.J., & Tate, W.F. (1996). The Urban Mathematics Collaborative Project: A study of teacher, community, and reform. In S.A. Raizen & E.D. Britton (Eds.), *Bold ventures: Case studies of US innovations in mathematics education* (vol. 3, pp. 245-360). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Webb, N.L., & Romberg, T.A. (Eds.). (1994). *Reforming mathematics education in America's cities: The urban mathematics collaborative project*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Author Notes

Norman L. Webb is a senior research scientist for the Wisconsin Center for Education Research of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. His current principal area of research is the evaluation of systemic reform. He is a co-director of the Systemic Reform Study Team of the National Institute for Science Education. He directs evaluations of curriculum and professional development projects and served as a consultant on the National Evaluation of Library Power project. Other areas of specialty include assessment and studying the alignment of education systems. His academic training was in mathematics and mathematics education.

Carol A. Doll is a professor in the Library and Information Science Program at Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan. She is the author of several articles, including "Quality and Elementary School Library Media Collections" (*School Library Media Quarterly*, 25(2), 1997,95-102) and "Audiovisual Materials and Programming for Children: A Long Tradition" (*Journal of Youth Services in Libraries*, 6(1), 1992, 53-59). She is co-author of several books, including *Collection Analysis for the School Library Media Center: A Practical Approach* (1991, American Library Association) and *Bibliotherapy with Young People: Librarians and Mental Health Professionals Working Together* (1997, Libraries Unlimited). She was a case study researcher for Library Power.

Collaborative Log Form

Collaborative Unit Planning Sheet

Teacher: _____ Grade(s) _____ Librarian: _____
 (could be teachers/teams)

Content area: _____ Unit of Study: _____
 (could be interdisciplinary)

Student Learning Objectives of the unit: (Date _____ Amt. of Time (in minutes) _____)

Proposed Learning Activities and Products: (Date _____ Amt. of Time (in minutes) _____)

Responsibilities

Teacher(s): _____ Librarian: _____ Both: _____

Log of Instructional Activities:

Examples:
 13 Sep 95; 30 minutes mini-lesson on how to judge currency of info. (teacher and librarian taught);
 14 Sep 95; 45 minutes students compiled current info; checked by teacher/librarian.

Date	Time Used	Activity
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Use additional sheet if necessary; add actual student assignment sheet(s) if available
 Use the reverse side of this sheet to jointly evaluate the unit.

**Teacher/Librarian Evaluation of a
Collaboratively Taught Unit**
[TO BE FILLED IN WITH TEACHER(S)]

Unit title: _____

What worked well in the unit?

**Typical time spent
by student on this unit
(approximate minutes):**
classroom Other
_____ _____

Suggestions for improvement:

What information skills were integrated into the unit?

From both the teacher's and librarian's point of view, was learning enhanced through collaboration?

Yes No. **Why or why not?**

Was the unit successful enough to warrant doing it again in the future?

Yes No.

How well did the library media center collection respond to the unit objectives?

Scale: 5 = excellent

4 = above average

3 = average

2 = below average

1 = poor

_____ diversity of formats (books, audiovisual, electronic)
 _____ recency (books and other materials up to date?)
 _____ relevance of collection to unit needs
 _____ duplication (enough materials for the number of students taught?)
 _____ reading/viewing/listening levels meet students' needs?
 _____ average of above ratings

What materials/technology will we need if we are planning to repeat the unit again?