UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

COLLABORATION AMONG TEACHERS AND TEACHER LIBRARIANS:
WORKING TOWARDS FULL IMPLEMENTATION

By

Roberta L. Waldner

This Capping Course Document is Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT:

In addition to a review of the research and professional literature on factors affecting the frequency and quality of collaboration between Teacher Librarians and their teacher colleagues, this capping paper also examines how to implement and enhance Teacher/Teacher Librarian (T/TL) collaboration in schools using a specific model of educational change. This paper is targeted both at Teacher Librarians who are new to a school library program, and also at Teacher Librarians who wish to revive or further enhance the frequency and depth of their collaborations with teachers in a school library program with which they've previously been involved. Not only can Teacher Librarians read the pertinent research findings with respect to collaboration, but they can use that information, coupled with the educational change model, to do three things. First, Teacher Librarians can assess the current frequency and quality of T/TL collaboration in their schools. Second, they can assess the extent to which the research-identified

factors which enhance collaboration are present in their schools. Third, they can, using the educational model provided, both identify their goals for full implementation of collaboration and identify action steps which should be taken to achieve that full implementation.

INTRODUCTION

"You're hired." The words were music to my ears, as they tumbled from my future principal's lips. It was the spring of 1994 and I had been hired as an English teacher to work in the Humanities Department at John G. Diefenbaker Senior High School in Calgary, Alberta. I would partner with a Social Studies specialist in an integrated, team-taught delivery of Alberta's English and Social Studies curricula at the 10, 20 and 30 levels. I was excited, but at the same time apprehensive. How exactly would cooperative planning and teaching (which we now often refer to as collaborating) work? What if my partner and I didn't get along? How would we mesh our personalities, teaching styles and ways of being in the classroom? Over the next three years, there were ups and downs as I navigated my way through the development of relationships with three different partners, each unique in their own right. We learned to plan, teach and assess together as well as negotiate our way through a very close relationship. In some cases, my partners and I had to learn to live with one another's particular styles. I learned to appreciate one partner's sense of ambiguity and random-abstractness while he came to respect my need for order and structure. We made each other better teachers and our students benefited because of that. We often joked that we spent more time with our teaching partners than with our spouses and sometimes we weren't far wrong!

Having this team-teaching experience was a pivotal time in my career. I discovered the benefits team-teaching had, not only to students in terms of differentiating instruction, creative grouping, and increased teacher-student contact time, but to teachers in terms of collegiality, camaraderie and professional growth stemming from the very close and synergistic relationship that team teaching partners must have. Until I began my M.Ed., my time at Diefenbaker High School was the most significant era of professional growth in my career. I felt saddened to find my next school a place where I was not team-teaching, where there was very little to no collaboration among colleagues and, worst of all, where there was no Teacher Librarian (further references to the Teacher Librarian in this paper will be made using the abbreviation TL) and no integrated library program in place. I missed collaboration terribly!

During the first course I took in the TL-DL program, EDES 542, Resource-Based Instruction, I became attracted to the concept of collaborative relationships between TLs and their teacher colleagues. I had had such wonderful experiences collaborating with colleagues during my time teaching Humanities. We bounced ideas off one another and built on each other's creativity and strengths. Together we could do things we could not do alone. It was exciting and energizing!! I was immediately struck by the possibilities which existed for TLs collaborating with teachers on research projects, problem-based learning and inquiry-based learning.

I was somewhat mystified, though, by much of the professional literature surrounding this topic which seemed to focus on the fact that teachers did not want to collaborate with TLs. This I could not understand--at first. Then I began to remember some of my initial misgivings about team planning and teaching and began to realize that the development of collaborative relationships is one which can be fraught with personal and professional insecurities and that development of truly fulfilling collaborative relationships within a strong, integrated school library program would take much study, careful planning and sensitive implementation.

Throughout the EDES 542 course on inquiry-based instruction and the rest of my TL-DL courses, I have continued to read and review the literature on the topic of collaboration with particular attention to two areas: first, why teachers do not collaborate with TLs, and second, what factors are involved (both within and outside the control of the TL) in creation and enhancement of a collaborative culture with respect to the development of an integrated library program.

The term 'collaborate', in its broadest sense, is defined by the Nelson Canadian Dictionary of the English Language as "to work together, especially in an intellectual effort." (p.273).   With respect to school library programs, however, the term collaborate, or collaboration is much more specific and refers to teacher-

librarians and teachers working together to plan, teach, and evaluate projects, tasks or even whole units which may be resource-based, project-based, problem-based or inquiry-based in nature. It is expected that through this particular partnership, each party will bring unique instructional skills to the table. Teachers provide the content knowledge and objectives as well as knowledge of their students, while TLs bring their knowledge of the school's library collection and how that collection supports curriculum as well as the ability to integrate skill instruction in information literacy within the context of the classroom content and curriculum.

In schools and in school libraries, collaborative work between teachers and librarians is necessary in order to ensure that students are well equipped to understand and manage information well. (American Association of School Librarians & Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1998). T/TL collaboration is also advocated by Saskatchewan Learning. As part of its Evergreen Curriculum, guidelines for strong school libraries which meet individual learners' needs through Resource-Based Learning opportunities are given in several categories, including Co-operative Planning (now termed collaboration) and Resource-Based Learning. The most advanced or exemplary set of guidelines state that "Instructional outcomes (should be) achieved through co-operatively planned and implemented resource-based programs" [and] that "Teacher and teacher-librarian[s] [should] share teaching role[s] as a result of co-

operative planning" (Saskatchewan Learning, 2006, Figure 1, Program). Collaboration, as part of a school library program and as an important part of the mandate of today's TLs is better understood within the context of the evolution of the function and role of school libraries since 1950.

Stripling (1996) traces this evolution. During the 1950s, the emphasis on school library programs was on collections and their development. During the 1960s, a shift towards isolated library skills instruction took place. At this time, TLs focused on teaching students how to best utilize the library's resources. Skills such as using indexes, or understanding the Dewey Decimal System of classification for non-fiction were taught to students, albeit without much attention to context for their use.

During the 1970s and 1980s, the emphasis shifted from isolated library skill instruction to TLs consulting with teachers about appropriate resources for instructional units as well as attempting to integrate library skills (currently known as Information Literacy skills) with curricular specific tasks and projects. This shift gave the TL expanded roles. Not only were TLs information specialists and teachers, they were becoming instructional consultants. "The instructional consultant role takes the library media specialist [a term synonymous with TL] beyond the library program to integrating the information [skills] curriculum

throughout the instructional program [of the school] by collaborating on instructional units" (Stripling, 1996, p. 635).

This integration of information literacy skills with curricular content tasks and projects continued through the 1990s and early part of the 21st century with increasing emphasis on inquiry and on constructivist learning principles. The notion that information literacy skills are taught within the context of a curricular task in Social Studies, Science, or English Language Arts, for example, creates a meaningful context for the learning of these information literacy skills. Subsequently these information literacy skills are often better retained and applied to future research tasks. In fact, student learning in information literacy is most effective when integrated with classroom instruction through cooperative planning and team-teaching by two equal partners: the classroom teacher and the teacher-librarian (Doiron & Davies, 1998; Haycock, 1997; OSLA, 1998;). School library programs which operate on this premise are called integrated school library programs.

The value of a school library program is well-documented in research literature stretching over the past few decades. Some of the most current researchers on the impact that school library programs have on student achievement are the team of Lance, Welbourn and Hamilton-Pennell. In their study, *Impact of School Library Media Centers on Academic Achievement: 1993 Colorado Study*, the

measurable, positive impact that school libraries have on student achievement was made clear. The study was replicated in Colorado in 2000. Both studies showed that standardized test scores increase with the development of key factors in library programs, and that the positive relationship between strong school library programs and test scores could not be explained by variance in school or community conditions. These studies, known worldwide in the school library community as the Colorado studies, have been replicated in New Mexico, Oregon, Alaska, Ohio, Illinois, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Florida and most recently, in 2006, the province of Ontario in Canada. The results of these studies corroborate those of the original Colorado Studies: strong school library programs have a strong, measurable impact on student achievement as measured by test scores.

Many of these school library impact studies pinpoint the key role that T/TL collaboration plays as a contributing factor to student achievement. Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell (2000) state that a central finding of their study is the importance of a collaborative approach to information literacy. Test scores rise in both elementary and middle schools as library media specialists and teachers work together. Specifically, Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell (2000) state that test scores increase as TLs spend more time planning cooperatively with teachers, identifying materials for teachers, and teaching information literacy skills to students. Similarly, in a study designed to test and

replicate the results of the Colorado Studies, a study done by Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell for the State of Oregon in 2001 reiterated the value of collaboration between teachers and teacher librarians in the following statement: A successful [TL] is one who works with a classroom teacher to identify materials that best support and enrich an instructional unit, [and] is a teacher of essential information literacy skills to students" (p. 3). The Saskatoon Public School Division recommends that 60% of a TL's time should be instructional in nature. In light of this guideline, along with the fact that the value of integrated school library programs and of T/TL collaboration as an important part of those programs is well documented in the research literature, one would think that collaboration among teachers and TLs would be something that occurs with frequency and a high degree of success.

However, despite the exciting and positive evolution of libraries, information literacy skill instruction and the expanded roles of the TL, many TLs who are ready, eager and willing to collaborate with teacher colleagues on research tasks, units and projects have been unsuccessful in convincing teachers to plan, teach and assess collaboratively with them. There are many stories about the lack of collaborative opportunities or of unsuccessful attempts at collaboration. In fact, Miller and Schontz (1993, p. 28) found that teacher librarians "are struggling to become teaching partners with teachers who don't want them." What are the reasons for teachers rejecting TLs' attempts to collaborate?

Some of the research literature has tried to identify these reasons. Hartzell (1997) pinpointed a lack of effort to fully acquaint pre-service teachers with a complete knowledge of the roles and functions of TLs. Wolcott, Lawless, and Hobbs (1999) concurred, stating that teachers had an incomplete picture of the services and value that teacher librarians could add to instruction. Oberg (1990) discussed the tendency for teachers to work in isolation as part of their resistance to changes in instructional initiatives. Some teachers cite the lack of time for common planning as an obstacle to collaborations with their TL. Whatever the reasons, there exists a gap between proven theory and widespread practice with respect to teacher-TL collaboration. Hence, the beginnings of a branch of research investigating how TLs can encourage, create and maintain a culture of collaboration has been born.

The field of research in this area is small and relatively new, but the topic is an extremely important one, given the topic's ability to permeate student achievement in all areas of the curriculum. The establishment and maintenance of positive collaborative relationships and practice between and among TLs and teachers should be of interest to all stakeholders in today's schools: parents, students, teachers, TLs and administrators.

My capping paper focuses on identifying the specific factors which encourage collaborative relationships between the TLs and their teacher colleagues. In addition, it focuses on specific and practical actions that a TL can and should take in order to foster and maintain collaborative relationships with colleagues. It is my hope that my capping paper can be a blueprint for action for myself as a TL and for other TLs coming into a school where TL collaboration with colleagues is not occurring at all, occurring infrequently, or occurring at only superficial levels.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Professional Literature

There is a plethora of professional articles on the topic of collaboration as it pertains to strong school library programs. Some of the literature discusses the benefits of collaboration as well as some of the pitfalls. Earlier professional literature focused more on convincing those in the profession of the value of T/TL collaboration. In recent years, however, the focus as shifted, and now, much of the professional literature on collaboration between teachers and TLs centers on the factors which enable successful collaboration and the factors which, when they are present, serve to inhibit successful collaboration.

Several common themes emerged as factors that helped to enable or promote an atmosphere of collegial collaboration between TLs and their teacher colleagues. One such theme is that teachers and the TL must have a shared vision of what they want to accomplish in terms of student learning and achievement as well as how they will achieve the vision. Wolcott (1996) emphasizes the idea of shared vision, stating that there must be a mutual understanding of each (collaborative) partner's instructional goals. With collaboration as one tool at their disposal to achieve the vision of strong student achievement, teachers need to be onboard and willing to collaborate with the TL.

Preceding this consensus and shared vision, there needs to be a level of awareness (which is sometimes lacking) on the part of teachers of the TL's roles and functions. Getz (1996) states that the likelihood of collaborating with teacher librarians is affected by teachers' knowledge about what teacher librarians do. Often teachers see TLs fulfilling non-teaching tasks and are unaware that TLs can fulfill a collaborative instructional role in the everyday learning and teaching at the school. Educating teachers about the TL's many roles is an important step in fostering a collaborative atmosphere.

The credibility of the TL as a teacher is also important. In addition to specialized training in information literacy, they need to have prior teaching experience in order to be seen as a fellow professional, not as clerical or technical personnel. If

TLs want teachers to collaborate, TLs need to 'do their homework' in order to be prepared to collaborate with teachers and be seen as an equal partner in the instructional process (Bush, 2003). Adding to their credibility as an instructional partner is teacher librarians' knowledge of the curriculum, their knowledge of the library collection and their understanding of how the curriculum is supported by the collection. Attending grade level/team planning meetings and serving on curriculum or school improvement initiative committees are other ways in which TLs can raise their profile as teaching professionals.

The other factors contributing to an atmosphere of successful collaboration at a school can be divided into the categories of administrative factors and interpersonal factors (Russell, 2002). The administrative factors include the topics of principal support, common planning time, and the type of library scheduling at the school, namely fixed vs. flexible scheduling. A fixed schedule for a TL means that classes are scheduled for library visits once or twice weekly, usually for book exchanges or read-alouds while a flexible schedule allows teachers to book time in the library and with the TL on an as-needed basis depending on their information and literacy needs for the various projects they undertake. Interpersonal factors include the ability of the TL to build trust and relationships with colleagues, being proactive in communicating with teachers about new resources, about their programs and seeking out collaborative opportunities. In addition, several personality attributes of the TL that serve to

enhance successful collaboration have been identified. These attributes include being friendly, flexible, collegial, respectful, trustworthy, open and communicative.

It should be noted that the literature does state that even in the face of obstacles to collaboration that exist in the area of administrative factors, successful collaboration often happens as a result of proactive persistence on the part of the TL and the presence of positive interpersonal factors (Brown, 2004).

The implications of the professional literature on collaboration are clear. First, to enhance and promote a collaborative atmosphere among teachers and the TL in a school library program, teachers must first be made aware of the TL's collaborative roles and functions. How that is best accomplished would be up to the individual TL and administrator at each school. In addition, TLs must be prepared to bring significant strengths to the collaborative partnership, and they must be seen as credible instructional partners. Having prior teaching experience is a must, and knowing the curriculum and how the library's collection supports it is equally critical. Also, attending to the administrative factors supporting collaboration is key. Keeping the school principal involved and aware of the program is important to its success. With this support in place, the other administrative factors of common planning time and library scheduling can (if necessary) be addressed more readily by the TL, in partnership with the

principal.   Finally, the TL must be cognizant of the interpersonal factors (behaviours which are largely within his/her control) that promote collaboration. The TL must not only strive to practice these behaviours, but to realize that they are critical to successful collaboration, even though administrative factors may still exist which inhibit it.

To obtain a comprehensive look at what collaboration is and how to promote it in a school, Butt and Jameson's *Steps to Collaborative Teaching* (2000) is a good resource. It not only defines different levels and types of collaboration, but also is a compilation of much of the research on the topic in terms of the key factors in creating a successful collaborative environment.   *Developing a Collaborative Culture* (Small, 2002) focuses on similar issues, and compiles a variety of research findings to answer the questions about how collaboration can be fostered and facilitated as well as what is being done currently by school library professionals. *Collaboration: A Road Map to Success* (Jinkins, 2001) offers TLs a list of 5 goals to work towards in order to achieve successful collaborations.   Hylen (2005) pinpoints collaboration as key to the success of any integrated information literacy program and again outlines factors contributing to successful collaborations, focusing on behaviours of TLs, teachers as well as on principals and scheduling issues. *Disciples of Collaboration* (Buzzeo, 2002) focuses on the interpersonal skills and behaviours of the TL in establishing collaborative partnerships, while Bush (2003) in her article *Do your collaboration homework*

strongly emphasizes the need for TLs to be prepared in order to be seen as credible instructional partners. Bush highlights several areas in which TLs should endeavour to gain knowledge and expertise in order to bring significant strengths to the collaborative table.

Research Literature

The research literature on the topic of collaboration as it pertains to school library programs represents a mixture of studies. Some research studies have focused solely on collaboration and the factors favourably affecting its implementation. Some studies have looked at school library programs and their impact on achievement, focusing on collaboration and the factors affecting it as only one aspect of many that are reflective of a strong, integrated program.

Several places where the latter phenomenon appeared were in the Lance studies. These studies were undertaken to determine measurable proof of what constitutes a strong library program as well as the effects of library programs on, among other things, student achievement. Collaboration, along with its role in a strong library program was examined in these studies. Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell (2000) identify several specific collaborative actions TLs can take which serve to enhance test scores. They include: planning cooperatively, identifying materials, teaching information literacy skills, and providing in-service training for teachers. The Oregon Study showed that a positive

relationship existed between test scores and the development of strong library media programs in schools. One aspect that was deemed to be characteristic of a strong library media program was that of T/TL collaboration. Students succeed where the Library Media Specialist is a consultant to, and a colleague with other teachers (Lance, Rodney & Hamilton-Pennell, 2001).

Some research explores the benefits of collaboration, not only to students, but to teacher colleagues as well. When working on units that are cooperatively planned by teachers and TLs, students exhibit higher levels of commitment not shown in other non-collaborative tasks. Students also benefit by having two adult professionals present and able to assist them (Sweeney, 1996). Teachers also benefit as a result of engaging in cooperative planning. These benefits include improved personal relationships among colleagues, increased energy and sense of well being, increased satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment, an exciting sense of synergy stemming from combining and building on creative ideas, and a commitment and a desire to improve as professionals (Sweeney, 1996).

Another theme that arises often in the literature on collaboration is the school faculty's role as a collaborative partner. Some emerging topics with respect to faculty include the capacity of the faculty for change and the necessity of increasing awareness of, garnering support for and building ownership among

teacher colleagues, of collaboration, which is a departure from the solitary nature of much of the planning teachers currently do. Callison (1999) discusses the importance of garnering teacher support for the implementation of new initiatives, stating, "human resources and attitudes committed to change may be the most powerful element necessary to successful implementation" (p. 46). Henri, Hay and Oberg (2002) support Callison, stating that when developing successful school library programs, of which collaboration is a part, it is vital to have whole-school support. In terms of a faculty's capacity for change, their history of implementation will be a strong predictor not only of success in new initiatives, but with respect to the amount of time, support, and staff development needed for future successful implementations. Donham, Bishop, Collier-Kuhlthau and Oberg (2001) state that

> A faculty that has experienced successful instructional innovation…
> will be able to do the transformative work required for an instructional innovation… A faculty that has experienced failed innovation will need great support, time and encouragement to be able to address an instructional innovation (p. 45)

Other research specifically looked at the impact on collaborative relationships of fixed vs. flexible scheduling and time available to TLs and teachers for cooperative planning. Tallman and van Deusen (1994) reported that more consultation occurred between teachers and library media specialists in schools with flexible schedules. Tallman and van Deusen also stated that while TLs in

schools with fixed schedules reported that 20% of their units were planned collaboratively, TLs in schools with flexible schedules reported that 60% of their units were planned collaboratively. Mixed scheduling (a combination of fixed and flexible) for TLs, also yielded a significant number of T/TL collaborations (Tallman & van Deusen, 1994).

As part of their study on scheduling and its effect on collaborative efforts, Tallman and van Deusen (1994) also identified two other important variables that affected collaborative efforts. They included the ways and instances in which TLs met with teachers for cooperative planning as well as the principal's expectation for teachers to plan collaboratively with TLs. Predictably, TLs who reported that they did not meet with teachers at all reported far fewer collaborative experiences than their counterparts who reported meeting with teachers either individually or in teams (Tallman & van Deusen, 1994). Interestingly, "the combined effect of principals who set expectations for collaboration with the use of flexible scheduling resulted in the greatest consultation activity" (Tallman & van Deusen, 1994, p. 21).

Another very important theme in the research on collaboration focused on principal support and its effect on strong library programs, and also on collaboration. In this area, the research pinpointed many areas in which principals can have strong impact on the school library program, of which

collaboration is a large part. Tallman and van Deusen (1994) commented on principal expectations for collaboration as being important. Other literature looked specifically at the importance of the principal valuing the library program in terms of resource allocation (financial, material and human). LaRocque and Oberg (1991) highlighted the importance of principals giving TLs sufficient input and budget resources towards "building the library collection so that it supported the program of study" (p. 28). Equally as important, though, is the principal's recognition that "clerical work, while necessary to the smooth operation of the library program, was not a good use of the TL's time" (LaRocque & Oberg, 1991, p. 29). What this means in terms of principal support is that library technicians or library assistants must be considered a vital human resource in the implementation of collaboration between teachers and TLs, because having technical or clerical support frees up the TL to focus on professional tasks. Also, important is scheduling and ensuring that the collaboration is supported by sufficient common planning time. LaRocque and Oberg (1991) reported principal support for common planning in a variety of ways, including scheduling common prep periods for teachers at the same grade levels or providing teacher release time in order to plan collaborative units with the TL. Henri, Hay and Oberg (2002) highlighted two more important aspects of principal support. They include the need for principals to inform newer teaching staff about the importance of collaborating with the TL, as well as the need for principals to encourage staff to plan collaboratively with the TL. In order to

better facilitate T/TL collaboration, Donham, et al. (2001) emphasized the need for principals to recognize the critical need for sufficient staff development and learning opportunities around the idea of collaborative skills and practices.

In summary, one research article in particular does a good job of synthesizing much of the literature about collaboration and pinpoints ten factors that contributed to the creation of a positive atmosphere for collaboration among TLs and teacher colleagues. The factors were divided into two categories: environmental and social. Brown (2004, p. 14-17) identified five environmental factors that enhance T/TL collaboration as well as five social factors.

The environmental factors include:

- Impromptu discussions

- Administrative support

- Flexible scheduling

- Clearly defined roles

- Scheduled planning meetings.

The social factors include:

- Shared vision

- Open communication

- Mutual trust and respect

- Self confidence in one's contributions

- TLs being proactive team leaders.

These factor groupings resonate closely with those identified by Russell (2002) who termed them administrative and interpersonal factors. Like Russell, Brown (2004) states that collaboration can be successful even in the face of environmental obstacles if TLs remain positive and proactive in seeking collaborative opportunities with their colleagues.

The implications of the research literature on collaboration are also quite clear. Collaboration as part of a successful, integrated school library program does impact positively on student achievement and as such, is a goal worthy of pursuit. The benefits of collaboration are clear not only for students, but for teachers in terms of collegiality, professional growth and feelings of success, accomplishment, energy and creativity. This, too, is a goal worthy of pursuing for teachers' benefit as such feelings engendered in teachers will very likely yield a positive effect on students and the entire school community.

Another important implication is the effect on collaboration that a factor such as the scheduling of TLs' time has. The research reveals a clear direction for schools to take in terms of scheduling. Flexible or mixed scheduling yields the highest

amount of T/TL collaboration and is the direction that schools should be taking in order to maximize collaborative activity.

Principal support for collaboration has many facets and, in turn, numerous implications. The research findings state that TLs must communicate with and (when needed) educate principals on the benefits for the school as well as the needs of strong library programs. Some literature suggests TLs share professional or research literature on strong library programs with their principals. Other literature suggests regularly scheduled goal-setting, meetings or memos that help the TL keep the principal well informed of the library program's status. After understanding and ownership, action on the part of the principal should follow. In that vein, for principals to put adequate resources into the library program is key. Budget resources must be allocated not only to develop the collection, but also for the hiring of clerical or technical staff in order to free up the TL to perform professional tasks. Temporal resources must not be overlooked, as an area where principals can support collaboration. Providing teacher release time with internal coverage or substitute budget dollars to facilitate collaborative planning with TLs is another area of action for the principal. Expectation is another area in which the building principal can facilitate collaboration. Making clear that T/TL collaboration is important, building consensus on its value with faculty, and communicating expectation of its evidence are all actions that the principal can take to promote it. Finally, it's

important that the recognition (and subsequent action!) exists on the principal's part, that in order for collaboration (indeed any new initiative) to be successful, there must be provision for adequate staff development and learning opportunities. This provides a clear direction for the principal to make it a priority to have professional development opportunities for faculty about T/TL collaboration.

In closing, although there is a rich body of professional literature on the topic of T/TL collaboration, the body of research literature is quite small. The research that has been done on T/TL collaboration centers around the influence of principal support and direction, as well as types of scheduling.   No research has been done which examines, in relation to T/TL collaboration, a TL's level of training, years of experience, F.T.E. or tenure at his/her current school. This is research that should be done, in order to better understand how these variables affect T/TL collaboration.

REFLECTIONS

Purpose

With sound grounding in the research and professional literature, the notion of collaboration cannot be ignored as a vital aspect of a strong school library program. But how does a TL, who is new to a school where collaboration has not been widespread, go about improving that aspect of the program? Equally as important is the question of the veteran TL who wishes to revive or promote the culture of collaboration with his or her colleagues. How can this be accomplished? Since T/TL collaboration is such a complex phenomenon, with many factors involved in its successful implementation, it is important to be able to, for one's own school, assess current levels of collaboration, assess to what extent the factors which enable collaboration exist there, pinpoint areas in need of action and suggest actions which should be taken to achieve the full implementation and practice of T/TL collaboration. It is my hope that this technique of assessment and prescription for action (as outlined here both in theory and in practice) will be useful not only for myself, but for others who find themselves in similar situations as TLs in future.

Rationale and Method

The goal of introducing the concept of T/TL collaboration, or of increasing its incidence at any school requires a two-faceted approach. First, the current situation with respect to collaboration must be assessed, as well as identifying the steps which need to be taken to adopt and implement this specific goal.

Second, the process of change must be carefully planned in order to optimize results.

In order to assess what steps need to be taken to implement and increase the amount of T/TL collaboration, an assessment of the current situation needs to take place. Using David Loertscher's (1988) *Taxonomy for School Media Specialists* would help to develop a baseline measurement for the frequency and depth of collaborations currently occurring at a school. Appendix A shows an example of how Loertscher's taxonomy has been converted into a simple table which can be used for a term or a semester to keep records on the number and types of T/TL collaborations. This would be especially helpful for a TL getting to know the types of functions his/her colleagues typically see him/her fulfilling, but it would also be useful for establishing quantitative data on collaboration in the school library program prior to taking any action to improve it. A post-intervention record-keeping period of time using the same table would show the quantitative results of the TL's efforts in this area.

Two well-known authors in the field of T/TL collaboration, Ken Haycock and Carol Brown, have written articles that comprehensively identify the factors necessary for the enhancement of collaboration between TLs and teachers. Haycock's (2004) article, "Research about Collaboration" identifies 6 factors which are important for promoting collaboration. Brown's (2004) article

identifies ten factors associated with successful collaboration which are divided into two categories: social factors and environmental factors. TLs should be able to examine the current reality of T/TL collaboration in any library program through the lens of these two articles. This will help to determine what factors are present, what factors are not, and which actions should be taken to improve frequency and depth of collaboration in the program.

In attempting to make significant, noticeable and successful change in any school environment, the changed must be planned carefully. The rationale for the change should, ideally, be well understood and supported by, at the very least, a committed group of individuals on staff, if not the entire staff. Leaders in adoption and implementation of change must recognize that change is often uncomfortable for many individuals and should take care not to overwhelm colleagues with a pace of change that is too quick. If attention is not paid to these two principles, the chances of the intended change (even if it is positive) being successful may be seriously compromised. Leithwood (1987) looks at change as problem solving. Leithwood suggests that teachers first identify the areas of change which are desired; then, that they identify how full implementation of the desired change would look; and finally that they identify manageable action steps which will eventually lead to achievement of the desired change[s].

In order to simplify the process of analysis and model for change, I created a planning matrix which placed Haycock and Brown's factors enabling collaboration down one axis and steps representing Leithwood's model of educational change across the other axis. It's important to note that some of the factors identified in Haycock's (2004) article overlap with those identified by Brown (2004) in her article. For example, Haycock mentions "purpose" as a factor which enables collaboration and this aligns closely with Brown's factor entitled "shared vision". Also, Haycock's factor entitled "communication" aligns closely with Brown's factor entitled "open communication". In cases such as these, I collapsed the two factors into one category encompassing all of the aspects identified by both authors. It is also important to note that not necessarily all of the factors enabling T/TL collaboration will require action at every school. Therefore, only the factors which are pertinent to the school under scrutiny should be placed in the matrix as determinants of action areas. A sample of the planning matrix is found in Appendix B.

I began the assessment with a short description of what the current situation was in the school with respect to each factor and placed this description in the first column of the matrix. I then wrote a description of what full implementation or the ideal situation would be with respect to that factor in the second column of the matrix. I then began to examine where there existed gaps between what currently existed in the school and what Leithwood would call full

27

implementation. Where there were no gaps, no actions were required. Where

the gaps were great, I targeted those factors as areas needing attention and

began, subsequently, to place on the matrix the actions (sometimes many,

sometimes few) required to carry the program forward towards the goal of

increased T/TL collaboration.

A Case Study and Solution

As a way of operationalizing my technique for analysis and prescription for

action on the topic of collaboration between TLs and teachers, I undertook a case

study of the school I had taught in most recently and developed an action plan

for increasing collaboration within that school library program. The Case Study

background is found in Appendix C and what follows here is my Assessment

and Action Plan.

The State of Collaboration at AIS: Assessment and Action Plan

Haycock's article identifies 6 factors influencing T/TL collaboration. The first is

environment. This factor encompasses whether or not there is a history of

collaboration at a school and the level of administrative awareness and support

for it. Although the level of administrative awareness for T/TL collaboration is

low at AIS, there is a strong history of collaboration between teachers and the IT

teacher. The second factor is faculty characteristics, focusing on the staff

members' ability to compromise and whether or not they see collaboration as

beneficial. The staff members at the very small AIS, by necessity, wear many hats and the ability and willingness to compromise and work together is high. Collaboration on many projects, including curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular events, as well as charitable operations and IT-integrated tasks and projects has taken place on an ongoing basis very successfully. Teachers at AIS not only see the necessity of different people bringing their unique skills and talents to a collaborative project, but they also see its value. The third factor, process and structure, is about having clearly defined roles for all school personnel, being flexible and having an appropriate (not overwhelming) pace of change or development. The faculty is certainly flexible, but does not have a conception of all of the roles of a TL, nor the roles of teachers and TLs with respect to collaboration. The fourth factor, communication, refers to the existence of frequent and formal communication between and among staff members as well as informal communication within personal relationships among colleagues. Since many colleagues are expatriates and share many commonalities, personal relationships are highly developed and informal communication is frequent and strong. There is formal communication between staff members at a weekly staff meeting, but none of the communication centers on upcoming units or collaborative planning.

The fifth factor is purpose, which is about colleagues having a shared vision with respect to collaboration and a feeling that they could not accomplish as well

alone what they could in collaboration with a colleague. Most of the curricular planning that occurs at AIS occurs in isolation with the exception of collaborative tasks teachers undertake with the IT teacher. There is a shared vision of collaboration on that front, but not in the area of information literacy, nor of collaboration with a TL. The fact that a shared vision exists with respect to IT collaboration, though, provides a strong base from which to build consensus and a shared vision of collaboration with the TL. Lastly, Haycock identifies resources as a key factor in collaboration. These resources include temporal, human, monetary, and material. While the school has excellent funding and materials, the human (in the form of a TL) and temporal (in the form of adequate time allotted for a TL to work and plan with teachers) resources are lacking.

Brown's article cites five social factors which promote successful collaboration. They include: [The TL being] proactive, developing a shared vision, open communication, mutual trust and respect, and self-confidence in one's contribution. In the area of social factors, AIS does fairly well. The factors of open communication, self-confidence in one's own contribution and mutual trust and respect are present in abundance at AIS. Teachers get along very well and are quite collegial, often sharing resources, making suggestions to one another and accepting materials or ideas from one another. They have worked together at the school for between 2 and 6 years and know and trust each other to a high degree. There are even two married teaching couples on staff. There is, though,

the absence of a shared vision as to what T/TL collaboration looks like, and why it is valuable. As well, since the Faculty Liaison for the Library (TL) is not trained and she has a small (.1 FTE) time in the library (most of which is taken up in management tasks), there really is no proactive TL looking for ways to collaborate with teachers on units and projects.

With respect to Brown's (2004) environmental factors: scheduled planning meetings, administrative support, flexible scheduling, clearly defined roles and impromptu discussion, AIS fares much more poorly. While there is a great deal of impromptu discussion among teachers as to what they are doing or how their tasks and projects are going, as well as the progress of students, there are no scheduled planning meetings, nor is there administrative awareness, support, or expressed expectation for collaboration. The library is run on a fixed schedule and the roles for teachers and the TL in terms of collaboration for integrating information literacy skills are not at all defined.

After examining the state of T/TL collaboration at AIS, five areas emerged as ones which, when addressed, could lead to a much greater degree of collaborative planning and teaching at AIS. It is around these five areas that this Action Plan centers. They include:

    Part 1-- Administrative Support

    Part 2-- Shared Vision

Part 1-- Administrative Support

The need for principal support has long been recognized in the literature on school librarianship. Principal support is dependent not only upon their understanding of integrated school library programs, but also their understanding of its benefits (LaRocque & Oberg, 1991). The part of this action plan that addresses administrative awareness and support seeks not only to educate the school principal on what collaboration is, but to identify its benefits and to garner principal support for the changes to program structure, scheduling, personnel and budgets which will be necessary to implement a strong, collaborative school library program.

Action #1: Prior to a goal-setting meeting with the principal, the TL will provide him with three key journal readings to focus their discussion.

Person(s) Responsible: TL and principal

Time Frame: Prior to TL/principal beginning of the year goal-setting meeting. Ideally, the TL would give the readings to the principal so that he could read, think and digest their contents over the summer holiday and be prepared not

only to talk about integrated school library program and T/TL collaboration, but be ready to act and take the steps necessary for implementation.

Measurable success indicators: The principal will demonstrate prior knowledge and increased awareness of integrated school library programs and T/TL collaboration during the goal-setting meeting. Hopefully the increased awareness will also be evident in increased support for library programs and the structures which will enable and support them.

The articles to be shared with the Principal are:

Miller, D. (2004). Integrating Library Programs into the Curriculum: Student Learning is the Bottom Line. *Library Media Connection*, 22(7), 34-36.

This article gives a very complete, yet succinct 'in a nutshell' view of integrated library programs, their rationale and advantages. It includes a sample collaborative unit.

Lance, K., Rodney, M., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000) *How school librarians help kids achieve standards : the second Colorado study.* San Jose, CA: Hi Willow [for Colorado State Library, Colorado Dept. of Education].

This report represents quantitative research on the impact of integrated school library programs on student achievement. Since the full study is 122 pages, the TL could recommend the Principal read the Executive Summary available online at: http://www.lrs.org/impact.asp

Schomberg, J., McCabe, B., & Fink, L. (2003). TAG team: Collaborate to teach,

assess and grow. *Teacher Librarian, 31* (1), 8-12.

This article highlights the value and importance of T/TL collaboration, outlines 5 steps in the collaborative process and emphasizes the need for administrative support, flexible scheduling and the time needed for collaborative planning.

Action #2: Prior to the beginning of the school year, the TL will request a meeting with the Principal to begin discussion on goal setting for the school library and its programs as well as to develop awareness and support on the part of the Principal about:

1. Information Literacy skills

2. Integrated library programs

3. Libraries' impact on student achievement

4. The advantages of Teacher/TL collaboration

Person(s) Responsible: TL

Time Frame: prior to the beginning of the school year

Measurable success indicators: Increased Principal awareness and support for (evidenced through action) an integrated school library program and a commitment on the part of the Principal to begin to put into place the structures needed to move forward in the direction of integrated collaboration.

Action #3: Request that the Principal (either alone or in collaboration with the TL) devote time during the first staff meeting or organizational days in order to present the idea of an integrated school library program utilizing T/TL collaboration to the staff, for their information and possible adoption as a school-wide initiative.

Person(s) Responsible: TL/Principal

Time Frame: Prior to the beginning of the school year

Measurable success indicators: The principal agrees to devote time to this issue during staff time prior to school opening. Following the presentation to the staff, a success indicator would be the teachers' beginning support for and awareness of the value of such a program shift.

Action #4: TL will keep the Principal abreast of goals, actions and successes in the school library program with a monthly memo/report. Included in such a memo would be evidence of progress toward goals realized, library/TL utilization levels, and evidence of collaborative planning and teaching.

Person(s) Responsible: TL

Time Frame: Monthly (ongoing)

Measurable success indicators: The Principal stays informed and supportive of the integrated library program and collaborative planning and teaching. The Principal continues to act in ways that support continued collaboration.

Action #5: TL will request that the first professional development (PD) presenter who is brought in (usually around November of each year) be an expert in the area of integrated school library programs and collaboration. Exactly who would present such a workshop/seminar is not known, but possible ("Dream" list) presenters might include Ken Haycock, or Toni Buzzeo, to name two. The school has had a number of high profile presenters on other PD topics, so the possibility of getting one of these highly respected speakers may not be as remote as one might think.

Person(s) Responsible: TL/Principal

Time Frame: early in the school year (likely late August)

Measurable success indicators: The principal grants the request and then proceeds to book an expert presenter on integrated school library programs and T/TL collaboration.

Part 2-- Shared Vision

According to Brown (2004), in order for collaboration to be successful, both the TL and teachers must share the same goal and vision. They need to be united in their purpose. In order to develop such a shared vision, teachers must first be made aware of all of the roles that a TL is trained to fulfill (including management tasks, development tasks and, most importantly where collaboration is concerned, instructional Tasks). Many teachers still do not

consider a TL a teacher, but simply someone who circulates and shelves books. In addition, where collaboration is concerned, awareness on the part of teachers should be raised as to the value of collaboration as well as its potential positive impacts on student achievement as well as teacher professional growth.

Once awareness about the TL's roles and the potential benefits for all parties concerned has been raised, and a shared vision built among colleagues, attention should be turned to staff development and training. If they are to be expected to implement and practice collaborative planning and teaching with the TL, they should be supported with appropriate and meaningful staff development and training opportunities. As Oberg (2001, p. 45) states, "Staff development is critical for the implementation of an instructional innovation" This section of the action plan focuses specifically on ways of developing a shared vision among staff members with respect to T/TL collaboration and on appropriate staff development initiatives to support teacher learning and practice transformation.

Action #1: During school organization meetings prior to school opening, TL (with principal's permission and assistance) devote a short time to developing awareness of what collaboration within an integrated school library program entails. As a way of broaching the subject, the TL would have staff members brainstorm and then discuss the ways in which they have collaborated with the IT teacher. There is a rich history of this type of collaborative relationship at AIS

and should lead to a lot of sharing. From the benefits of this collaboration, the TL could segue into a discussion of student research and how the same type of collaboration and integrated research and information literacy skill learning could take place with a TL.

Person(s) Responsible: TL/principal

Time Frame: 45 minutes at a staff meeting prior to school opening

Measurable success indicators: Teachers express a new awareness of the TL's role and become more open to the idea of collaborating in an area other than IT.

Action #2: TL will follow up on the initial introduction of the idea of T/TL collaboration with the distribution of two professional readings for teachers to read on their own, to use as a basis for discussion at a subsequent weekly staff meeting, in hopes of building consensus among staff that this new direction of collaboration is one that everyone agrees is of value. One reading would focus on the roles of the TL. The other would focus on the benefits of collaboration. The first reading, about TL roles, could be: pp. 56-59 of the book *Achieving Information Literacy.* In this section, the roles and behaviours of a trained TL are succinctly delineated. The second reading regarding collaboration would be: Schomberg, J., McCabe, B., & Fink, L. (2003). TAG team: Collaborate to teach, assess and grow. *Teacher Librarian 31* (1), 8-12. As previously stated, this article is an excellent one for developing awareness and support around the topic of collaboration.

Person(s) Responsible: TL

Time Frame: During the first month of the school year

Measurable success indicators: Teachers will read the readings and have positive comments about them. Teachers will be willing to build consensus around collaboration as an innovative instructional direction that they all support.

Action #3: The TL invites teachers to plan and deliver collaborative units with her, being aware that time to plan is likely going to be at teachers' convenience. The TL will be willing to plan at times convenient to colleagues until such time as the Principal can support the program with release time for common planning.

Person(s) Responsible: TL

Time Frame: Ongoing

Measurable success indicators: Teachers will begin to approach TL with unit ideas and TL will collaboratively help to identify Information Literacy skills necessary to the unit's success as well as discuss instructional strategies for delivery of the unit.

Action #4: AIS will host an expert PD weekend workshop on the topic of integrated school library programs and collaboration, with an emphasis on both

theory and practice. It is important that the teachers are left with real, applicable skills in T/TL collaborative planning and teaching.

Person(s) Responsible: TL/Principal/Educational Consulting Company contract executive

Time Frame: During the first semester (preferably in October or November)

Measurable success indicators: The principal and contract executive will be successful in securing an expert presenter. The weekend workshop will succeed in developing even higher levels of awareness around the learning issue, but more importantly, will leave teachers both inspired and equipped with the tools and strategies to move forward with implementation of collaborative planning and teaching to integrate information literacy skills across the AIS curriculum.

Action #5: Purchase resource books on T/TL collaboration and Information Literacy to add to the school's professional resource collection for the TL's and teachers' reference and continued learning and implementation of collaboration. Two good examples would be:

Buzzeo, T. (2002). *Collaborating to Meet Standards: Teacher/Librarian Partnerships K-6*. Worthington: Linworth.

Buzzeo, T. (2002). *Collaborating to Meet Standards: Teacher/Librarian Partnerships 7-12*. Worthington: Linworth.

These books are valuable not only because of their focus on the history and development of collaborative relationships, but also because of their inclusion of

research data on the topic as well as practical ways of implementing collaboration in schools.

Person(s) Responsible:TL

Time Frame: September or October

Measurable success indicators: Teachers and the TL will access and utilize the books as a way to support their first forays into collaboration. Teachers and the TL will find the suggestions and information contained in the books helpful, encouraging and motivating.

Action #6: The TL and a couple of teachers who seem especially committed to the notion of collaboration will, at the school board's expense, visit the libraries at a larger International school located in the country's capital city, in order to question, observe and learn from the team of certified school librarians there and to observe collaborative teaching in action.

Person(s) Responsible: TL/Principal

Time Frame: Following the weekend workshop (preferably sometime after Christmas vacation)

Measurable success indicators: Teachers and the TL will be able to witness firsthand a well-established school library program which integrates Information Literacy skills through T/TL collaboration. They will also benefit from the collective experiences of other colleagues at the larger International School in the

capital, who have already implemented such a program. Teachers share what they learned with AIS colleagues upon their return.

Part 3-- Planning and Communication

Whether teaching alone or in collaboration, lack of planning often results in unsuccessful learning and teaching experiences. One of the most common reasons cited by teachers in schools where collaboration occurs is finding the common planning time necessary to prepare such units (Sweeney, 1996). If time isn't provided or found, in order to enable collaborative planning, it likely won't happen. Twining (2001) stated that when there wasn't time earmarked for common planning, the TL and teacher often work in isolation. Often, in established school programs, TLs can attend grade-level or subject-area planning meetings to stay in touch with upcoming units and projects and initiate collaborative relationships. This section of the action plan will focus on finding ways to make common planning time happen, even in the unique and small atmosphere of AIS.

Action #1: In order to implement a formal means of communication between the teachers and the TL about what units or projects are upcoming, the TL will request that a few minutes' time (5-10 minutes maximum) be allotted during a

staff meeting every other week for the purpose of the teachers and the TL and principal all touching base with respect to what topics are being studied.

Person(s) Responsible: TL and Principal

Time Frame: beginning from the opening of the school year and continuing

Measurable success indicators: The Principal remains aware of collaborative initiatives. The TL becomes aware of upcoming units and can identify resources, volunteer to set up separate times for meeting to plan with various teachers (if they desire). Teachers remain aware of ways in which the TL can contribute to their instructional objectives.

Action #2: TL and teachers will publicize successful collaborations at weekly staff meetings and monthly all-school assemblies. The all-school assemblies are a forum for students to demonstrate what they've been learning in the classes or to display fine and performing arts. Collaborations between the IT teacher and other teachers have been showcased at monthly assemblies. Collaborations between the TL and teachers should also be publicized.

Person(s) Responsible: TL and Teachers

Time Frame: beginning as soon as possible and continuing on an ongoing basis

Measurable success indicators: Teachers who may be reluctant to plan may be influenced positively by the knowledge that others have successfully implemented collaborative planning and teaching with the TL. Also, in terms of advocacy, there is no better place to publicize one's program than at the monthly

all-school assemblies. Not only will it serve to celebrate successful learning and student achievement, but also successful T/TL collaborations. Nearly every single student's mother attends each monthly assembly and some of the fathers do as well (when their work schedules permit). Word of mouth information spreads very quickly in the school parent community and this type of positive advocacy among parents (some of whom are school board members) could lead to increased support for budget and personnel changes which could further enhance collaboration as part of a strong library program at the school.

Action #3: TL and Teachers will request substitute release time in order to support common planning time. The principal at the school does not teach any classes and can, from time to time, be available to cover classes for teachers or the TL to enable collaborative planning.

Person(s) Responsible: The Principal/TL/teachers

Time Frame: as needed

Measurable success indicators: The Principal will agree and support the initiative by occasionally providing release time to teachers or the TL. Collaborative planning will increase and collaborative teaching occurrences will become more successful and enjoyable for students and teachers.

Part 4-- Scheduling

The type of scheduling that a TL possesses has been the topic of much research and discussion in the field of teacher-librarianship. Fixed schedules, where TLs have classes scheduled into the library each at a specific time in the week, or where TLs are required to provide release time for other teachers is one type. Flexible schedules allow for classes to book and utilize the library's resources (and the TL's services) on an as-needed basis. Mixed schedule is, as its name suggests, a combination of the first two types of scheduling. Research has shown that in schools with fixed scheduling, only 20% of units were planned collaboratively with a TL, while at schools with flexible scheduling, 60% of units were planned collaboratively with a TL (Tallman & van Deusen, 1994). Tallman and van Deusen (1994) also examined the effect of principal expectation for collaboration to occur along with flexible scheduling. In fact, "the combined effect of principals who set expectations for collaboration with the use of flexible scheduling resulted in the greatest consultation activity" [between TLs and teachers] (Tallman and van Deusen, 1994, p. 21). Because the current library program at AIS is exclusively on a fixed schedule, and a flexible or mixed schedule is more desirable, this part of the action plan will deal directly with strategies designed to move the school toward a means of library scheduling that will more positively influence T/TL collaboration.

Action #1: Request that Principal re-distribute TL's .1 time. Currently, the TL is in the library for an entire morning (4 45-minute class periods) every Thursday

(which is the day that parent volunteers come to do scheduled book exchanges with all classes as well as doing read alouds with younger grades. Having the TL and the parent volunteers in the library at the same time is a duplication of human resources which is unnecessary and not productive in terms of collaboration with teachers. Ideally, the TL's library time would be re-distributed to one period in the library on each of the four days when parent volunteers are not in the library (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday). This would allow the TL time to work with a wider number of classes and teachers on collaborative tasks at times other than regularly scheduled book exchanges.

Person(s) Responsible: TL

Time Frame: Prior to the beginning of the school year.

Measurable success indicators: The principal sees the value of the time redistribution, allowing for elimination of human resource overlap and for increased T/TL collaboration on research tasks and makes the scheduling change.

Action #2: TL will request that the principal maintain the parent volunteer-run Thursday book exchange and read aloud times for all classes.

Person(s) Responsible: TL

Time Frame: Prior to the beginning of the school year

Measurable success indicators: Younger grades will still get their much loved read-aloud times. Parent volunteers remain involved with the program. TL's time is freed up from clerical tasks such as circulating and re-shelving books in order to focus on professional tasks, such as collaborative planning and teaching.

Action #3: TL requests that the principal consider making collaborative planning (at least once per semester or once per year) an expectation of each staff member

Person(s) Responsible: Principal/TL

Time Frame: Following the PD weekend seminar, after teachers have had considerable time to adopt, digest and implement the initiative.

Measurable success indicators: Since bi-weekly lesson plans for each teacher are collected by the Principal for the purposes of the SACS Self-Study and Accreditation process, evidence of collaboration with the TL could easily be reflected in those plans and reviewed by the Principal.

Part 5—Resources (Human)

Haycock (2004) identifies sufficient resources (of all types: monetary, collection materials, human, and temporal, for example) as a key factor in promoting collaborative planning and teaching. While the budget for resource collection is excellent, and the temporal resources could be improved by a simple schedule adjustment, what remains lacking is the sufficient human resource, in the form of an acceptable FTE assignment for the TL. Asselin, Branch and Oberg (2003), in

Achieving Information Literacy: Standards for School Library Programs in Canada, state that an acceptable FTE for a TL at an Elementary School with a student population of less than 300 students would be .6. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) whose accreditation AIS is seeking, also requires that each of its accredited K-12 schools with a student population of less than 250 have a TL with no less than .5 FTE (SACS, 2005). This final portion of the action plan will focus exclusively on increasing the AIS TL's FTE to the levels deemed acceptable by these documents.

Action #1: TL meets with the principal and contract executive during the contract executive's bi-annual visit to request that they lobby the school's board to increase the TL's FTE to .5. Ideally, the TL's .5 FTE time would be scheduled in the mornings to coincide with the AIS policy that all core subject areas are taught in the mornings while P.E., Fine and Performing Arts are taught in the afternoons.

Person(s) Responsible: TL

Time Frame: May (to coincide with the contract executive's visit, and also to give the initiative some time to have developed as a staff practice)

Measurable success indicators: The principal and contract executive agree to request that the school's board increase the TL's FTE to .5.

Action #2: Principal and contract executive will request that the board increase the TL's FTE to .5 in order to meet SACS accreditation requirements as well as to positively impact student achievement at the school.

Person(s) Responsible: Principal, contract Executive and School board members

Time Frame: May (to coincide with the contract executive's bi-annual visit as well as to give the board time to consider their decision prior to the start of the new school year and the SACS Accreditation Review Visit.

Measurable success indicators: The board agrees to increase the TL's FTE to .5 and to consider re-distributing some of her courses to other teachers or to new hires.

Conclusion

It should be noted that this Capping Paper and the steps outlined for analysis and assessment of a school's current climate, with respect to T/TL collaboration, as well as the factors which enable it, have been based on the work of Brown (2004) and Haycock (2004). That being said, it's important to note that despite the seemingly comprehensive nature of the collaboration enabling factors described therein, further research should be done in this area not only to replicate and affirm the validity of said factors, but to explore the possibility of the existence of other factors which could enable T/TL collaboration.

Collaboration between teachers and a school's TL is an important part of the development of a strong, integrated library program. The opportunities for collegial sharing and professional growth as a result of collaboration are very exciting, as are the possibilities for differentiated instruction, development of information literacy skills and constructivist learning tasks. The research is clear about collaboration's place in ensuring that school library programs are positively impacting student achievement. With such clear evidence, teacher colleagues should not be thinking "Why should we collaborate?" but rather, "Why shouldn't we?" With a thoughtful plan for implementation, collaboration can be a very important step in the creation of an excellent school library program which is fully utilized for the benefit of students.

Although the case study and action plan outlined here (because of the nature of the particular school studied) did not need to address every one of the factors identified by Haycock and Brown as positively influencing the culture of collaboration in a school's library program, it is my fervent hope that the structures and steps for analysis and action outlined therein will be applicable by all TLs whatever the state of collaboration in their respective schools. It can seem like a daunting task, but one which should not be forsaken, for, according to Brown (2004, p. 18), things like "Lack of administrative support, time limitations, and rigid schedules may remain as obstacles, but proactive and positive attitudes (on the part of the TL) are more likely to reach that most-wanted group: teachers

who will collaborate" This a clear mandate to all TLs. We cannot and must not give up our efforts to encourage and promote collaboration in our school library programs despite the environmental or administrative circumstances in which we find ourselves. With persistence, the goal of collaboration among teachers and TLs can be realized in spite of the obstacles which seem to prevent it.

References

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational
Communications and Technology. (1998). *Information power: Guidelines for
school library media programs.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Asselin, M., Branch, J., & Oberg, D. (2003). *Achieving information literacy:
Standards for school library programs in Canada.* Ottawa: CSLA/ATLC.

Brown, C. (2004) America's most wanted: Teachers who collaborate. *Teacher
Librarian*, *32*(1), 13-19.

Brown, J. (1990). Navigating the 90's—The teacher-librarian as change agent.
Emergency Librarian, *18*(1), 19-28.

Bush, Gail. (2003). Do your collaboration homework. *Teacher Librarian 31*(1),
15.

Butt, R., & Jameson, C. (2000). Steps to collaborative teaching. In *Oregon School
Library Information System 2000 Implementation Manual.* Retrieved February
21, 2006 from
http://www.oslis.k12.or.us/develop/collab/docs/steps_collab.pdf

Buzzeo, T. (2002). Disciples of collaboration. *School Library Journal, 48*(9) 34-35.

Callison, D. (1999). A site-level library power case study of Lincoln, Nebraska:
Educational excellence on the plains. *School Libraries Worldwide, 5*(2), 45-
62.

Doiron, R. & Davies, J. (1998). *Partners in learning:, Students, teachers, & the
school library.* Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Donham, J., Bishop, K., Collier Kuhlthau, C. C., & Oberg, D. (2001). *Inquiry-Based Learning: Lessons from Library Power*. Worthington: Linworth Publishing, Inc.

Getz, I. 1996. Attitudes of preservice and inservice teachers toward working with school librarians. *School Libraries Worldwide,* 2 (1), 59–70.

Gross, J., & Kientz, S. (1999). Developing information literacy: Collaborating for authentic learning. *Teacher Librarian 27*(1), 21-25.

Haycock, K. (2004). Research about collaboration. *Teacher Librarian, 31*(3), 48.

Haycock, K. (1997). Reinventing school libraries: Alternatives, models and options for the future. *Education Canada*, *38*(1), 44-52.

Henri, J., Hay, L., & Oberg, D. (2002). An international study on principal influence and information services in schools: Synergy in theme and methods. *School Libraries Worldwide*, *8*(1), 49-70.

Hylen, J. (2005). Help students and teachers become information literate. *Teacher Librarian*, *32*(5), 22-24.

Jinkins, B. (2001). Collaboration: A road map to success. *Knowledge Quest*, *29*(3), 26-27.

Lance, K.C., Rodney, M.J., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2001). Good schools have school librarians. Retrieved April 25, 2006, from www.oema.net/Oregon_Study/OR_Study_exec.pdf

Lance, K.C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000). How school librarians help kids achieve standards: The second Colorado study. Retrieved May 9, 2006, from http://www.lrs.org/impact.asp

Lance,K.C., Wellborn, L, and Hamilton-Pennell, C. (1993). *The impact of school library media centers on academic aahievement.* Castle Rock, CO: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D.J. (1987). *Improving classroom practice using innovation profiles.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Loertscher, D. V. (1988). *Taxonomies of the school library media program.* Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Larocque, L., & Oberg, D. (1991, October). The principal's role in a successful library program. *The Canadian School Executive*, 27-30.

Miller, D. (2004). Integrating library programs into the curriculum: Student learning is the bottom line. *Library Media Connection*, *22*(7), 34-36.

Miller, M.L. & Shontz, M. (1993). Expenditures for resources in school library media centers. FY 1991-92. *School Library Journal*, 39, 26-36.

Montiel-Overall, P. (2005). A theoretical understanding of teacher and librarian collaboration (TLC). *School Libraries Worldwide, 11*(2), 24-48.

Montiel-Overall, P. (2005). Toward a theory of collaboration for teachers and librarians. *School Library Media Research*, *8*(4), Retrieved May 14, 2006 from http://www.ala.org/ala/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents /volume82005/vol8.htm

Nelson Canadian Dictionary of the English Language. (1997). Scarborough, ON: ITP Nelson.

Oberg, D. (2001). Teacher Transformation. In J. Donham, K. Bishop, C. C. Kuhlthau, & D. Oberg, *Inquiry-Based Learning: Lessons from Library Power* (pp.31-46). Worthington, OH: Linworth Publishing, Inc.

Oberg, D. (1990). The school library program and the culture of the school. *Emergency Librarian*, *18*(1), 9-18.

OSLA. (1998). *Information studies grades 1-12.* Toronto, ON: Ontario School Library Association.

Russell, S. (2002). Teachers and librarians: Collaborative relationships. *Teacher Librarian, 29*(5), 35-38.

Schomberg, J., McCabe, B., & Fink, L. (2003). TAG team: Collaborate to teach, assess and grow. *Teacher Librarian,* 31 (1), 8-12.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2005). Standards, policies and procedures. Retrieved March 31, 2006, from http://www.sacscasi.org/region/standards/index.html

SSLA. (2006). *Saskatchewan School Library Association Executive Newsletter*, *19*(2), Retrieved May 18, 2006 from http://72.14.203.104/search?q=cache:hEzTkUQz9y0J:www.stf.sk.ca/ prof_growth/ssc/ssla/pdf/newsletter/ssla_newsletter_january_2006. pdf+SSLA+newsletter&hl=en&gl=ca&ct=clnk&cd=1

Saskatchewan Learning. (2006). Resource-based learning guidelines. Retrieved May 3, 2006, from http://www.sasked.gov.sk.ca/docs/policy/rbl/guide.html

Small, R. V. (2002). Developing a collaborative culture. *School Library Media Research*, (2) Retrieved February 27, 2006, from http://www.ala.org/aasl/SLMR/

Stripling, K. (1996). Quality in school library media programs: Focus on learning. *Library Trends*, *44*(3), 631-656.

Sweeney, L. (1996). Collegial experiences: Teachers and teacher-librarians working together. *Teacher Librarian Today, 2*(1), 23-27.

Tallman, J.I., & van Deusen, J.D. (1994). The impact of scheduling on curriculum consultation and information skills instruction. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 23 (1), 17-25.

Tallman, J.I., & van Deusen, J.D. (1994). Collaborative unit planning—schedule, time and participants. *School Library Media Quarterly*, *23*(1), 33-37.

Todd, R. (2003). Irrefutable evidence. *School Library Journal.* Retrieved May 10, 2006 from http://slj.reviewsnews.com/index.asp?layout=article&articleid= CA287119&publication=slj

Twining, J. (2001). *Collaboration on the information front.* Unpublished dissertation. University of Denver College of Education, Denver, CO.

Wolcott, L. (1996). "Planning with Teachers: Practical Approaches to Collaboration." *Emergency Librarian*, 23 (3), 8-14.

Wolcott, L.L., Lawless, K.A., & Hobbs, D. (1999). Assessing pre-service teachers' beliefs about the role of the library media specialist. ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology (ED437065). Retrieved August 2, 2006 from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01 /0000000b/80/10/a5/3e.pdf

Appendix A: Teacher/TL Collaboration Record **Adapted from Loertscher, D.V. (1988)**	

The chart that follows is a simple tool to allow TLs to track the frequency and type(s) of collaborations which occur between themselves and their teacher colleagues. It can be used over any length of time, and is very time-efficient.

Type of Collaboration	Frequency
Level 1: No involvement. Library media center is bypassed.	
Level 2: Students access information when needed.	
Level 3: Specific requests from teachers and students addressed.	
Level 4: Materials gathered on the spur of the moment.	
Level 5: Informal planning in hall or lunchroom.	
Level 6: Advance notice for needed library materials.	
Level 7: A concerted effort to promote library.	
Level 8: Formal planning with teacher on a resource based project or unit.	
Level 9: Participation in development, execution, and evaluation of a resource-based teaching unit.	
Level 10: Participation in resource-based teaching units where the entire unit content depends on the resources of the LMC(Library Media Center) program.	
Level 11: Participation and contribution made along with teachers to planning and structure of what will be taught in school.	

Appendix B: Matrix of Enabling Factors & Actions Toward Full Implementation

Enabling Factors	Current Situation	Full Implementation	Action #1	Action #2	Action #3	Action #4	Action #5	Action #6
Administrative Support	Little is known by principal about integrated school library program.	The Principal not only displays awareness of what an integrated library program is, but supports the program, on which and its initiatives in the discussion in a form of human, budgetary and temporal resources.	TL provides principal with several key articles on strong school library programs, on which subsequent meeting can focus.	Near the beginning of the school year, TL requests a meeting with Principal to develop awareness and support for Information Literacy, Integrated School Library Programs and their impact on student achievement, as well as Teacher/TL Collaboration.	TL requests that some time during school startup or organizational meetings be devoted to informing teachers about integrating school library programs and Teacher/TL collaboration, with an eye to a school-wide adoption of this as a new initiative.	TL requests that some time of school library program's PD presenter be one who is an expert in implementing integrated school library programs and Teacher/TL collaboration.	TL keeps principal informed of school library program's PD presenter for one who is an expert in implementing integrated school library programs and Teacher/TL collaboration.	
Shared Vision	There currently is no school library program, nor is there a significant amount of FTE devoted to a Teacher Librarian to develop one. Although teachers are collegial, professional and committed to excellence, there is little awareness of the roles of a TL, nor of the collaborative opportunities which exist with the TL in...	Teachers should have a full awareness of the TL's roles and functions. They should also have the philosophical commitment and practical skills to plan and teach with the TL as part of a strong integrated school library program.	TL conducts short information session about Teacher/TL collaboration and integrated school library programs during school start-up meeting(s).	TL provides teacher colleagues with some professional articles about the roles of the TL and about the benefits of Teacher/TL collaboration as a basis for further discussion and consensus building around the initiative.	TL invites teacher colleagues to collaboratively plan and teach research projects and tasks with her. TL makes herself available when it is convenient for them.	AIS hosts an expert PD presenter for a weekend workshop on Integrated School Library Programs and Collaboration.	TL purchases teacher resource books on Information Literacy and Teacher/TL Collaboration.	
Planning & Communication	There is currently no formalized system of communication between teachers and the TL regarding collaborative planning and teaching.	Formalized, regular opportunities for communication and collaboration between teachers and the TL for the purpose of collaborative planning and teaching are in place.	TL requests that a few minutes (5-10 maximum) be devoted during each weekly staff meeting to teachers sharing what tasks, topics and projects will be studied in the coming week in their classes and courses.	TL and teachers will publicize successful collaborations at weekly staff meetings and monthly all-school assemblies.	TL/teachers will request internal coverage or schedule release time in order to support common planning time.			
Scheduling	The library's circulation and Read-Aloud times are run on Thursday mornings by parent volunteers. The TL's .1 FTE is also on Thursday morning, remain involved doing most of the clerical tasks and simultaneously allowing the TL to work collaboratively with an increased number of teachers and students.	The TL's FTE time should be spread out over 4 days, allowing the parent volunteers to periods in one morning to one single period over each of four days, to maximize the time she is able to spend with a variety of teachers and their students.	TL meets with the Principal and Contract Executive to request that they lobby the school's board to increase the TL's FTE to 0.5.	TL requests that Principal re-distribute TL's .1 time from 4 Thursday book exchange and Read Aloud times for all classes.	TL will request that the Principal maintain the parent volunteer-run Thursday book exchange and Read Aloud times for once per year) an expectation of each staff member.	TL requests that the Principal consider making collaborative planning (at least once per semester or once per year) an expectation of each staff member.		
Resources (Human)	The TL is currently allowed .1 FTE to manage the school's library, its volunteers, circulation, and Literacy Promotion programs. This small amount of time, scheduled as it is, does not allow the TL to engage in collaborative planning and teaching with colleagues.	The TL's FTE is increased to 0.5	TL meets with the Principal and Contract Executive to request that they lobby the school's board to increase the TL's FTE to 0.5.	Principal and Contract Executive will request that the board increase the TL's FTE to .5.			The TL and 2 or 3 interested teacher colleagues will visit and observe school library programs in action at a larger International School which is close to AIS.	

Appendix B: Matrix of Enabling Factors & Actions Toward Full Implementation

Enabling Factors	Current Situation	Full Implementation	Action #1	Action #2	Action #3	Action #4	Action #5

Case Study Background

Anywhere International School (A.I.S.)

The Community of Anywhere

The city of Anywhere is located in South America. Its population is approximately 300,000. Its major economic industries include fishing and mining. Its adventure tourism industry is also burgeoning because of Anywhere's proximity to both the desert and ocean. Despite the fact that Anywhere contains many amenities, the expatriate community is comparatively small. The school community contained between 40 and 50 families at any given time.

Anywhere International School: History, Governance and Profile

The Anywhere International School is a private International School, owned and funded by two large multinational mining companies both of which, during the 1990's found it necessary to recruit a larger number of expatriate employees in key company positions: Human Resources, Occupational Health and Safety, Mine Maintenance, Geological Exploration, Mining Engineering and Metallurgy. The companies found it extremely difficult to attract quality expatriate personnel such as engineers, business experts and geologists because they often had

families accompanying them, and there was no school in Anywhere with English as the language of instruction at which their children could be educated.

Originally, the two mining companies each began their own company school, staffed with foreign certified teachers and administrators. However, after 2 or 3 years, it became obvious to both companies that logic would dictate the amalgamation of the two separate company schools. Thus was created the Anywhere International School. To facilitate the management of the new school, the two companies contracted an American educational consulting company (ECC) based in the USA. As part of their responsibilities, ECC recruited teachers and an administrator for staffing the school, and supplied materials, budgeting advice, assistance in obtaining and maintaining facilities, and curriculum support. An ECC contract executive visited the school twice per year. In the interim, the school's issues and decisions were addressed by a five-person school board, which included two appointed representatives from each of the founding mining companies as well as the Director of the school. It is significant to note here that with the exception of the Director, none of the Board members had any background in Education. Rather, they were mining industry executives. As such, they not only had a responsibility to their expatriate employee parents to provide an excellent education to their children, but also a responsibility to the mining companies to ensure that the expenditures pertaining to the school were kept under control. Predictably, in a commodities industry, the board's purse

strings loosened and tightened with the fluctuations in the market. Funds for

resources and equipment were very generous, with the Board members deferring

to the educational perspective and expertise of the faculty and the Director. If

the faculty and Director deemed resources and equipment necessary, they were

given (nearly 100% of the time) carte blanche for ordering said materials.

The school originally housed grades Pre-Kindergarten to 8, and the school's

population was constantly in flux, but typically ranged between 50 and 70

students. The study body was truly international in its composition. Expatriate

contracts with the mining companies typically lasted 2 years and so students did

not usually remain at the school for their entire Elementary education. The

education tuition benefit was also initially extended by the mining companies to

children of National mining executives' children (provided they had a proficient

level of oral English). Placement at the school was also offered to the mining

companies' supplier and subsidiary companies, with those companies bearing

the cost of their employees' dependents' tuition. In later years, as a way of

offsetting the school's costs, the school board began accepting applications and

placements of local National children who were not associated with the mining

industry. The population of students at AIS who were designated ESL rose

steadily over the years.

The school was housed in a three-story building with 2 large play yards, a common area, enclosed library, science lab, computer lab, cafeteria, media room, and auditorium. The faculty consisted of 10 teachers and one full-time Director. The Director was North American, as were 5 of the teachers. The remaining 5 teachers were local National hires with excellent levels of proficiency in English. There were generalist teachers in Pre-K, K, Gr. 1, Gr. 2/3 (split), and Gr. 4. The Gr. 5/6 (split) and 7/8 (split) students were taught by subject specialists. In addition to the core subjects of Math, Language Arts, Science and Social Studies, students took Spanish as a Second Language, Art, Physical Education, Industrial Arts, Computer Applications and Music from specialist teachers as well. The school's timetable was arranged in blocks, with 4 blocks of 90 minutes per day (two in the morning and two in the afternoon). The school underwent an intensive accreditation process with the host country's Ministry of Education and, subsequently, undertook the "Self-Study" process for International Accreditation by S.A.C.S. (The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools). Each November, the students in the school wrote the S.A.T. (Stanford Achievement Test) in Mathematics, Language and Reading Skills/Comprehension.

Library Facilities at A.I.S.

The school's library was housed in a very large room (3 times the size of a regular classroom). The collection included 3500 books, 12 magazine subscriptions, as well as a variety of A/V materials and CD ROM encyclopedias, including Encarta and Grolier. There was no set operating budget per student delineated by resource-type for the library at A.I.S. Rather, orders for books and other materials were placed on an as needed basis, with input from all teachers, some parents and some students. Approval to fund these resource orders was granted in every case by the school board. These materials also supplemented paperback collections in the upper grade classrooms.

Library Use at A.I.S.

The library was sometimes used for research and frequently for group work space (with large tables), particularly by the upper grades (4-8). Each Thursday was library visit day. On this day, a group of dedicated parent volunteers saw to cataloguing, circulating and re-shelving books as well as story time for the younger grades. Each class had its own designated time to visit the library for these purposes. Since the library was open for use the rest of the week, with a flexible sign-up schedule, students could, with teacher assistance, exchange books in between Thursday fixed-schedule exchange times. The library was also a designated supervision area and therefore was open at morning recess and lunch hour for students to meet, read, play games or do homework. The library at A.I.S. did not have an automated circulation system, although all the books in

the library were listed in a library database, searchable by title, author, genre or keyword. This database was searchable on the school's network, or remotely through the school's web-page. There was not a designated TL at A.I.S., either. One expatriate teacher was given 0.1 FTE Administrative time to oversee the library's operation. She was responsible for working with parent volunteers, scheduling class visits, ordering materials, and reading/literacy promotion programs. There was little to no collaboration occurring in the school with respect to Information Literacy skills, although collaboration among teachers and the ICT teacher for various projects happened very frequently. There was no written library policy, no research skills continuum was a part of the school's curriculum, nor had a common Research Model been adopted. The idea of an integrated school library program with collaboration, cooperative planning and teaching was not part of the school's practice or plan for development/improvement.

Faculty Profile

In terms of the faculty's capacity for change, the Director was very cognizant of innovative methods and initiatives, as were the Foreign Hire teachers. The Director, 3 of the expatriate teachers and one of the National hire teachers held advanced degrees. At least once a year, a PD seminar was held at the school

with an expert presenter flown in from abroad, with topics ranging from Learning Styles to E.S.L., to "First Steps" Writing Continuum Program to Technology Integration. The National hire core subject area teachers, having come from a very traditional, teacher-centered, rote-learning educational system, had a similar, teacher-centered style of teaching. Despite this fact, most were interested in learning about and open to new or innovative teaching methods, styles, and initiatives from their North American colleagues or from the expert PD presenters who were brought in. Adoption and implementation of these methods was sometimes slow, but many National hire teachers made efforts in that direction. This was due in no small part to the fact that students and parents from North America and Australia were not accepting of a completely teacher-centered style of education.